



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND**

Volume 3

3rd. Session

Number 72

VERBATIM REPORT

THURSDAY, MAY 16, 1974

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MOTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Justice.

HON. T. A. HICKMAN (MINISTER OF JUSTICE): Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following bills;

A bill, "An Act Respecting The Solmonization of Marriage."

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Summarizes Jurisdiction Act."

A bill, "An Act To Amend Certain Statutes."

A bill, "An Further To Amend The Registration of Deeds Act."

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Election Act."

A bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Mechanics Lien Act."

A bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Companies Act."

A bill, "An Act Respecting The Licencing Of Trust Companies and Loan Companies."

And on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Health -

A bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Department of Health Act."

A bill, "An Further To Amend The Newfoundland Medical Care Insurance Act."

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

HON. C. W. DOODY (MINISTER OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT): Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Ratify, Confirm and Adopt An Agreement Between Government And Canada Bay Lumber Company Limited."

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of forestry and Agriculture.

HON. E. MAYNARD: (MINISTER OF FOPESTRY AND AGRICULTUPE): Mr. Speaker,

I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill,

"An Act To Amend The Farm Development Loan Act,"

A bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Crown Lands Act."

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Education.

HON. G. R. OTTENHEIMER (MINISTER OF EDUCATION): Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Education Teachers Pension Act."

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

HON. H. R. V. EARLE (MINISTER OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS AND HOUSING): Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, 'An Act Further To Amend The St. John's Housing Corporation Act.'

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Fisheries.

HON. H. COLLINS (MINISTER OF FISHERIES): Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Fisheries Loan Act."

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations.

HON. J. R. ROUSSEAU (MINISTER OF MANPOWER AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS): Finally the run is on. I give notice, Mr. Speaker, that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, 'An Act Further To Amend The Workmens Compensation Act.'

A bill, 'An Act Further To Amend The Hours Of Work Act.'

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. S. A. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to Your Honour's attention that only half of the ministers are in their seats again today, Sir. There is not enough there to pull up a punt.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Who are we going to ask questions to.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: We have numerous questions, Sir, to put to the ministers and they are not in their seats.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: I would like to start out by -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. W. W. MARSHALL (MINISTER WITHOUT PORTFOLIO): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I would like also to draw to Your Honour's attention the fact that up to this year or up to the change of government we were not allowed to ask a question to anybody.

MR. NEARY: Oh, sit down Mr. Nastiness.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: I would like to ask the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, Sir, if he would like to give the House a progress report on the Reid Land Controversy.

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

MR. E. MAYNARD: All I can say at this time, Mr. Speaker is that negotiations are ongoing and I will make a report to the House as soon as I have something specific to announce.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the minister indicate how many meetings have been held with Mr. Reid? Have they met this week? Are they still meeting? Have they agreed on a price? If so, when does the minister expect the whole matter to be completed?

MR. E. MAYNARD: Yes, we have met with Mr. Reid on I think it is three occasions in the past couple of weeks. We will be meeting again, and apart from that there is nothing further I can say on it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: A complete blackout.

I wonder if the Minister of Mines and Energy could inform the House if he is still studying this matter of the increase in oil prices? Has he got it studied to death by now? Just what is the minister doing about it? Are we following Nova Scotia's example?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

HON. L.D. BARRY (MINISTER OF MINES AND ENERGY): Mr. Speaker, I am happy that the honourable Member for Bell Island asked that question today because since his last series of nonsensical questions relating to this matter, we have received some information, some further information from the Liberal Federal Government in Ottawa.

MR. DOODY: That lame-duck government.

MR. BARRY: - indicating the method in which they have calculated the three point seven cent increase which they are allowing the oil companies to impose on our people here in Newfoundland and in other provinces in

Eastern Canada. Much to our amazement, bewilderment, astonishment and disbelief, we find that included in this three point seven cent increase which the Liberal Government in Ottawa have permitted the oil companies to impose, we find included in this a figure to cover not just the amount which crude oil has increased because of the rise in prices by the Arabs and Venezuela and so on. We find not just an amount for that in there, we find that the federal government have also permitted the oil companies, the multi-national oil companies, to increase prices to cover increases in their operating costs.

AN HON. MEMBER: What?

MR. BARRY: To cover increases in their operating cost, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: When they are doubling and tripling their profits over the last year. Now this is a Liberal Government in Ottawa that is suppose to be concerned with the cost of living.

AN HON. MEMBER: Shame! Shame! Shame on them!

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, it is just beyond belief but fortunately this state of affairs will only continue for another two months and we will get some reason and sanity back into that House on the Hill in Ottawa.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister: Is the minister aware that the matter of regulating oil and gas prices falls within the provincial jurisdiction? I would like to ask the minister if it is the intention of his administration to place this matter of regulating prices of gasoline and heating fuel under the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities as they have done over in Nova Scotia, and forced the oil companies to roll back their prices?

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, again I am very grateful to the honourable Member for Bell Island for giving me an opportunity to reply to this type of question. With respect to the effectiveness, Mr. Speaker, of

regulating prices, I think when I say that there is no magic formula involved in setting up a regulatory body there is no magic involved in this immediately bringing down prices, I think that is shown by the effectiveness of Mrs. Plumptre and her posse who have been roaming around Canada at the behest of the Liberal Government in Ottawa over the last few months.

AN HON. MEMBER: Liberal talk.

MR. BARRY: Did the creation of this bureaucracy, Mr. Speaker, have any effect on the rising cost of living in Newfoundland or any other province in Canada?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, to the first point mentioned by the honourable Member for Bell Island, the fact that the regulation of petroleum prices is within provincial jurisdiction: Then I suggest that he go up and talk to his Liberal colleagues in Ottawa and ask why they had a bill before the House, before it was finally desolved, before the fuddv-duddle between the honourable member's leader in Ottawa and Mr. Lewis, who was finally broken up by the rising cost of living, by the fact that the people of Newfoundland and other provinces were no longer prepared to put up with this total lack of interest in keeping the cost of living down in Newfoundland or anywhere else in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, this federal bill had clauses in there to regulate prices right across Canada, to permit the national government to get some control on petroleum prices. Mr. Speaker, while there is some question as to whether or not this bill was going further than it was necessary, in my opinion the only way that you are going to have total regulations of petroleum prices within Canada is by doing it on a national basis. If, and I say "If", Mr. Speaker, we conclude that we can effectively bring down petroleum prices by setting up a regulatory body, we shall do so. To date we have not concluded that we will have any effect in bringing down prices by setting up a regulatory agency.

We have not reached a final decision on this matter. We are not going to be rushed into it by the ravings of the honourable members opposite. When we have made a decision on this point, we will bring in a report to this honourable House.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, there is what happens when you send a boy to do a man's job. Sir, is the minister aware that the Government of Canada have allocated \$9 million to the province, this province, to offset an increase in gasoline and heating oil prices?

MR. BARRY: That is untrue. That is untrue.

MR. NEARY: Is the minister aware -

MR. BARRY: That is a false statement.

MR. NEARY: that Nova Scotia has set aside \$5 million to offset increases in heating oil and gasoline in Nova Scotia? Is the minister aware that it would be misappropriation of funds if this province did not use part of that \$9 million to offset an increase in gasoline and heating oil prices? Is the minister aware of these three facts?

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I never heard so much misinformation contained in one question in all of my life. I think it was in "1984" that is the book, "1984", with big brother as the main character, they had a Department of Misinformation, Mr. Speaker. Well I submit that if that honourable crowd opposite ever get into power, the honourable Member for Bell Island will be the Minister for Misinformation because -

MR. NEARY: Not misappropriation like that crowd over there.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, everything that the honourable member has said in that statement that he made - it was not a question - that statement -

MR. NEARY: Three questions I had.

MR. BARRY: - was totally false.

MR. NEARY: Three questions I asked.

MR. BARRY: Was totally false.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker,

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, this province, as the Minister of Finance has pointed out in his budget, this province

MR. NEARY: Gets \$9 million.

MR. BARRY: Received a certain additional amount in equalization payments.

MR. NEARY: No.

MR. BARRY: Because of the revenue that had gone to other provinces from increased petroleum prices, an increase in equalization payments, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. BARRY: No payment designated to reduce the price of petroleum products. As a matter of fact that reminds me of the third item, Mr. Speaker, that the federal government, in this letter that it sent out to the various Ministers of Energy, in the last week, the third element in there explaining this three point seven cent increase, the third element was an increase in federal sales taxes on petroleum products. -

MR. NEARY: For which they are giving him \$9 million.

MR. BARRY: An increase in the federal sales tax, Mr. Speaker, that is how a part of that increase cost to our consumer in Newfoundland is made up. In this province we have removed the sales tax, Mr. Speaker. We have removed the sales tax! What do we see the Liberal Government in Ottawa doing? We see them exploiting, capitalizing on this inflationary trend, caused partly by international factors but we submit to a great extent caused by the mismanagement of the Liberal Government in Ottawa.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: The minister did not give me an answer to either one of the three questions I put to him, Sir. So I am going to ask the minister if he is aware that Mr. Macdonald, the Federal Minister of Mines and Energy, yesterday severely criticized the Progressive Conservative Premier of Ontario, the minister's idol up in Ontario, Premier Davis, for not using the money that was turned over by the Government of Canada as a result of the export tax -

AN HON. MEMBER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member is entering into a debate in the question period on this point and as such he is obviously out of order.

MR. ROWE, W.N. On this point of order, Mr. Speaker: The honourable Member for Bell Island was asking a question of the Hon. Minister of Energy. Now we sat here, Sir, speaking to this point of order, and heard the Minister of Energy go off on all kinds of irrelevancies in the hope that we would get one or two nuggets of information from him. Now I would ask, Sir, that the same courtesy be extended to my honourable colleague in the asking of the question. You know, if you were going to call him to order, Sir, then I would submit to Your Honour that when a minister gets up and starts to rave on and is not strictly relevant to the question asked, that Your Honour call him to order as well, which Your Honour has not done to date.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

Here is a loud point of levity on these questions. If we were sticking strictly to the rule perhaps the honourable Member for Bell Island's first question would not have been allowed. The answers given by the Hon. Minister of Mines and Energy have practically been a speech and not a concise answer as the question there requires. The honourable Member for Bell Island has made a speech in asking a question, so I submit that both these honourable gentlemen are out of order.

MR. NEARY: Let me see if I can put the question properly then Sir, I shall try and rephrase it. Is the minister aware that Mr. Macdonald, the Federal Minister of Mines and Energy, was severely critical of the Premier of Ontario for not using the tax money, the increase in the equalization grants to offset an increase in gasoline and heating oil in the Province of Ontario? Is the minister aware of that?

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, what does the honourable member want us to do? To fall down and bow and lick shoe laces every time that a Liberal minister in Ottawa shoots off? Does the honourable member opposite

place the same emphasis -

MR. NEARY: Answer the questions.

MR. BARRY: - on the statement by the Honourable Donald Macdonald as he does on the statement brought down from on high by Jehovah?

AN HON. MEMBER: Haw! Haw!

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, we have our own opinions. For the first time in Newfoundland history, we have a government that forms its own opinions and that just does not lap up whatever is fed it by a Liberal minister in Ottawa. But if I could answer that question -

MR. W. N. ROWE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. If the honourable minister were a good orator, then we would not mind listening to him. Unfortunately that is not the case. We do not like two speeches from him. I would suggest, Sir, that if the honourable minister should not want to answer the questions and he has shown that he is not going to answer the questions, that Your Honour, rather than, you know, allow him to carry on like that, call him to order and suggest to the minister that he answer the question or say nothing, rather than just waffle on like he has been doing for the last twenty minutes.

MR. BARRY: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker, if I may: If the honourable members opposite feel that I am out of order at any particular time, they can stand up, which the honourable did on that occasion, and bring it to the attention of Your Honour, I agree that I was deviating somewhat from the thrust of the honourable member's question - if I could get more to the point.

AN HON. MEMBER: We want Your Honour to rule on the point of order.

MR. BARRY: We have a choice -

MR. NEARY: Could we have a ruling, Mr. Speaker?

MR. BARRY: I have agreed that there was a point made by the honourable member opposite.

MR. NEARY: On the point of order that was raised, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion Your Honour has to make a ruling.

MR. BARRY: We are not deciding on his opinion.

MR. NEARY: The Minister is not running the House, you know, Your Honour is running the House.

HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: So we have to have a ruling on the point of order. Sit down!

MP. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The point of order raised by the honourable Member for White Bay South was perhaps well taken. I am sure the Hon. Minister of Mines and Energy is aware that he was not relevant to the question asked by the Member for Bell Island. He was proceeding to make a speech. I shall permit him to continue on the assumption that he is going to be precise with regards to the answer to the question.

MR. BARRY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I am glad you brought that to my attention, I was not aware of it.

When this province received increased equalization payments and I have to point out that they did not amount to an enormous amount of money -

MR. NEARY: Nine million dollars.

MR. BARRY: they were - Yes, a reasonable amount, nothing -

AN HON. MEMBER: Unreasonably small.

MR. BARRY: Nothing near to what is needed in order to meet the demands of the people of Newfoundland for services.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, again we have the misinformation being vomited out by the honourable member opposite. This payment was not made to reduce petroleum prices. This government had taken steps before this payment was ever received to reduce petroleum prices by removing the sales tax. Now this payment was an increase in equalization payments to go into the general revenue of the province, to be used as the priorities of the province demanded. Now, Mr. Speaker, this money is being used to build hospitals, This money is being used to build schools. This money is being used to build roads. This money is being used to put in water and sewer systems, all of which my honourable colleagues have pointed out in their estimates and will be

revealing in more detail later.

Now if the honourable member is saying that we are doing wrong by not putting this money into the reduction of petroleum prices, then I say to him that is his opinion and he is entitled to it but I say he is wrong.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is the minister denying that there was a general understanding -

MR. BARRY: I am denying that, yes, I am denying that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Yes, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair has allowed this issue to go on for some time now and it has become a debate rather than a straightforward question, a supplementary question in the answer period. I think we should get on to other questions really.

MR. ROWE, W. N. Mr. Speaker, a supplementary - I am a different member, obviously, but it is on the same issue, I would like the opportunity to ask the minister a straightforward question. We have not been able to elicit any information from him. Besides nailing futility against the Liberal Government in Ottawa, is this minister's administration going to do anything to try and offset the rising cost of petroleum products in this province? Is he going to do anything besides rail against the Liberal Government in Ottawa?

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, to reiterate, we have already done something in that we have removed the provincial sales tax. We cannot remove the federal sales tax. We would like to but that is not within our power. Secondly, we are now analyzing the situation to determine whether we can effectively regulate prices within the province and gain anything by so doing, Mr. Speaker, to benefit the consumer. At the present time we cannot say that we will bring any benefits to the consumer and we may even disadvantage the consumer by creating another bureaucracy -

NEARY:.... the machinery is there already.

6299

May 16, 1974

Tape 1651 (Afternoon)

PK - 12

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is referring to the Public Utilities Board which has more work to do down there now than almost it can handle.

6300

We have an excellent Chairman down there who is being worked to death, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Powell, the Chairman of that Board is one of the most able administrators in our Province. He is probably putting more energy into his job than any other individual that I know in the Province. The honourable member opposite is saying that with the heavy burdens they now have that they can without any additional staff get into the regulation of petroleum prices. That is total absurdity, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I think the point that the honourable members opposite are asking is whether the Provincial Government is in a position at this time to further subsidize petroleum prices from its own revenues. Mr. Speaker, I can say that at this time, this government is not in a position to do this as is clearly set out in the budget speech of the honourable Minister of Finance. As any member can see, anybody with any common sense at all can see that this Province can barely scrape by with providing the services that are needed, desperately needed by our people. We cannot afford to subsidize petroleum prices, a subsidization, Mr. Speaker, which I should point out does not benefit equally every resident in Newfoundland the way the provision of general services does.

It benefits most the people who have the greatest consumption of the petroleum products.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: If I could just conclude, Mr. Speaker, I will say that this government at the present time has set out its financial priorities in the budget speech. While we can sympathize with the anger of our people for seeing an increase in petroleum prices with the added cost of living that results from this, while we are angered ourselves by the Federal Government permitting this to happen, we are not in a position at this time to further subsidize it.

One final point, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member for Bell Island is implying that there was a general understanding between

provinces that this money would be used to further subsidize petroleum prices. Mr. Speaker, if that be not a lie, it is because the honourable member does not know any better. It is definitely a false statement, a misstatement, an untrue statement.

MR. NEARY: It is not untrue.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Labrador North.

MR. M. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Tourism. I wonder if the minister can inform the House if there will be any work done on a national park in Labrador this year. I know there is some correspondence and some survey work has been done over the last couple of years. I think it proper to conclude that this year they have intended to establish a national park. I am concerned, Sir, about an article in the "Daily News" today where they are taking the polar bears and the porcupines and the wolves from Labrador and bringing them up to the Salmonier Line. The member from Harbour Grace -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! The honourable member for Labrador North is really making a speech.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, if the minister have any information or can inform the House if there will be any work this year on a national park, if there be one in planning? There is considerable correspondence going on. Maybe he can enlighten the House as to what is happening as far as a national park. We do not want to see our wild beasts being taken down to the Island. They may not live in this -

MR. T. DOYLE: Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge, at this point in time, the matter is strictly in the initial negotiation stage or initial talking stage. I cannot truthfully see how any work will start on it in this current fiscal year, unless there be a change in the Federal attitude.

MR. WOODWARD: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: I have knowledge and there has been a considerable amount of work done as far as survey work is concerned, both between the Province and the Federal Government, and there is work planned for this year. So maybe if the minister at a

later date can gather the information, he can give more information to the House regarding the park.

MR. DOYLE: Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted as the minister responsible for the parks in the Province, that if the honourable member should have any information from Ottawa that we do not have, I would very much like to get it. I am not really too double-minded which direction it comes from, as long as we get it. I have not any information of any staff this year. If he should have, I should like to have it.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for White Bay South.

MR. W. ROWE: I would like to address a question to the Minister of Justice, Mr. Speaker. In view of the representations recently made to the Minister of Justice, Mr. Speaker, can the minister tell the House if he is going to bring legislation before the House this session to allow the Newfoundland constabulary to have a normal trade union organization, belonging to a normal trade union organization with all of the rights and privileges attendant thereon, including the right to strike?

MR. T.A. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, today at noon I received a very good brief and I had a very excellent meeting with representatives of the Newfoundland Federation of Labour and with the Police Brotherhood. The basic request in that brief was that they be given the right to join a trade union of their choice and also that consideration be given to the preparing of a brand new constabulary act, and the view was expressed at the meeting that the present act, which was passed in 1970, (I think it was) is totally unsatisfactory.

I undertook, and this was all they asked me to do, they are very reasonable people, to bring the brief to the attention of all members of government in the hope that during the forthcoming months we can get to work on seeing whether a totally new act is necessary or whether massive amendments to the present one are. That is all that would be appropriate for me to say now.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I want to give notice that I am not

satisfied with the answers to questions given by the Minister of Mines Sir, and I would like to debate it later on this afternoon, during the late show.

Sir, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Tourism. Would the minister inform the House if all the provincial parks will be open by May 24th, a holiday.

MR. DOYLE: No, they will not, Mr. Speaker. The parks that were able to be opened were opened yesterday, May 15, which is the official opening date. There are certain parks in the Province, because of weather, snow and conditions of roads brought about by the winter conditions, will not be opened for another couple of weeks. I would say they all will be opened by the first of June. About one-half of them opened yesterday.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Education, Sir, would inform the House what steps his department has taken to react to a secret ballot that has been taken, on at least two occasions if not three occasions, to change the hours of work in the minister's department?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, actually to put this in context, many government departments and perhaps all have made various requests with respect to hours of work and these are all being considered together by government, not department by department. They are all being considered together so that, presumably, among the criteria, number one is to get a reasonable flow in and out so that everybody is not coming the same time, from the point of view of traffic and also from the point of view of the kind of services rendered and what kinds being most accessible to the general public. All of these matters are being considered together, not individually department by department.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the minister indicate then when the public service employees here in Confederation Building can expect a reply to their request to have the hours of work changed? How long is it going to take to study this matter?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I would think, Mr. Speaker, that certainly within the next month a final decision will be made on that.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we get into Orders of the Day, according to the new rules I have to indicate what matters will be discussed on Thursday. The only notice I have been given is the verbal notice just given by the member for Bell Island. This will be discussed at five thirty, assuming he passes the thing to me in writing by five o'clock.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. MARSHALL: Order 2, Committee of Ways and Means. For the benefit of the Opposition I might say this is the budget speech.

MR. SPEAKER: Order 2, Committee of Ways and Means. I think the honourable member for White Bay South, I believe it was, adjourned the debate last night.

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I think I spoke five minutes or something last night.

MR. SPEAKER: Seven minutes.

MR. ROWE: Seven minutes, very good Sir. Sir, I want to repeat something which I said last night. I do not think it is needless repetition, I think it is extremely necessary repetition. When the Budget Speech was called, Mr. Speaker, we saw the member for Bell Island spring to his feet and deliver himself of a forty-five minute excellent oration. The member for Labrador North subsequently got up, right after him, and delivered a half an hour or forty minute speech. Then, Sir, I called upon members opposite who wanted to speak, since we are few in number, to rise and speak on the Budget debate, ministers or backbenchers. Nobody, Sir, got up to speak. So, I, as the third member of the opposition, was forced or see the debate closed; I was forced to rise to my feet in order to speak in the Budget Speech debate.

Now, Sir, I passed comment on that action by the government side of the House because it indicates that although the House Leader and his minions on that side had made every effort, albeit unsuccessfully, to muzzle this side of the House, he has made every

effort to muzzle this side of the House with no success. He has obviously successfully muzzled his own colleagues and supporters on that side stifled all debate or comment or observation or remark by anybody on the government side of the House. I make that observation, Sir, because it is a commentary on what is going on in that government and in that caucus, the P.C. caucus.

The only other alternative of course and this is not outside the realm of possibility, the other alternative is that they are waiting for all of us to speak here, one by one, and then members of the other side can get up when we have exhausted our right to speak, can get up one after another, twenty or thirty of them, and can parade their wares before the House and before the public. That is the other alternative, Mr. Speaker, and I would not be surprised if the House Leader tried that alternative. It would be consistent with the lack of fair play and the arrogant stand which he and his colleagues have taken during this whole session and indeed all sessions of the House, but of course culminating in this session, worst example in this session of trying to cut off, in fact cutting off debate on the estimates and limiting the amount of time which members can speak in this House.

Mr. Speaker, having had the debate on the estimates cut off, my colleague, the member for Bell Island, sought to have his forty-five minute speech extended to ask a few questions of the government. That courtesy which is normally extended as a matter of course to allow a member to wind up his remarks was refused again by members on the other side of the House. Some members said yes, some members said no.

It represents to me, Sir, one consistent whole piece of action by this administration, a desire to cover up and to hide the answers, if they have any answers to the questions which they know we want answered and which they know the people of Newfoundland want answered.

Over \$350 million, Mr. Speaker, more than \$350 million, which is almost \$1 million a day of expenditure, was allowed by this government to go through the House without any questions whatsoever, without any debate

being allowed on them, without any comments from the ministers concerned, without any minister answering questions on over \$350 million.

I suppose three or four years ago \$350 million would have been the whole budget for the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. Now it represents nearly half, about half of the whole budget. This administration, in its endeavour to get out of the House of Assembly as quick as possible without answering questions, made sure by the most arrogant use of their majority that over half the money being voted by this House for expenditure would go through on a blank check, without any questions asked, without any answers being given.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is bad enough, It is bad enough that this government allows that to happen, in fact forced it to happen but what is even worse is the fact that the House Leader, the government House Leader, supported again by his colleagues, made sure that he calls the departments of expenditure which were among the least controversial departments, He made sure and certain that the departments of government which would likely involve the government in embarrassment, which would show up the government for muddled policy decisions, which showed that the government had no answers to many of the questions that people are asking all throughout this Province, the House Leader and his supporters made sure that these departments were kept back, kept to the last so that there was every likelihood they would never see the light of day in the estimates' debate.

That needs to be said, Mr. Speaker, because it indicates clearly and graphically what type of an administration and government we have in this Province today.

Departments such as Education, the highest spending department of all, which should have been brought on first in this House because first of all the amount of money is the greatest of all the departments and second of all, I suppose it touches every man, woman and child more

intimately than any other department in the government, the Department of Education which should have been brought on first was kept back purposely by the government House Leader, by design of the administration and the government, so that there would never be any questions asked on the Department of Education.

Fisheries, surely one of the most important departments in this government or any government in Newfoundland, which should have been called among the first, second or third, kept back once more and no questions allowed to be asked or answered on that Department of Fisheries.

The Department of Public Works, which my friend the member for Labrador West who happens to be the minister of at the moment, a department which has been known in the past to be slightly embarrassing to the government, kept back once more so that no questions could be asked by members of this side of the House and no answers could be given by the ministers of the Crown.

Rehabilitation and Recreation, Tourism, Tourism with the great Confederation Silver Anniversary rip-off, upwards of probably \$6 million going to be spent in this Province. No, Sir, no hint that that might come up before the House of Assembly or the committee for debate, kept back once more so that no embarrassing questions could be asked of the minister or of the government.

There are ten or a dozen similar departments. The Department of Health, the second highest in expenditure and again a department which is felt almost on a daily basis by the people of this Province, not put forward first, second or third, to make sure that we could ask questions on it and get information from the government. No, Mr. Speaker, kept in the background knowing that we would exhaust the seventy-five hours of time forcibly imposed on us by the government House Leader, and that department would never see the light of day.

I went through the estimates quickly again, Sir, yesterday, and questions spring up from the paper as you are looking through the estimates, questions spring up

that we would want to ask this government. Under the Department of Education, for example, which should have been the first department called, we would have liked to hear the Minister of Education and the Minister of Finance rationalize their new policy of providing tuition and allowances on a certain scale to the Memorial University students when two years ago, I believe it was, they wiped out tuitions and allowances or virtually wiped them out saying at the time that there was no need of them, thereby precipitating a disastrous situation at Memorial University.

Here they were forced once more by a situation which they had perpetrated and which had gotten completely out of control, forced to reinstate it. We would have liked to hear the Minister of Education say a word or two of explanation on that but no, Sir, no opportunity, not one question allowed to be asked.

DREF schools, which is another topic - the minister has said that they are not going to go after money from Ottawa to build DREF schools throughout this province. The specious argument he gave for that was because they were too expensive, as if it were not possible to sit down and renegotiate or negotiate schools which were more within our means. But no, the minister has decided and his colleagues have decided to spurn all help from Ottawa for school construction in this province at a time when the boards of education are crying out for money for school construction.

I would have liked to ask the minister and I am sure my colleague, the member for St. Barbe North, would have wanted to ask the minister why. Give us an explanation. Give us an answer to some of these questions. No, Sir, no opportunity provided.

School boards: Sir, you hear nearly every day you turn on the news, school boards all over this province virtually on the brink of bankruptcy; to borrow a phrase from the Minister of Finance. We would have liked to find out from the Minister of Education what is the actual situation. What does the government intend to do about it? But no, Sir, the department is kept back so the minister and his colleagues are spared any possible embarrassment regarding that situation.

On school construction generally, Mr. Speaker, we would have liked to have some information. Not an iota of information. The whole question of Memorial University, where we voted through millions of dollars without any explanation by the minister. Presumably the minister has seen the budget of Memorial University to see where the money is being spent. Nobody in this House has had any explanation as to where the untold millions of dollars are going for Memorial University. Memorial University, grant-in-aid; nearly \$24 million dollars by way of a grant-in-aid to Memorial University, voted through, Mr. Speaker, with not one jot of information given by the minister, no questions allowed to be asked, a blank check to Memorial University. I am sure they need it but as a responsible member of this House I would have liked to hear from the minister some scintilla of explanation as to what they propose to do with that money.

Presumably the treasury board and the minister have seen the budget at the university even if they are loath to have it made public or tabled in this House of Assembly.

Any new programmes by the Minister of Education this year? The Minister of Education has kept a very low profile over the past few months concerning his department. Nobody seems to know what is going on. The school buses for example; the minister came in the other day and gave what was a ministerial statement, supposed to be a policy statement, consisting of historical theses on school buses with a one-sentence or two-sentence statement of policy as to what the government is going to do with this very knotty, thorny problem of transporting children to school, a policy, by the way, which has not, I believe, been universally accepted. It has been rejected by a number of educators as responsible and as expert as the honourable minister, Mr. Speaker.

Why does the minister not give us some information? Why did he not insist that the Department of Education, the most problematical, controversial department of government, why did he not insist or the House Leader if he be responsible as a government leader, that this department come forward and receive treatment early

on in the estimates? We all know why, Mr. Speaker. We know why, Mr. Speaker.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: The honourable member's brother asked us to hold it out.

MR. W. POWE: Brother asked to hold it out? Do not let the House Leader mislead the House. Let us not have Mr. Nastiness" himself, Sir, pour more of his venom into this House.

If this government had any gumption or courage, Mr. Speaker, it would have brought that tremendously important department into the estimates, into the committee, first of all so that we could ask the minister some questions, instead of having the craven gall to keep it back knowing full well that there would be no questions asked of the Minister of Education on his department.

Rehabilitation and Recreation - another department which touches very intimately a great number of people. Homes for the aged for example - I would like to ask the minister some questions on homes for the aged. Recreation and sports services under that department - I would like to hear the minister tell us what is going to be done in the various communities in Newfoundland and Labrador this year by way of providing facilities for sports and athletic activities.

We heard the Minister of Finance go down to Burin district and say, Do not be so foolish as to ask for a stadium or for some sports facilities. Have more responsibility than to ask the government to provide that on the Burin Peninsula, giving rise to what amounted nearly to a rebellion in that part of our province and forced the Premier in a public statement, on a stage, with the Minister of Finance sitting by his side, to say, "This government will spend money on recreation and sports facilities."

"I do not care," said the Premier, "who says differently" and looked at and pointed at "Crusty Scrooge" himself and put him right in his place. There seems to be a certain conflict in policy by the administration as to what they are going to do for sports and recreation throughout this province. Why did we not hear something from the minister on rehabilitation and recreation? No, Sir, it is

another one of those problematical departments which the House Leader in his usual way decided to keep back, not to call early on, so that no embarrassing questions could be asked of the minister or of the government.

What new programmes are there under the Department of Rehabilitation and Recreation? The minister certainly does not have a low image. He seeks every possible opportunity to put his pleasant visage before the television cameras. I must say, Sir, that there has been a paucity of information forthcoming from the minister as to what new programmes there are going to be in this province this year in the field of recreation or in the field of rehabilitation.

The same thing applies to the Department of Health - kept back by design, by plot, by the Minister without Portfolio, the Government House Leader, and his colleagues, to spare the Minister of Health any embarrassment as to what is going on. What new programmes is his department going to bring out in this present financial year? What hospitals are going to be built throughout this province? Not a word, Sir. When are they going to be built? Where are they going to be built? How large are they going to be? A question which will be very embarrassing to the member for Bonavista South who knows that his people want a forty-odd bed hospital down in his area and the government is going to supply a twenty-five bed hospital when every indication was given by the Premier and others earlier on, Sir -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: What about the ambulance programme?

MR. W. ROWE: Well, what about the ambulance programme? We only pick it up, bits and pieces. The minister made sure that his estimates were kept back and not brought before the House so that he would not have to answer questions, Mr. Speaker.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Ask them on the Order Papers.

MR. W. ROWE: Ask them on the Order Papers? Do not be so foolish. The honourable member knows the Order Papers are not worth the paper they are written on, Mr. Speaker, as far as questions are concerned, because no answers again are forthcoming from this arrogant government. Some ministers have a sense of responsibility and others do not.

Medical care in general in the province; Sir, what is the state of medical care in this province? Nothing from the minister. The minister carries on like an obscure civil servant, no answers forthcoming. He made sure his department was not brought up so that we could ask questions on that.

What about medicare, the medical care plan and the doctors' fees? The minister seems to be ready enough to come into this House to announce that doctors are going to be paid a higher amount of money this year or next year or last year for the services they are performing. He was embarrassed when his supplementary supply came through the House because his department had grossly underestimated the needs and the costs of medical care or medicare last year in this province. We would like to ask the minister why that was allowed to happen? What safeguards have been taken this year to make sure that they do not grossly underestimate the cost of medicare, the medical care plan in this province? But no, Sir, no opportunity given to this side of the House whatsoever.

Mines and Energy - another department, Sir, whose policy is about as clear as ditch water. Every now and then we pick up the paper and see that the honourable Minister of Mines and Energy has spoken to Rotary or Kinsmen or Lions Clubs and has announced some brand new policy which he has not announced in this House before. No opportunity, Sir, is given the members of this House, especially the official opposition, to question the Minister of Energy on his energy policy, if there be an energy policy, which nobody has been able to perceive.

My honourable colleague, the member for Bell Island, has been at some pains for months to try to elicit some germ of a policy on energy from the Minister of Energy. What has the member received in reply? Nothing, Sir. Harangues and nonsense and character assassinations, all kinds of wishy-washy piffle from the honourable member, the Minister of Mines and Energy. No policy, none whatsoever as far as we can see.

We saw where earlier on at the earlier public energy conference they took a position which favored rich Alberta, for some strange reason.

They were laughed at by all the responsible expertise in Canada for this government taking a position which supported the greedy position of Alberta in trying to lay their grubby hands on every cent that came from their oil wells rather than spreading the wealth a little bit throughout the country as a whole. We saw the Minister of Mines and Energy and the Premier, the spectacle of them supporting that policy at a conference in Ottawa - universal execration from everybody as a result.

Then we see the Minister of Justice going up to a closed session conference on energy and according to the Prime Minister and other ministers who came out thereafter was in total agreement with everything that was agreed upon there. There was unanimous agreement by all ministers, all governments who went to that conference. They agreed in fact with what the federal government is now doing in allowing this price increase. Is that not true?

Now the Minister of Mines and Energy stands up and says that they do not agree with it, after his colleague, the acting Premier, went up a month or so ago and unanimously, with his other counterparts including the federal government, agreed with the price to be given on oil exported for Alberta, unanimously agreed on how much would come to the federal government and how much would stay with the government of Alberta, unanimously agreed on certain price increases over the next few months, agreed to all that. Then we find the Minister of Mines and Energy standing up today and saying that they do not agree with it. He stands up here piously in the House of Assembly and wonders why we on this side of the House are somewhat at a loss as to what the energy policy in this province is.

We would like to ask the minister, but no. Because it was a controversial department, the government House Leader over there, Mr. Speaker, made sure it never saw the light of day. He pushed forward all the departments concerning which there was very little controversy and kept back all the departments, the important departments concerning which certain questions ought to have been asked. We would have liked to ask the Minister of Mines and Energy, concerning the Rural

Electricity Authority, the new programme, the capital construction programme of this year, where new generating capacity is going in for communities. We would have liked to get that information from him. No opportunity was provided by the honourable House Leader, in his desire to stifle and gag members of this House who want to ask questions.

Mr. Speaker, we were involved in the Department of Industrial Development for about twenty minutes or a half hour. We wanted to ask some detailed questions concerning the Lower Churchill, in advance of the debate which will be coming up in the House. The estimates time was the appropriate time to ask these questions, because there is a give and take and one can ask questions and get answers, short or long as the case may be. Then, we could be all prepared to go into the debate when the bill comes before the House with a firmly thought out position. But no, Sir!

When my colleague, the member for Bell Island, asked for the courtesy of leave to be extended to him to continue some remarks on industrial development, the House Leader and his cohorts, well trained I might say, most of them anyway - some of them had the decency to say, "Yes, give him leave." but no, not the House Leader and his particular clique. They said, "No, no leave given to allow questions to be asked." They would not allow leave to be given so that we had to sit down and watch the spectacle of \$350 million of public money going through this House undebated. It is no wonder, Sir, that this government is plummeting in popularity throughout this province.

I was talking to a man who is highly involved in the fisheries the other day. Sir, I do not know what his politics were or are, although I suspect what they are but I do not know what they were. He was disgusted at seeing the Department of Fisheries go through this House without any opportunity being given to members here to ask the minister what new programmes are going to be introduced this year and how much money is going to be spent on this, that and the other thing. He was disgusted, he and hundreds and thousands like him, Mr. Speaker.

Forestry and Agriculture - another department which has some very great problems in it. Again because it is a controversial department the House Leader decided to hold the department back, make sure it never saw the light of day. I am sure that my colleague, the member for Bonavista North, would have had hundreds of sensible, straightforward questions to ask that minister concerning the administration of his department, but no opportunity was given.

The DREE Agreement on forestry, for example: I would have liked myself to ask the minister what the details of that agreement are, what is going to be the overall impact and effect on the forestry industry in this province. No opportunity and never will get an opportunity probably to ask the minister.

Sir, another example of the contemptuous attitude of this government is that out of thirty-two or thirty-three members or whatever they have over there, they cannot even keep a quorum in the House. A quorum call, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. DUNPHY): Would the clerk count the House, please?

We have a quorum.

MR. W. ROWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is just another example of the contempt which this government has for this parliamentary institution and their desire not to give out any information or even to show any interest in what goes on in this House; the apathy, the lack of energy that this government has on some of these matters.

My colleague, the member for Bell Island has asked questions of the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture

concerning the land freeze, the crown land freeze, which is now in effect. No questions have ever been answered on that, Mr. Speaker. No questions ever have been properly answered on that. It is difficult on the oral question period to have the give and take necessary to try to elicit information. Again this is another one of the reasons why the Department of Forestry was kept back by the Minister without Portfolio, the Government House Leader, so that these questions would, hopefully, never see the light of day.

Mr. Speaker, the same thing applies to the Reid land controversy which has been going on. Following a number of questions in this House by my colleagues and myself concerning the possible sale by the Reid interests of their holdings in this province, this government was finally goaded into some action on the matter. If the controversy had not been raised or if we had not raised it here or if other people outside the House had not raised it, this government would have politely sat by, Mr. Speaker, and allowed that land to be sold to anybody, for any purpose whatsoever, in spite of the fact that many people have by this time possessory rights in respect of that land and the public in some cases have recreation rights in respect of some of that land. They would have sat by, Sir, and allowed that to happen. There was never an opportunity provided here to have a full-fledged debate on that. The Minister of Forestry, in collusion with the Government House Leader, made sure that that department was kept well back and was never brought into this House for discussion.

The famous Department of Tourism: Mr. Speaker, let us have a look at some of the things there and see why that particular department never saw the light of day. Publicity and Investigation, Subhead 1303-03, \$1, 100,000 to be spent on general publicity, development, development capital, documentary films, local tourist boards, advertising, newspapers, television magazines, etc. There is over \$1 million to be spent on publicity by that department. If that be not a hot topic, Mr. Speaker, for discussion nothing should be.

Mr. Speaker, we would like to know from the minister where that well over \$1 million is going? Who is going to get it? Is "Jolly George" going to get his meat hooks into that? As he has in the past two or three years by the frank and candid admission of the Minister of Finance, when he got up and shocked one of our columnists in the "Evening Telegram" by admitting that this government supports political patronage, lashing it out with both hands. The minister, I feel, Sir, should have exposed his department to public scrutiny and insisted for his own sake and for the sake of the government that this department did get a thorough going over when the estimates were brought in the House. But no, Sir, again he was kept back by the Minister without Portfolio, so that the thing never saw the light of day.

Silver Anniversary Celebrations; \$1.6 million, Mr. Speaker to be spent, plus another \$170,000 in the Department of Finance, plus another \$10,000 or \$12,000 or \$15,000 in nearly every other department of government.

MR. EVANS: What about the Golden Anniversary?

MR. W. N. ROWE: If the honourable member should be around during the Golden Anniversary, Sir, I hope that he then shows by that time he might have matured beyond adolescence and perhaps he shall have something to contribute to this House. Hopefully he shall Sir. The "Burp from Burgeo," Sir, has not been among those who have made the greatest contribution to this House in the past two years. By the Golden Anniversary, when he gets re-elected again - he spent twenty-five years trying to get elected, seven times trying to get elected. He finally got elected.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Dunphy): Order please!

The honourable member is not being relevant at all to the issue being discussed. I would ask the honourable member to do so.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, as Your Honour knows, the budget speech, if one should read the rules, one would see that the rules of relevance are relaxed during the budget speech, Mr. Speaker. Now what I was talking

about is the contribution by the honourable member over there. Also, Sir, if Your Honour remembers, I was drawn into an idiotic controversy with the honourable member because he is the one over there provoking me. Now if Your Honour should wish to rule me out of order, I would ask Your Honour to rule that kind of comment in the House out of order as well. I am sure Your Honour will.

Mr. Speaker, he was twenty-five years trying to get elected - the Silver Anniversary, defeated next time. Another twenty-five years and he might be elected for the Golden Anniversary. Perhaps he will be a little bit more -

MR. EVANS: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Dunphy): Order please!

When an honourable member is speaking from his seat, I think all other honourable members should afford him the courtesy of silence. Every one who speaks in the House has the right to be heard in silence.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

When he did get elected, it cost the public \$2.6 million excess money to try to put the member in the House.

MR. EVANS: (Inaudible).

MR. W. N. ROWE: Anyway, Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted by "Mr. Wisdom" himself, "The Burp from Burgeo" to continue, I would say, Sir, that when one looks at all the hidden costs on the Silver Anniversary of Confederation, upwards of \$5 million or \$6 million of public money will be spent this year by the government. Some of it might be well spent. Other portions of that amount will be lashed out in political patronage to "Jolly George" and his buccaneers and to other favourites of this government. Political patronage has been admitted by the Minister of Finance, when all over the province there is a crying need for water and sewer systems, road construction and pavement. This government, to listen to the Minister of Finance, is broke, but it still came up with a surplus; imposes a sales tax, imposes an increase in the tax on incomes.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Dunphy): I would like to bring to the honourable member's attention that his time is almost up.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I will wind her up.

They can spend money, Sir, on everything that it suits their fancy to spend money on. They lash it out in political patronage but not on the really necessary things.

The Department of Fisheries: We would have liked to ask the minister what new programmes and projects he has. The fish plant down in LaScie, in my district, this year was a tissue of errors and mistakes and everything else in not being able, for some reason or other, to get somebody to manage that plant until very late in the season, Mr. Speaker. It was probably too late for some fishermen who ordinarily get fitted out. The minister knows that.

The Department of Public Works: There should have been some questions on the regional college in Corner Brook. A nice, nifty, little question could have been answered about the Premier's house as to how much money have the government spent on renovating the Premier's house. But no, Public Works was not allowed to see the light of day. No controversial department, Mr. Speaker, was allowed to see the light of day.

Now my suggestion to the honourable ministers (I will wind up on this note, Sir) is that every minister, if he should have any gumption at all, any sense of responsibility at all, every minister whose estimates did not come into the Committee of the Whole should get up during this budget speech and use his time to explain to this House what programmes and projects he is going to do this year under his department and what the money is going to be spent on. He should allow members of the opposition, if he has any courage, to ask the questions and to yield to members of the opposition in order to allow these questions to be asked. If forty-five minutes be not enough, the courtesy of the House should be extended to that minister to carry on until members of the House are reasonably satisfied with the answers that have been given or at least be given the opportunity to ask the questions.

Mr. Speaker, if the ministers should not do this, if the ministers should not take advantage of the time which is left to allow questions to be asked and to give information to this House, the people of Newfoundland can only re-enforce the conclusion they have already drawn; namely, that the government conspired to keep back the controversial departments and the embarrassing departments and not allow questions to be asked on them which might cause them some embarrassment or which might have been controversial. In departments like Education and Fisheries, which should have been brought up first, for some reason, whether it be apathy or indifference or the arrogance for which this government are becoming famous, they did not see fit to bring them forward, and the people of Newfoundland are the losers. Who cares if we get an opportunity to ask questions? That is not important, Mr. Speaker. What is important is that through us some information can be gotten out to the public of this province. The press can report it. The people sitting in the visitors' galleries can see the government and see what they are going to do. That is what is important.

If the ministers of this government, Sir, who have not had their estimates brought before the Committee of Supply, do not allow questions to be asked or get up and explain their estimates during this budget speech, then they deserve to be condemned as totally useless and arrogant, making a dictatorial use of power which has been reposed in them by the people of this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I think I will have a few words to say on the budget speech.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Dunphy): Order please!

MR. MORGAN: I hope I can be heard in silence.

Mr. Speaker, the last speaker from the opposition side of the House of Assembly is condemning the government because of the fact that he could not debate the estimates of various departments.

My reply to that kind of a charge is that if the same honourable member from White Bay South had not spent nineteen or twenty hours, approximately twenty hours of debate, trying to castigate the character of one honourable minister of this government, he would have had adequate and quite ample time to debate the estimates of Tourism, Fisheries and other departments. The opposition chose in the debate on the estimates to stand in this Assembly day after day, session after session, sitting after sitting, and use up the time in castigating the characters of government members.

On the Department of Rural Development, the opposition chose to condemn the business enterprise of the Hon. Member for Trinity South more so than the estimates of his department. Day after day we stood here as backbenchers and listened to the kind of trash that went on. The same honourable gentleman can stand in this House of Assembly today and say that he was unable to obtain information on the various government departments. He spent twenty hours on one single heading on the estimates. That is the first time in the history of debating the estimates in this House. He spent twenty hours on the one single heading, the salary of the Minister of Finance.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Dunphy): Order please!

Would the honourable members to my right refrain from comments while the Member for Bonavista South is speaking. He has the right to be heard in silence.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that the rules of the House will be abided by by the opposition members.

To stand twenty hours debating one single heading in the estimates, the salary of the Minister of Finance, to me is ridiculous when we had so much important business to discuss, so many important questions to be asked of the different headings and the different departments.

Why did they choose to stand and to try to castigate one minister and to condemn the other, two single headings, the minister's salary on Rural Development and the minister's salary on Finance? Why did the opposition try to do that? Was it to try to get the public of Newfoundland to believe that the government were trying to muzzle them in time with seventy-five hours only? Ridiculous! The people of the province are not that naive. Seventy-five hours of debate was adequate time to debate the various departments' estimates. Instead the opposition chose to do what they did and that was to waste the time. Now they stand and say that the government muzzled us, we could not debate the estimates. Then to listen to the Hon. Member for White Bay South stand in the House and say, "Why did not the Minister of Education bring such an important department forward first for debate in the House of Assembly? I will tell them why he did not do it. Our House Leader was requested of the critic on the opposition side of the House on education to delay the estimates on education because he was absent from the House of Assembly.

MR. F. B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order. We have been dealing with the estimates for some number of weeks and the Minister of Education and myself did have an agreement to hold off the consideration of the estimates on a number of days. The agreement was not to hold off the consideration of the estimates of the Department of Education for the past two or three or four weeks or for the seventy-five hours. I want that to be made most clear. I would ask the Member for Bonavista South to withdraw that statement because it is not correct.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order. I did state and I state again that the reason why the Education estimates were not brought forward before they were brought forward in the House and unfortunately they could not get debated because the time had elapsed, was that the critic on the opposition side on education had requested the government, the government on this side and the Minister of Education,

to hold back the Department of Education to give him time to get back in the House to discuss the estimates.

MR. F. B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker to a point of order. The Hon. Member for Bonavista South is deliberately misleading and confusing the House. I asked for an agreement with the Minister of Education to hold off the consideration of the Department of Education on one or two days, on one or two occasions. Now the Member for Bonavista South is trying to leave the impression that I asked to put this off for the whole period of time. That is simply not true.

Mr. Speaker, something else is more important here on this point of order.

MR. MORGAN: State the point of order.

MR. F. B. ROWE: I am stating my point of order, if the Yahoo would shut up.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. F. B. ROWE: I am standing on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to be heard in silence.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is another very important principle here. As far as I understand it, there is a gentleman's agreement in this honourable House, when members on both sides of the House can get together privately and come to certain agreements in private conversation. If this were to be used as a strategy on the other side of the House, well God help any private conversations that can be held between members on various sides of the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before sitting down on this point of order, I would like for the Hon. Minister of Education to get up and tell the truth on this matter and ask his colleague to stop using the agreement we had between ourselves as dirty, vicious propaganda.

MR. OTTENBEIMER: Mr. Speaker, if I may speak on this point of order?

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Dunphy): The Hon. Minister of Education.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I will speak on the point of order but obviously with a certain latitude because it would be very difficult to relate it specifically to a point of order.

I would like to state this for the record. I think the honourable gentleman knows that when he went to get up, I intended to get up on my own initiative and not under duress. It was my intention to do so to clarify what is a question of fact, not to make any comment on it.

As I recall, when the budget was brought down, a day or two after, the honourable gentleman mentioned to me that he planned to go in his district the following week and whether the estimates of the Department of Education could be postponed or not be called during that week, at which time I undertook to mention it to the House Leader and to request him. I believe I was out of town for a day or so after that and I presume the House Leader got back to the honourable gentleman.

The facts, as I recall them, were that I was requested by the honourable gentleman to ask the House Leader not to call the Education estimates during a specific week, which I did. I think what followed after was that the House Leader informed the gentleman that that would be done. All I wish to do is to state the facts as I recall them.

MR. F. B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister of Education was out of town at the time I was present in the House. It is a gentleman's agreement that has been viciously abused here.

MR. MARSHALL: On that point of order, Mr. Speaker. The point is that the Hon. Member for St. Barbe South asked for the estimates to be withheld while he was out of town. He was out of town approximately a bit over a week I believe. We had intended to bring Education in. I would not have mentioned this but for the fact that the Hon. Member for White Bay South has gotten up in this House and accused us of attempting to hide the estimates of the Department of Education because they did not come up in order.

May 16, 1974

Tape no. 1654

Page 10

The fact of the matter is that we deferred them for the Hon. Member for St. Barbe North. We are not going to sit here and take

his barbs and his jives when we have done something at the request of the other side and we will honour any agreement at any time but they are now attempting to turn against us publicly, in a very partisan fashion. The fact of the matter, on this particular matter, is that the Member for St. Barbe North we have acceded to him, as we always do, in a spirit of co-operation. He was out for approximately one-half of the time of the estimates and we are not going to have one of the members on the other side getting up here and trying to use these things for their own advantage. Now that is the situation, the same as the honourable Member for St. Barbe -

MR. W. N. ROWE: Since my name has been brought into it, Sir, on a point of order. We should make it clear what is at issue here. Let us make sure that we have the thing actually correct.

During my remarks I alluded to the fact that the Department of Education was the most important department and that it should have been called the first or among the first of all, with all of the other important departments. The argument, the fact that the honourable Member for St. Barbe North might have been out for a week; the estimates went on for many weeks and the House Leader refused to call the department. So they cannot drag this red herring, Sir, through this and use a gentleman's agreement, in the mouth of the honourable Member for Bonavista South, to use it as a piece of partisan political propaganda, to try and undermine his gentleman's agreement which should have never been referred to anyway public, Sir. It is a condemnation of the government opposite that they have used a gentleman's private agreement, made behind the Chair, Sir, to try and embarrass the Member for St. Barbe North.

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): If I may rule on the points of order, I have heard so many points of order, I am dizzy. There is a point of order that was raised, whether or not the honourable gentleman for Bonavista South was misleading the House. It is the opinion of the Chair that he was stating a matter of fact or of opinion. Whatever the circumstances surrounding the absence of the honourable Member for St. Barbe South, that is relevant and he was stating a fact and

therefore in order.

The honourable Member for Bonavista South.

MR. J. MORGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In continuing the point I was making that the honourable Member for White Bay South stood and condemned the government for not bringing Education before the House, yet his own colleague had requested the government to hold back the estimates on education. So that is the kind of hypocrisy we have being listening to from the opposition all through the debate on the estimates. To spend twenty hours on one heading, the minister's salary, i.e., the Minister of Rural Development, another twenty hours on the salary of the Minister of Finance, forty hours on two headings of estimates with all the millions of dollars that we discussed in the estimates is completely irresponsibility on the part of any opposition, in any House of Commons or House of Assembly in this country. To spend forty hours in trying to castigate the individual character of a member of the House of Assembly that was the name of the game not to debate the spendings of government, not to find out the information they need for the people of Newfoundland to know.

Then they go out to the media and say, "Oh, the government are muzzling us. They will only allow seventy-five hours for debate". After the opposition using forty hours of the same seventy-five on two headings of estimates, to listen to the hypocrisy of the honourable Member for White Bay South again, in condemning the Department of Rural Development and the Minister of Rural Development, when that same man was the very individual who was Minister of the Department of Community and Social Development, who brought in the experts from the Mainland, brought them in as the so-called planners, the great successors, the great visionaries of the planning world, brought them in to resettle, to destroy approximately 400 to 500 communities in Newfoundland. That same minister stood in this session and condemned the Minister of Rural Development because we were giving out loans and grants to rural Newfoundland.

There has not been one constructive positive word from the opposition all during the last two week or three weeks of debate. No individual in this province can tell me that there are not good things in this budget. Nobody can take this document and look it over and say "No, the Progressive Conservative Government of Newfoundland are not doing anything for the province." It might seem partisan coming from me as a backbencher on the government side but the opposition must also be responsible. Surely they can point out the things that are being done by this that are good for Newfoundland and maybe elaborate more on them, what can be done to improve them. But no it is not that. They want to stand in the House and destroy, destroy and destroy, not only to destroy government policy but destroy characters and to attempt to destroy individual members of the House of Assembly characterwise. That kind of opposition is irresponsible.

Then to have the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, unfortunately I have to refer to him in the budget debate, I may not get a chance to do it again, unfortunately he is not in the House today. But to have an individual who is going out across the Province of Newfoundland trying to sway the individual voters in his direction, to become Premier of this province, to have that same individual both stand in the House of Assembly and out to the media, to all of the people of Newfoundland, advocating, for example, here is one of the statements: 'Opposition Leader, Edward Roberts, urge government to reopen the contracts with teachers, with firemen, with hospital workers and others paid from the public chest.' Mr. Roberts goes on to say, 'That if government do not reopen contracts right now, the Minister of Finance, the Honourable Mr. Crosbie, will be faced with the most turbulent rides in his political career.' That is a statement from a man who is going out trying to be the Premier of the province. That is on one day.

The next day he stands in this House of Assembly and condemns the government for increasing taxes to bring in a revenue of \$14 million

The third day he stands in the House of Assembly and says, "We want the services. We want the new hospitals. We want roads paved. We want water and sewerage here and water and sewerage there." He wants all of these things, but they do not want to have any increase in taxation. They want to reopen all the contracts and give higher wages to all the people who are paid from the public chest but they do not want an increase in taxes. All we are doing is increasing one cent in the sales tax and four per cent in the income tax.

Mr. Speaker, the hypocrisy is tremendous. And as long as we have opposition in this Assembly of that nature, unfortunately the people of the province are going to suffer, because I am a firm believer in the two party system, a firm believer in that. I think an opposition in the House of Assembly with maybe five or ten seats less than government, providing they are responsible and a sensible opposition, is good. It is good government. We have what? Nine members on the opposition side? And the only responsible opposition coming from the other side of the House of Assembly is not the official opposition. I said this before publicly and I will say it now in the House of Assembly; the only responsible opposition is coming from the New Labrador Party, in the person of the honourable Member for Labrador South. It is the only responsible opposition. I think it is shameful and disgusting on the part of the official Liberal Opposition to carry on in this manner.

I feel confident that as long as the Hon. Leader of the Opposition continues on in this manner the people of the province will not only reject him but the people in his own party are going to reject him. They are going to reject him this fall. Of course, it may be good news to some of his honourable colleagues on the other side of the House. It may be indeed welcoming news to the honourable Member for Bell Island, if his colleagues and in the House of Assembly and his friends in the Liberal Party are going to oust the present Leader. It may be also be good news to the honourable Member for Hermitage and maybe Mr. Jamieson, maybe Mr. Stirling and others, but that is not a point that I am going to be elaborating on in this debate. Personally I do not care too much

who becomes leader of the Liberal Party but I do care about the fact that we have not got responsible opposition to govern in the House of Assembly. I think every government should have a strong opposition to point out the flaws and the failures of government and to bring in some responsible, constructive viewpoints on government policy, but unfortunately we have not got that in this House of Assembly.

So, Mr. Speaker, the honourable Member for Bell Island, the other night in speaking on this same debate, was mainly critical of government because of the fact that during the past two years we have done nothing to establish industry and to create jobs. He had great praise, great praise for his former Leader and could be his next Leader in his party. I forgot to mention that honourable gentleman who is working behind the scenes.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: So, Mr. Speaker, he failed to mention, Sure, we all have praise for the Hon. Mr. Smallwood in his work in bringing about Confederation, but to stand and to throw great praises on the man who had so many failures and a man who gave away the resources of this province in such a manner that it takes many heads and brains on this side of the government, on this side of the House of Assembly, at this time to try and get back the resources that belong to Newfoundland and to Newfoundlanders.

There is no mention of the fact of his failures, of the shoe factory and the glove factory and the rubber factory, cement factory, a battery plant, the steel plant and go on down the line, the light bulb factory, Bison Brewery, Sea Mining over in the St. George's Area, the birch plant. You could stand there for hours literally and go on with a list of the great industrialized Newfoundland that the former Leader and the former government Leader was advocating for this province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: What is the point of this government going out on the same kind of tangent, wild tangents without any previous planning and

feasibility studies, going out and grabbing the great promoters like John Doyle and others and bringing them in and saying: "Here, boy, here take this. I have a big concession in Labrador. Here are 10,000 square miles of timber rights or mineral concessions. Create jobs for us. It does not matter what we give you. We will give you lots. It does not matter how much it costs the Newfoundland people in the long run."

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: 'All we want is development. Despite the cost to Newfoundland and to Newfoundlanders, all we want is development.' That was the attitude, develop or perish, of the previous government.

That is not the attitude of this government. It is not going to be. If it were, here is one backbencher who should not be standing up praising this government, he should not be standing up condemning this government. I am not the kind of individual member who will stand in this House of Assembly - as I said time and time again before - and heap praises on a government that does not deserve praises. I have often criticized government where I felt criticism was justified and I will do it again. I might be labelled as a maverick or an outspoken member but I intend to do it again, but right now I have no reason but to heap praises on this government. I feel the government are doing a good job, if I did not think so, I should not say so.

Surely it would not take too much courage or stamina like the honourable Member for Hermitage, an intelligent-type individual who could also stand and recognize the fact that the government are doing good things for the province, but he failed to do that. I wonder why? Anything good that the government are doing they want to destroy, tear it down.

Mr. Speaker, it is not going to prove anything by making fools of themselves. If the honourable gentleman should want a debate in that direction, I shall debate him, Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman has stood on every point brought before the House of Assembly, he has stood up and made a complete fool of himself, knowing or without knowing that his own

leader, instead of him standing up and debating the estimates, which he has not done, The Hon. Leader of the Opposition has said very little during the estimates of this House of Assembly, in this session, very little has he said. The reason why is because the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is pushing forward the honourable Member for Bell Island to stand up, He stood up on every estimate, on every heading and he knew in many cases he was not knowledgeable enough, none whatsoever, regarding what he was talking about, but he rambled on and on and on. He attempted every way possible to grab headlines. The headlines that went out to me, I am sure the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was quite happy about it because what it meant, Mr. Speaker, was the fact that here is a man who is dreaming, dreaming in his own way that one of these days he is going to become Leader of the Liberal Party. He is dreaming that and as long as he keeps on dreaming that, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is going to, the honourable Member for White Bay North is going to permit the honourable Member for Bell Island to go ahead in the House of Assembly, speak on anything he wants, speak on everything that comes forward, "I will not say anything. You go ahead and do it, make a complete fool of yourself." Then he will be quite aware and have confidence that the honourable Member for Bell Island is in no way going to become Leader of the Liberal Party.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: So the honourable Member for Bell Island, without knowing it, maybe without knowing it, I think it is without knowing it, he is really a tool of the Liberal Party. He is being used as a tool for the Liberal Party.

MR. R. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I have heard the honourable Member for Bonavista South for some time. Even allowing for the extra latitude in the Budget debate, I believe he is taking liberties that he ought not to be allowed to take. I would appeal to you to ask him to be more relevant to the matter of the budget under debate.

MR. NEARY: No wonder the House Leader says he can make a fool of himself if he wish.

MR. SPEAKER: The rule of relevancy of course is a difficult one to making a ruling on. I must admit that I do not think the Honourable Member for Bonavista South is being as relevant as he should be to the Budget debate.

MR. MORGAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, thank you for your ruling, but the point I am getting at is a point that and the fact is during the estimates, the debate of the estimates of this budget, that the most we have heard from is from one individual member of the House of Assembly, that individual being the honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. As I understood Your Honour has just ruled on the matter of relevancy and asked the Member for Bonavista South to be more relevant, and he is now persisting along the same lines as he was prior to your ruling. I would suggest you ask him to be more relevant and more respectful of the Chair.

MR. MORGAN: On that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: On that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN: On that point of order. The point I am making is that I am discussing what was said during the debate on the estimates and the estimates are directly relevant to the budget itself. I am discussing the points brought forward by individual members on the estimates of the budget.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order, Sir. In the absence of the Premier, I wonder if the Government House Leader could discipline members, such as the Member for Bonavista South, Sir?

MR. EVANS: I would throw him through the ninth story window and that would be -

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the honourable Member for Bell Island, why did he stand and make such a stupid remark? Is he making a point of

order? Or is he accustomed to doing this?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Let me repeat what I just previously said a few minutes ago with regards to the rule of relevancy of which I am sure the honourable Member for Bonavista is well aware.

MR. MORGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, if an honourable member of the House of Assembly were only going to be in this House because he wants to be there for his own benefit, he should not be here. If he were not going to stand and speak sincerely for his constituents or speak sincerely for the people of the province, let him not be in this House of Assembly - that includes the honourable Member for White Bay South.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, if I be allowed to be heard in silence, I shall continue. There is no point in elaborating on this tremendous document. There is no point because this would be, to scrutinize this document and scrutinize the estimates, should have been and would have been if they acted responsibly the responsibility of the opposition - but they did not do that.

So this year for the first time of the history of Newfoundland we are spending all these millions of dollars in different departments and because we have not a responsible opposition, we did not have responsible debate on the various government departments. Because irrespective of what the opposition said and how they attempted to destroy the government programmes and government policy, there is one point that was never mentioned, I do not think it was mentioned by any member in the House of Assembly, I do not think even the Hon. Minister of Finance mentioned it. Just by reading over the budget he might have mentioned it and it went unnoticed that last year, in 1973, the financial year 1973,

this government, the Progressive Conservative Government, was given the authority to borrow \$209 million. That was the original approval and the original estimates for government to go out last year and borrow \$209 million. Instead they only borrowed \$157 million. Now can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, the previous government, the spendthrift government, the wasteful, spending government, can you imagine them, let alone asking permission to borrow, but after getting permission to borrow \$200 million and only borrowing \$150 million, that would have never happened.

That is a prime example to me as a backbencher, a prime example that this government is a government that is controlling and managing the finances of this Province in a proper way. As long as we have a government that is managing the finances of this Province - we all know, the public of Newfoundland know that we are managing our resources properly. We are managing our forestry properly. We are developing and managing our fishery; provided we get the co-operation from the federal boys in Ottawa, which is highly unlikely.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: "There are no roads being done," Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation in standing here today and stating that this year in Bonavista South that there will be more road work done this year in Bonavista South, in my district, than was done in any five years combined.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: More money, Mr. Speaker, spent on roads than any five years prior. That is an example that there is no services, there is no money from government? There is going to be a new hospital built in Bonavista, irrespective of the criticisms made by the opposition and "The people do not want the hospital down there" and all of this. There is going to be a thirty-five bed hospital and the plan of the previous government, Mr. Speaker, was to build a clinic, "Close out the cottage hospital, we will give you a clinic." That was the plan of the Department of Health when the present Leader of the Opposition was minister.

That was the official plan of government. It is on the record downstairs in the Department of Health. It is there for anybody to see. It was the official plan of the Liberal Government who sold out the Bonavista Peninsula, sold out completely. "We are going to close down your cottage hospital and give you a clinic." Well, this government is going to give them a hospital. They deserve a hospital. They are going to get it this year.

That is the kind of services this government is putting out. Forest access roads, a substantial programme last year in my district. This year it will even be more than last year on the construction of forest access roads. That is the kind of thing this government is doing in my district, not only in my district but in the Green Bay district and Trinity North and all the rural districts, Trinity South. That is the kind of programme and services this government is putting out.

No, the opposition members do not want to recognize it, they fail to recognize it because they refuse to recognize it. As long as that attitude continues and as long as they want to tear down like they tried - It really hurt me here during the debate on the estimates as I sat here behind a minister who is sincere in doing his work and I sat here and watched, he is a fairly new member of government the same as myself, elected in the last election, who is sincere in doing his work, who works hard in his department, travels the Province extensively, trying to help rural Newfoundlanders and I saw the honourable member for Bell Island and I would have overlooked the honourable member for Bell Island if I thought maybe he respected him, but I saw the honourable member from Hermitage and the honourable member from White Bay South and then his colleague. the Leader of the Opposition also stand up and try to tear apart the character of that man, trying to create a conflict of interest which was not really there. It was not there. It was proven it was not there.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The member for Bonavista South can voice his opinion on any subject he wants to and I am prepared to sit here and listen to him or turn him off but when he begins assigning motives to why I question some matters going on in the Department of Rural

Development, well that is quite another matter on which I would like to have something to say. At no time, Mr. Speaker, did I attempt to cast any aspersions on the minister personally? If he cannot take the heat he can get out of the kitchen. On the point of order, I would ask you to have the Member for Bonavista South retract that statement in which he assigns motives to members on this side.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: Will he sit down when somebody else is talking. It is about time he learned the rules of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order. It is in my opinion, I said, and I will say it again, it is in my opinion that the honourable members I mentioned on the opposite side of the House of Assembly did try to castigate the character of the Minister of Rural Development and also tried to create a conflict of interest which really was not there.

MR. NEARY: On a point of order, Sir. I submit, Your Honour, and I second the point of order my colleague made here, Sir, because I was one of the members who were named, that we proved beyond any shadow of a doubt that the minister was in conflict of interest. Sir, there were no ulterior motives. We had the proof. We had the evidence. We stated the facts.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Can I speak to the point of order, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Bell Island is debating the point of order.

MR. NEARY: If the member were questioning our motive, Sir, our motive was to expose the situation to the people of Newfoundland, and we did our duty as members of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The point of order raised by the honourable member for Hermitage, in the opinion of the Chair, is really a difference of opinion between two honourable members.

MR. MORGAN: That ruling shot down the opposition side.
Learn the rules of the House.

MR. SIMMONS: To that point of order and perhaps a matter of clarification too: Do I understand that it is okay for members to assign motives to other members of the House? Is that fair ball now?

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, this is a serious point of order. Your Honour has made a ruling and the honourable member for Hermitage should understand that when you make a ruling from the Chair he has a recourse to appeal it but we cannot tolerate in this House debating, continual debating of Your Honour's rulings or asking questions with respect to them.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sure that the honourable member for Hermitage is aware that there is a procedure to follow if he were not satisfied with a ruling that is made by the Chair. I certainly do not intend to let any member on any side of the honourable House debate a ruling that the Chair has made.

MR. SIMMONS: In view of my strong feelings on this, one because I did hear the member for Bonavista South assign motives to us, in view of that I would like to appeal your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The motion is that the Speaker's ruling be sustained. Those in favour "aye", those against "nay".

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion the "ayes" have it.

MR. MORGAN: To get back to the same topic where I was so rudely interrupted by the opposition, it is that the opposition chose to do this without choosing to debate - they chose to cast the inference on the member from Trinity South, the honourable Minister of Rural Development. They chose to take twenty hours of debate in this Assembly to try to cast the inference to the public of Newfoundland that this man here is in a conflict of interest. "He is only there for one reason - to build up his contract business, his construction business." I sat here and I really cringed to listen to responsible individuals in government, so-called responsible individuals, to listen to that kind of trash when they could have spent the same twenty hours. Sure they want to condemn the programme. They did. We on this side

defended the programme. They chose to take at least twenty hours of the estimates of the budget in this Assembly this year to try to destroy the character of this man.

MR. SIMMONS: I quite agree, as does the member for Bonavista South, with the member when he states that we said we felt it was perhaps the prime purpose of the Minister of Rural Development, and you heard the rest of the statements from the member for Bonavista South but I object and I would like to have a ruling on this. I object again to his saying that we were trying to destroy the character of the minister. That was not my motive. He is assigning motives which were not mine and I ask you to have him retract that statement.

MR. W. ROWE: On that point of order, Sir. I must say, Sir, I did not get up the first time, although my name was used by the honourable member in his speech, but this time he has done it again. I must protest as well, by using the point of order to say, Sir, that the honourable member is not allowed to do two things. (1) He is not allowed to assign motives to members for what they do, ulterior motives. (2) As Beauchesne shows, he cannot impugn our honour as members of this House.

Now, if he says, as he has said, that we have tried to show that the minister was in a conflict of interest situation. That is a statement of opinion and fact by him. That is okay but when he says that we tried to destroy the character of this man or destroyed his character, Sir, that is assigning ulterior motives to members of this House.

Surely that cannot go undisciplined by Your Honour. Otherwise Your Honour knows what the House of Assembly is going to become.

MR. MORGAN: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. The point I am making and I will make it again in this point of order is that the opposition, by doing what they were doing, by casting the inference of conflict of interest, they were, indirectly or directly, I would say indirectly destroying the character of an individual.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: He did not say that.

MR. MORGAN: That is what I said prior. So why all of the points of order?

MR. NEARY: Sir, we were merely doing our duty as members of this

honourable House, exposing evidence to the public, Sir, we brought documented evidence into this House, Sir, exposed it to the people of Newfoundland, that gave all the appearance of conflict of interest. That was our right and our duty to do that, Sir. We had no choice. If we did not, Sir, we should not be members of this honourable House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! The honourable member for Bell Island is again attempting to debate a point of order and did not state what his objections to the point of order were. In the first instance I ruled that the honourable member for Bonavista South, that it was a matter of opinion between two honourable members, although as he continued his speech I feel that he was on the verge of inferring that members of the opposition were deliberately trying to destroy the character of the honourable member, and I would caution him.

MR. MORGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I did say deliberately trying to destroy the character, I withdraw that but I will say they were attempting to destroy the character. In my opinion they were doing that. They spent twenty hours in doing it and wasting the time of this honourable House.

Now getting back to irresponsible opposition, because if you want to tie indirectly to the good things in this budget and the bad things, there could be some bad things.

MR. NEARY: Is his time up yet, Your Honour? How many more minutes does he have?

MR. SPEAKER: Five minutes.

MR. NEARY: Five minutes more. Very good, Sir.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, if we are going to have responsible -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, am I going to be heard in silence?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, we have had more interruptions in this Assembly this year by irresponsible characters who do not even stand on their feet when they want to speak. So I would request right now to at least be heard in silence.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: I have not stood one-quarter of the time, Mr. Speaker, in this House that the honourable member for Bell Island has. I venture that I have said more in five minutes that he has said in twenty hours. At least I do not say the same thing over and over and over again.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: It seems to be hitting a sore point, Mr. Speaker, on the other side of the House, because I believe in calling a spade a spade. I heard the member from Labrador North speak on the budget and some estimates and I said to myself, individually, "Here is a man who is sincerely concerned for Labrador," But yesterday evening when that same individual stood to speak in the budget debate, he stood in the House of Assembly and advocated anarchy in Labrador. He did so. He did so without any hesitation. He stood in the House of Assembly and advocated anarchy in Labrador. Yet that same honourable gentleman was with the previous Liberal administration as Minister for Labrador Affairs. His colleague, the honourable member for Fogo, was also a minister of that Liberal administration for the same responsibility, Labrador Affairs, and he stands in the House of Assembly and advocates anarchy, nothing short of that.

So that is another example of irresponsibility from opposition spokesmen. The only honourable gentlemen in the opposition who when they say anything they mean what they say and they say something that really means something are the honourable gentleman from Twillingate and the honourable gentleman from Fogo, these two individuals.

I repeat, the only responsible opposition we have had in this session to government is the New Labrador Party. I think it is regretful because if this situation were allowed to continue, Mr. Speaker, we shall have a situation in the next year where government will have absolute control, and government should never have absolute control, should always be a strong two-party system.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I would like to interrupt the honourable member. Except by leave, his forty-five minutes have expired.

The honourable member for Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I would certainly like to have a few things to say on this budget speech debate.

Mr. Speaker, I too, with my colleague from White Bay South, certainly would first of all like to record my deep regret that we never heard at all from a number of important departments. We have heard various reasons to why this was not done. We have heard about how the opposition has wasted time and that kind of thing. Someone has suggested, I believe the member for Bonavista South, that seventy-five hours was adequate. I understand, indeed once since Confederation, once in twenty-five years or so, has there been a need for more than seventy-five hours or have more than seventy-five hours been used.

Well, of course, that is for a couple of reasons. One of the reasons being that except in 1971 when a number of the Liberal members crossed the floor to join the opposition, except in that year there was never much of an effective opposition from Confederation period of 1949 until 1970 anyway. So I am not surprised that it did take very long because there was nobody there to put the questions. In the absence of questions, we did not have the kind of thing in 1949 and 1950 and 1952 and up to 1960 and 1970, we did not have the kind of spectacle from the ministers of the Crown that we have had in the last few days.

The game plan, Mr. Speaker, changes considerably once the government members know there is a time limit. Now, Mr. Speaker, without a time limit the Cabinet ministers have to be concerned about getting their estimates through the House as quickly as possible. They keep their backbenchers from standing up and they go to them in the corridors and say, "Now, do not get up and speak," or "Shut up," or "Be short because we want to get this thing over with."

MR. EVANS: The honourable member is dreaming, as usual.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I am making a lot more sense dreaming than the member for Burgeo makes when he is wide awake.

Mr. Speaker, with the imposed time limit, with the gag rule that

May 17, 1974.

Tape 1656

RH - 9

the member for St. John's East sponsored and ran through this House, with that gag rule, the game plan, I was saying, it is quite different. Without the gag rule, without the time limit, the seventy-five hours or whatever number of hours, without that time limit the game plan is quite different.

The ministers of the Crown get after their backbenchers, get after each other

to get on with it, to stop making long speeches so we can get this thing through the House. The time used up by the government side of the House in that situation is minimal. You do not have the situation, Mr. Speaker, I challenge anybody on the government side to go back through Hansard and go back through the records of the House during the past twenty-five years and see if you have anywhere the spectacle that we saw when the Minister of Transportation would take an hour and fifteen minutes to answer one question. If you want to know why we have eaten up the seventy-five hours and have not gone through all the departments, there is one reason.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I timed him one day in answering a question from one of my colleagues, in answer to that one question he got up and for one hour and fifteen minutes he rambled on and as far as I am concerned he has not answered the question yet. The Minister of Finance, twenty hours his estimates were in committee. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that of those twenty hours the Minister of Finance talked between ten and twelve of those hours.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: I will check Hansard. Let him check Hansard.

AN HON. MEMBER: I did.

MR. SIMMONS: No, he did not. He has not got the facts straight. Mr. Speaker, I put it to you that if there had not been a time limit, the Minister of Finance would never have spent ten hours clowning around as only he can do. Ten hours he stood there, off and on, I do not mean ten hours in one stretch, but half an hour now, three quarters of an hour the next time; he would not have done that had there not been a time limit. I am aware we could have used, Mr. Speaker, the seventy-five hours much more profitably. I am aware that had there not been a time limit we probably would not have needed any more than seventy-five or eighty hours to do the estimates, for the reasons I have just given you, that the ministers would not have made prolonged speeches, filibuster speeches to avoid as many questions on this side as possible. The backbenchers would not have been up giving filibuster speeches for the same kind of reason. We would have been

able to ask the questions on this side that we ought to ask about education, about fisheries, about forestry.

I have heard the explanations from my colleague, the member for St. Barbe North, and my friend the Minister of Education, about why the education estimates were delayed. Two points, Mr. Speaker, on that; First of all that explanation, as my colleague has so well said, explains why the estimates were not called in the first week or so but it does not at all explain why they were not called at all during the entire seventy-five hours.

Also, Mr. Speaker, if it explains in some fashion why education was not called early in the game, where is the explanation for not calling Health, the second largest item of expenditure in the whole budget? Where is the explanation for not calling forestry, for not calling Fisheries? There is no explanation, and yet there is. My colleague, the member for White Bay South, gave the explanation. The explanation is that these departments were never intended to be called; the word had gone out to the Minister of Finance and to the Minister of Transportation, kill all the time you can in committee so these heads never come before the committee. There is the explanation.

Mr. Speaker, I again want to record my complete disgust and my dissatisfaction with the answers we did not get from the Minister of Transportation. Here we are towards the end of May, we still do not know what is to be done, unless we listen to announcements from the member for St. Georges who seems to know what is to be done. The member for St. Barbe South seems to know what is to be done in his district. The member for Bonavista South, he indicated a couple of weeks ago he knew what was going on in his district and yet the minister tells us he does not know. I say he does know, Mr. Speaker, and I say he abused his function here in committee when he did not tell the House and tell the committee what the road programme is for this particular year and I once again call upon him, to carry out his responsibilities as minister properly by first of all letting the public know what is to be done in this particular calendar year ahead of us - not ahead of us anymore, it is upon us. The construction season is about to begin and here we are not knowing how all these millions of

dollars are going to be spent.

It is particularly regrettable that we have not had an opportunity to discuss the education estimates. Not only because of my background in education but also as a concerned citizen with respect to the kind of education systems we have in the province, I dearly wanted to hear something about the expenditures in education. I had a number of questions I wanted to ask and I know my colleague, the opposition spokesman on education, had a number of questions. The member for St. Barbe North, I have no doubt that he will be addressing himself to a number of the subjects as they affect the education estimates. But there are just a couple of things I wanted to say on the subject.

I have been watching with some interest, as an educator, watching with some interest this government's action insofar as capital funds for education are concerned. I fully expected as one, with my previous capacity as an administrator in education, a superintendent and having to be concerned about where funds ought to be placed for school construction, limited funds at that, and also in my earlier capacity as editor of a teacher magazine, I had given a voice to the need for increased funds on a number of occasions over the past six or eight years. I heard the notifications and the expressions on the part of the P.C. members who were then in opposition about what they would do if they were in government.

So I looked forward, I must admit privately, notwithstanding the flag I fly as a partisan -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I look forward to something better, some more money when the P.C.'s came to power. With the interjection of the member for Green Bay, I should take the opportunity to correct a very false statement which he made in this House some time ago. In addressing himself after a petition had been presented by my colleague, the member for White Bay South, in reference to facilities for Westport, the member for Green Bay got up and unabashedly informed the House that the policy of the Green Bay School Board had been to concentrate on the larger areas in the -

MR. PECKFORD: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. PECKFORD: Point of order, Mr. Speaker, I do not know what this has to do with the budget, what the honourable member for Hermitage is now bringing up. So I submit, Sir, that it is entirely irrelevant to the present debate that is under discussion in the honourable House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! I think the point raised by the honourable member for Green Bay is well taken. It is not relevant to the budget debate itself.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I was not at all discussing this. Had I been allowed to pursue my point I think, Mr. Speaker, you would have seen that it is quite relevant. I was leading into the matter of expenditures, capital expenditures of one board in this province, one I know very well, the Green Bay Integrated School Board. I was going to correct a bit of information because if I just made my statement on the subject it would appear immediately in conflict with the statement the member had made. So I was doing him a kindness by showing that indeed our statements are at variance. They are at variance. His statement was that only the large communities in the district were being looked after, I wonder, Mr. Speaker -

MR. PECKFORD: On a point of order, It is obvious I tried to let the honourable member for Hermitage go on for some time to find out whether it really is relevant to the budget debate but there is no question in my mind, Mr. Speaker. What the honourable member for Hermitage is trying to do now is to counteract statements that I made a lot earlier, if he wanted to correct my statements he had ample opportunity before now to do so.

MR. SIMMONS: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker, it is obvious to me that the member does not want the truth to come out, so I shall withdraw the point. May I continue?

MR. SPEAKER: The point raised by the honourable member for Green Bay and as I just mentioned a few minutes ago, comments made referring to a petition that was presented in this honourable House some days or weeks ago and any points raised therein by members is not really relevant, in the Chair's opinion, in this particular one at least, to the budget debate. The honourable

member for Hermitage may continue.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, in the District of Green Bay, one that I know extremely well, the expenditures over the past year in education have had to be limited, the capital expenditures, because of the limited amounts coming from governments. These expenditures were spent, Mr. Speaker, in a number of small communities. The Community of Nippers Harbour cannot be considered a very large community. A new school was put there. The Community of South Brook, a new school was put there. The Communities of Beaumont and Long Island, a new school was put there. The Community of Woodstock, a new school was put there. The Community of Seal Cove, a new school was put there. The Community of Pilley's Island, a new school was put there.

Mr. Speaker, in those seven instances, I have just cited seven examples where schools of four rooms or fewer, four rooms or two rooms were put in small communities. I wanted to enter that into the record because it goes to show what a board can do with limited funds, notwithstanding the false statements to the contrary that have been made by the member for Green Bay on the subject.

Mr. Speaker, that board and all of the other thirty-five boards in this province could have done a lot more had they had the money. To make my point, Mr. Speaker, I quote from a recent **edition** of Hansard, the verbatim report of this House, when an honourable member of this House said the following, all of which, or some of which I will let you know what I endorse and what I do not after, but a quote that is very pertinent to the subject under discussion, the need for additional capital expenditure.

He said this, "Mr. Speaker, there is a very good article carried in so and so **edition** of a certain publication and it deals with the problem that has been set forth by the Integrated Education Committee and the demands of that committee for further and more funds by way of capital vote."

Then the member goes on to say, a member of this House, the article

goes on to say, Mr. Speaker, "There can be no denying that provincial spending on education has shot dramatically upward in the last two decades, from \$4 million in 1949." I know the Minister of Justice will be interested to hear this because he was himself the chairman of the school board and he and I in days gone by talked a lot about the need for increased expenditures in education.

Quoting from the member's speech recently in the House of Assembly he said, and he indeed was quoting from an article in a publication, he said, "From \$4 million in 1949 to one hundred and something in the present year. Comparisons between the expenditure in the pre-confederation period and the present can be most deceiving," he said, "and may well precipitate a complacency about the matter." Then he goes on and on, on the subject of the need for more funds in education. He goes on to quote the article from the publication.

At one point he says, quoting from the publication, "The real eye opener comes when we compare Newfoundland's allocation for capital expenditures in education with those in other provinces. Here is an example." Then he goes on to give an example of what the Newfoundland Government is spending compared to what governments in other parts of the country are spending.

He says again, "The argument" and again, he says, "I quote from the publication, "the argument that we must first develop industry, build more roads, provide more municipal services, is frequently advanced to justify the pittance which has been budgeted for school construction. Those who pursue that line of reasoning forget one basic and crucially important factor, they forget or they choose to ignore the fact that the boy of thirteen, in some makeshift classroom or overcrowded basement, cannot wait five years for Newfoundland to develop industrially. He cannot have his maturation stand still. His time is now, five years hence he may not be too

tolerant when told, 'I am sorry, we had to choose between you and roads and we chose roads.'"

The member goes on, "If he is robbed of a high school education, of a well adjusted, happy adult life, he may not understand it when we tell him that the present tight money situation was to blame. Factors of human need," the member said, "not those of political expedience must dictate our decision to allocate provincial revenue."

Here is the point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, which a member of this House said in this House in the past, this is the point right here; the case for an immediate quadrupling of the provincial allocation for capital educational expenditures is watertight. "To hold the budgeted amount at the present several millions of dollars would be criminal and irresponsible. We make an appeal to the provincial legislators not to sell the youth of Newfoundland short." He is still quoting from the article in the magazine.

Then he went on to say, quoting the article again, "It often takes more political courage to do that which deserves your re-election than that which guarantees your re-election." Then he said, and to that, Mr. Speaker, I say Amen! Amen! and Amen! Then he went on to say, "That is precisely what we are doing in the vote in this year's estimates, we are selling the youth of Newfoundland short. We are not quadrupling the grant." Then he goes on to make a case of how the grant should be quadrupled.

Mr. Speaker, I deliberately did not say who the member was. The member of course is the present Minister of Justice.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is a good speech.

MR. SIMMONS: It is a good speech. I will tell you why it is a good speech. It is a good speech because it appeared in the "Educators' Gazette" and I wrote it for him, word for word.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: He should at that. He should, Mr. Speaker, and let us hope that he has more success getting capital funds for education than the present Minister of Education and let us hope that he has the same assumption and the same conviction about the need for funds for capital purposes in education that he had four years ago when he made that speech, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HICKMAN: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: I see. Well that is why, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice and I understand each other very well and that is one of the reasons I am here, Sir, because the Minister of Justice was not successful in getting this point across either, from the opposition, and obviously he is not very successful getting it across now that he is in government. So I have come here and one of the reasons I have come is to see if I cannot get this point across, that there is a need out there, all over this province, for a lot more money for capital expenditure.

I wrote that article four years ago. The minister has just acknowledged it, got up and read the article, not only read it but then endorsed its content and said, Mr. Speaker, that we ought to quadruple. Now what did quadruple mean at that time? At that time in 1970 the government was spending \$4 million for new schools. He said and I said in those days it should be \$16 million.

MR. WM. ROWE: In those days?

MR. SIMMONS: In those days in 1970. I still say it should be \$16 million or perhaps \$20 but certainly \$16 million. What is it today? Well it depends on whose figures you listen to. In the context I am talking about, today it is \$10 million. Now we will be told by the minister it is really \$12 million, it is really \$25 million and so on. I am talking about provincial funds.

AN HON. MEMBER: Ten.

MR. SIMMONS: It is \$10 million. He will say \$12 million because he has a \$2 million one-shot deal there to make up. Will he acknowledge that it will be \$2 million year after year, is that what he is indicating?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: (Inaudible) It is \$12 million provincial funds.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, we all know, both from the announcement that

the minister made to the Federation of School Boards back last October and from his explanations in the House earlier in the session that the \$25 million is made up of \$13 million for the DREE schools, \$13 million, some odd thousand; \$2 million to rectify a situation which has occurred over the years because the Catholic people have gotten more per capita from DREE than the integrated schools. That \$2 million is going to rectify that particular situation. Then there is \$10 million in addition to that to be spread, as per the BNA Act, among the denominations, on a per capita basis - \$10 million, Mr. Speaker.

Here we are, the man who was in opposition, who stood here and told us in 1970 it should be \$16 million. Not only did he tell you, Mr. Speaker, but I want to acknowledge that I said so too in 1970; I say so today that it should be \$16 million or \$20 million. Now that these fellows are in government, Mr. Speaker, the tune is different, quite different; \$10 million is suddenly a lot of money to spend on construction around the country.

Mr. Speaker, I put it to you that the \$4 million in 1970 which was increased to \$8 million by the Liberal Government in 1970, which has been increased this year to \$10 million by the Progressive Conservative Government, I put it to you that the increase from \$4 million to \$10 million in those four years has scarcely done more than to take care of the inflationary costs of school construction, and I give you an example. In March 1972 the per capita cost of frame construction, wood construction if you like, for schools was about \$17 to \$19, depending on which part of the province you built those schools in. That was the going rate, about \$17 to \$19. If you called a tender on a job and three or four tenders came in, inevitably the low tender would come in at around \$17 to \$19 a square foot for school construction in 1972.

Two years later and some months, in May 1973, that figure is not \$17 to \$19 but \$37 to \$38, it has doubled.

AN HON. MEMBER: 1975?

MR. SIMONS: No, I say today, in May 1974, the frame construction, wood construction, is running about \$36 million to \$38 million. It has doubled in two years. Has the provincial budget for school construction doubled?

May 16, 1974

Tape No. 1657

NM - 10

No, it has gone from \$8 million to \$10 million, not enough to take up the slack Mr. Speaker. The \$2 million is

not even enough to pick up the slack from last year. Yet we are suppose to believe that this budget and particularly the education part of it is the best thing that ever happened to Newfoundland. I say, Mr. Speaker, and more important, the people of Newfoundland are saying that it is fast approaching one of the biggest disasters we have had in terms of a budget. In a year when there is a real scare about inflation, in a year when housing costs are skyrocketing, for a Minister of Finance to come in with the tax increases that we have heard so much about, seven per cent going up to eight per cent, four points on the income tax. The Minister of Finance stands there with a straight face and tell us that this is the best he could do. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, it is the best that he could do, a man so out of touch with the realities of rural Newfoundland.

That, Mr. Speaker, reminds me, I remember a month or two ago I had an occasion to be on an "Open Line Programme" and I referred to some members of the opposite side, in talking about money matters of course, Mr. Speaker, or else this would not be at all relevant. I talked about, I wondered how these members could reflect the needs of rural Newfoundland. The minister afterwards got a bit touchy on the subject and completely -

AN HON. MEMBER: It is a good case.

MR. SIMMONS: It is a good case, Mr. Speaker, and I hope the member has heard it and I hope he heard me say and I hope he can tell the word 'boy' from 'bum'. He could not when he spoke in the House on the subject. I called the Member for St. John's Centre a 'corner boy'. He got up and thanked me for it. A corner boy is a complimentary term. It is a fellow from St. John's, is that right? A corner boy.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: He told me it was. He was my authority, the Member for St. John's Centre.

MR. NEARY: Stop interrupting.

MR. SIMMONS: Fight?

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. SIMMONS: Right! Exactly! He, in his usual fashion, the Member for Bonavista South gets up and tries to twist and misconstrue the compliment I gave to the Member for St. John's Centre on the radio, a compliment that the member actually stood up and thanked me for.

Now then what I said about the Minister of Finance was a compliment. I said, "He was born with a silver spoon in his mouth." It was not his fault. He could not take any credit for it. He could not take any blame." But he got awful huffy a day or so later on the subject. All I was saying and I wish that he had heard the full context of what I said, all I was saying was that a man in that situation could not have much particular compassion for or insight into the problems of rural Newfoundland.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The honourable gentleman seems to be getting involved in outlining to the House of Assembly a programme that he had on "Open Line". I am sure this is not relevant to the debate on the budget.

MR. ROWE, W. N. Mr. Speaker, let me speak to that point of order, Sir. You know on the budget debate as it is clearly shown in the authorities, the rules of relevancy are relaxed in any event, but just to quote something from "Beauchesne" on the relevancy. It is on page 111, 193 is the paragraph referred to: "Relevancy, per se, is not easy to define. A wrong comprehension of it may have a serious affect on the freedom of speech. Members are often deprived of their right to speak on the pretext that their remarks are irrelevant when as a matter of fact they refer to matters perhaps remote but yet related even indirectly to the question under debate. In borderline cases the members should be given the benefit of the doubt." Sir, it goes on to support that statement with further comments.

What I am saying, Sir, is this: In any event a member is entitled to the benefit of the doubt but in the Budget Speech which is a debate which is traditionally in this House considered to be as wide-ranging as the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Sir, it is not incumbent on any member to get up and raise specious points

of order based on irrelevancy. I submit, Sir, that the Member for Hermitage is being relevant to the Budget Speech which encompasses all expenditure in this province on any matter and involves every matter which comes under the jurisdiction of the government.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order. I must say, Sir, that I do believe that "Open Line Shows" and indeed anything which would be on radio or television, 'Amos and Andy' or (what is it?) 'Cher' on Sunday nights?

AN HON. MEMBER: "Sonny and Cher", I believe that these are extremely relevant matters.

AN HON. MEMBER: 'Archie Bunker'.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: 'Archie Bunker' and I believe all of these matters are extremely relevant in the Budget debate for the Province of Newfoundland for the fiscal year 1974-1975, and I would certainly hope that Your Honour would rule that all of these programmes on all stations CBC or CJON, VOCH, VOWR any of these would be quite relevant, Sir.

MR. F. B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order: Whilst the Minister of Education did entertain us and showed his dedication to the whole consideration of the estimates, the reference that my colleague made to the 'Open Line Show' was just a passing reference. My colleague was dealing with the actions and the activities of the Minister of Finance and dealing with the attitude of the Minister of Finance, in his capacity as Minister of Finance, and I would suggest that he was extremely relevant to the debate.

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): Order, please!

On the points made by the various members from either side of the House, if the member for Hermitage should find it necessary to make a point where he must go slightly outside the rule of relevancy, I think anybody would take that as acceptable, as being in order.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

See, Mr. Speaker, if you have a budget which we had to hear with for the last few weeks and have to live with I suppose for the

rest of the year, a budget that represents such a pretty cover and such a shimozzle inside, you begin scratching your head and asking yourself: What is the reason for this? On the surface they are a bunch of reasonable fellows. Why the shimozzle? Why the lack of emphasis where it is needed? Why the lack of concern for school construction? I began looking for reasons. The only real reason that I can come up with, Mr. Speaker, is that the Minister of Finance who pilots this budget, who supervised this being put together, that the Minister of Finance just is out of touch. He does not know what the needs of rural Newfoundland are.

Then I say to myself, if that be so, why? And I begin to look at the reasons.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: It is obvious.

MR. F. B. ROWE: All kinds of possibilities.

MR. SIMMONS: It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, why we are in trouble on this particular budget. Perhaps the first thing we need is a new Minister of Finance. Even the present Minister of Municipal Affairs was not this bad. At least he could take advice on the subject. He was not the most brilliant Minister of Finance we ever had, but perhaps he is not -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I am merely interrupting the honourable Member for Hermitage because it is time for the Late Show that was suppose to have been on. The honourable Member for Bell Island gave notice that he was not satisfied with the answer to a question that he asked the Minister of Mines and Energy. The rules say that the Speaker has to indicate to the House by 4:00 P.M. on Thursday afternoon the matters to be raised, which he did. The rules also say that the honourable member who wishes to raise a point has to have it passed to the Speaker in writing by 5:00 P.M. Some approximate two or three minutes ago the honourable member passed a note informing that he wished to raise the matter, and the

Chair is not willing to proceed with it and it shall be deferred until the next day.

HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: On that point, Mr. Speaker, you know the fact is there. It is clear. It is, you know, notice referred to, whether or not it is given orally, during the oral questions, it must be given in writing to the Speaker not later than 5:00 P.M. the same day.

HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: They asked for leave and I am replying to whether -

MR. W. N. ROWE: They give leave or they do not, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL: If the honourable member cannot read, I do not think he can add anything, Sir.

MR. W. N. ROWE: On a point of order, Sir. The honourable minister should gracefully give leave or he should keep quiet. I mean, he is too nasty and he should not be allowed to speak.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: Sit down! Sit down!

MR. SPEAKER: Is leave granted for the debate on the matter in question? There is not unanimity so the matter will not be debated and shall be given an opportunity on the next day as this occasion arises.

MR. NEARY: That is democracy for you.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Sir, we are not going to be permitted to carry on with this debate today?

MR. SPEAKER: That is correct.

MR. NEARY: Okay, Sir. Muzzled again!

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Hermitage.

HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I would like to draw to the attention of the honourable members that the Member for Hermitage does have the floor.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, before I leave the matter -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we could have the same kind of courtesy extended to me that the member (Where is he from temporarily, Bonavista South?) insisted on having?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

It appears to the Chair that members on both sides of the House are interrupting the honourable Member for Hermitage. Therefore, everybody should be quiet and let him speak.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, before I leave the matter of education I first of all did point out that I feel that the amount of \$10 million was certainly not enough in this year even to take care of the inflationary costs, the rise in cost for school construction from last year to this year, and this is most regrettable.

There are other areas though that caused me to be quite disappointed with the education part of the budget. The pupil/teacher ratio has been discussed at some length in this Chamber and we have heard the minister's explanations and his version of the explanation but no amount of explanation, Mr. Speaker, on the part of the minister or anybody else in the administration, will put at ease the hundreds upon hundreds, upon hundreds of school teachers in this province who have been inconvenienced, who have been caused a fair amount of concern as a result of the announcement and the way that the pupil/teacher ratio programme is to be implemented.

The NTA made a suggestion, I believe I made it in the House at one point too. The suggestion that still needs to be made, because the minister has not yet responded to it, is that if for financial reasons he has had to phase in this programme over three years instead of two, the least he could have done in the interim was to freeze the pupil/teacher ratio in effect to the high school, in other words to keep

the present formula until, (What is the format up until June?) keep that formula for high school and phase in the elementary formula.

What is happening now with the chaos that the minister created with his announcement? What is happening in effect, of course, is that the elementary schools are not getting the teachers in some cases to which they are entitled. It is not a matter of blaming it on the high school or blaming it on the board. The boards were left in a real dilemma because the minister came in here just two or three days before February 15. As some people will know, February 15 is the deadline by which boards must indicate to their teachers whether or not they are surplus staff or not. The minister came in here, I believe, on the 11th. or 12th. of February, and made this statement which had far-reaching implications for teachers throughout the province, and as a result the boards were very much in a bind, at least morally if not legally.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: And as a result, Mr. Speaker, the boards were obliged to keep their teachers in the high schools for the coming year even though in some cases it means a couple of teachers more in a given school than the minister's new formula allows for. In consequence, to find these couple of teachers beyond the formula for the high school, boards could only take them from one place, take them and took them from the elementary schools. So in effect, notwithstanding all the fanfare that the minister has used on television and in this House to tell us what a great new programme this is, I will tell you what kind of a programme it is insofar as just about every school in this country, in this province is concerned, it is a programme that has put a teacher here, a teacher there, a few teachers but a programme on the whole that has caused a lot of aggravation, a lot of frustration at school board meetings, in the administrative offices of school boards, at the school staff and administrative level, and in every staff room, it has caused a lot of havoc, it has caused a lot of chaos. High schools that had twelve teachers this year were suppose to get

ten next year, where saved the axe for one year, and they are holding on to twelve, but the two they are holding on to above the ten are two that should have been down in the elementary school and would be there, would be there, Mr. Speaker, if the minister had really acted in good faith on this matter and allowed the present high school formula to continue until such time as he had phased in the new formula at the elementary level.

Because you see, Mr. Speaker, in fairness to the programme that the minister has announced, in the third year, with few exceptions, in the third year his new formula provides for the numbers of teachers at the high school level which there are at present. So what is happening in the interim is that a school with twelve teachers, on paper, is dropping back to ten, then up to eleven and back to twelve. So that in the long run, in most cases, the high schools will not suffer but in the short run the minister and his new policy have created a lot of chaos in the high schools concerned and in the elementaries which would have gotten the teachers but for the matters that I have raised in the last few minutes.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Is he going to shut up?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I will explain it one more time. I ask the indulgence of the more intelligent members of the House. I am going to explain it in rather elementary fashion for the Member for Bonavista South.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I will give the Member for Bonavista South an example, if you have a community in which you have, and I pick those figures off the top of my head, so they may not be accurate but they will illustrate the point. I could get him an actual example but I will just make up one as I go along to make the point.

If you have a high school in a community with twelve teachers, on their present formula, and an elementary school with sixteen teachers, the new formula that the minister has announced has the effect of reducing the twelve high school teachers to ten and increasing the

fourteen elementary teachers to sixteen.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: No, of course it is not. Of course it is not true and I did not say that, Mr. Speaker. Well stay with me. Does he promise to stay with me just for a minute? I will try one more time.

HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: If you have a high school with twelve teachers, the formula reduces it to ten. You have an elementary school with fourteen the formula increases it to sixteen - from fourteen to sixteen? Okay? Two increase in the case of the elementary, two decrease in the case of the high school! Because the minister's announcement came a couple of days before the deadline, February 15, the deadline by which boards must notify teachers if they are surplus, what the boards have done in effect is left the two teachers in the high school, and they got them from the improved formula in the elementary. So in effect that elementary school is not getting the two teachers. The staff is disgruntled because they are not getting the two teachers. The high school staff is disgruntled because they know in a year or so that they will have to lose those teachers, of course pending the coming into force of the formula. There are a lot of disgruntled teachers around this province and there was no need for it. There was no need for it, Mr. Speaker, at all.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to leave the subject of education after making one more brief point, the one about bus transportation. The minister must be the classic example of a man who likes to recite history. But I should not stop there, Mr. Speaker, he loves to recite history when he thinks it is to his party's advantage to recite the history. He did not bother to tell us, even though he goes painstakingly down through every step when this happened in 1952, in 1953, and in 1954, in the morning and afternoon, all the way down. He does that as a matter of course when he makes ministerial statements. Somewhere down near the bottom of the statement there is a little paragraph, there is a

statement which he was to make at the beginning but he gives you a lesson in history first.

MR. SPEAKER: If I could just interrupt the honourable member, to advise him that he has five minutes left.

MR. SIMMONS: But in the case of bus transportation, Mr. Speaker, the minister did not quite do that. He did not bother to tell us one essential fact, that the ninety-five per cent is not a new formula at all. It is the same formula that most of the boards have been operating under this year, the formula that he announced last October. So there is no improvement. There is no real improvement, Mr. Speaker, over the present. The only encouragement in it, is that there is an indication from the announcement that the government are returning to sanity on the subject and going back to the formula which the Liberal Government introduced three or four years ago.

Mr. Speaker, before sitting down just let me come to the subject of the Silver Anniversary of Confederation. A lot has been said about this. I have not spoken on this subject at all, Mr. Speaker. I have not said one word except by way of question to the minister on the subject of the Silver Anniversary.

Let it be clear, Mr. Speaker, first of all that after twenty-five years of Confederation I believe we have an awful lot to celebrate. I intend to do a lot of celebrating. I have already done some of it and I intend to do some more. There has been a lot of confusion on this point, Mr. Speaker, the government members have tried to construe that people on the opposition side are not for a celebration. Let me put it clear, Mr. Speaker: We are for a celebration. We are not for a multi-million dollar brawl.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. SIMMONS: Now, Mr. Speaker, if you go through the estimates, you will find - Mr. Speaker, just a point of clarification, the little exchange we had here about whether the Member for Bell Island were allowed to proceed with his point, is that coming out of my time? Or has that been taken into account?

May 16, 1974

Tape 1658 (Afternoon)

PK - 11

MR. SPEAKER: The point which was raised earlier by a gentleman,
rather than I in this Chair, that

6365

points of order in such matters would not be deducted only 9ⁿ quorum calls.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I have gone through the estimates and I have counted up seventeen departments which have hidden in there somewhere, \$14,000, \$15,000, \$16,000 or something. I believe, Mr. Speaker, there was a deliberate attempt to hid it. Is it not significant that ten or twelve of the departments have \$14,000? I can see the Minister of Finance saying, "Look, we cannot have all this show up in one department. So, here you sneak \$14,000 into yours. You put \$14,000 into yours." Ten departments have identical amounts, \$14,000. Another four departments have from \$10,000 to \$17,000.

It is obvious, Mr. Speaker. I do not mean hidden in the sense of hid. One can find it sure, but it does not look as much, Mr. Speaker, if it is scattered throughout seventeen departments. All together, Mr. Speaker, in the seventeen departments of the eighteen departments, they all together have expenditures of (Who has \$10,000?) \$12,000 to \$17,000. By the way, is there one \$10,000? Well that is another one. Yes, I am sorry. Fisheries, under general administration, \$10,000 up to \$17,000.

MR. SPEAKER: I would like to advise the honourable member that forty-five minutes have expired.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: By leave.

MR. SPEAKER: Leave is not granted.

MR. WILSON: I would like to rise. It is very seldom one gets the privilege in this honourable House in such things as in the Throne Speech and this debate. I am one who while I have that privilege is going to use it. It may not suit probably the opposition in lots of things that may be said. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, we are all here in this House for a reason.

In debate on the estimates going through this House, they have pointed out pretty clearly to me the reason is not very obvious with the opposition. We get them standing on the floor, in the case of the honourable member for Hermitage, and speaking about these estimates not going through and some not brought out into the light. If the

honourable member for Hermitage had not wasted so much time in trying to cut down the honourable members on the government side of this honourable House, and put some sense and reality into it which he should have been able to do as one who was educated for same. There are probably letters before his name, as far as I know, before and after. It is not on my part, Mr. Speaker. There was no government had to contribute anything as far as I am concerned, for my education, because I am not round-shouldered from carrying it around. That is one thing.

MR. SIMMONS: No government contributed anything towards mine either.

MR. WILSON: Well, as far as if they did or they did not, if they never contributed to it, the honourable member should be able to contribute something to this honourable House and to the people of this province.

MR. SIMMONS: I am doing my best, boy!

MR. WILSON: Doing his best.

MR. SIMMONS: Doing my best, and I do not have to worry about selling the House.

MR. WILSON: The honourable member is doing a poor job.

MR. EVANS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. WILSON: I was referring to the honourable member for Hermitage. It takes a man to do these things, when they have to get out without education to do it. I challenge the honourable member with what he has done, as far as that is concerned, with his education. Did he use it there?

I saw enough here this evening and I have seen enough since I have been in this honourable House as a member for the Port de Grave District of trying to be cut off my legs.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Sorry to interrupt the honourable member but the Chair feels that he is not being relevant to the Budget Speech and it is becoming a debate about the personalities of the honourable members.

MR. WILSON: I thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am trying to be as relevant as the honourable member opposite has been. Therefore, I -

MR. MORGAN: That is a good point. It is a good point.

MR. SIMMONS: Is the honourable member questioning the Speaker's ruling?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: He is trying, he said. He is trying.

MR. EVANS: He told the honourable member he was not relevant. He is not questioning.

MR. WILSON: As relevant as the honourable members on the opposite side. That is all I am asking for. As far as the Budget Speech is concerned, we are hearing in this honourable House that there is nothing in the Budget Speech.

I can assure the honourable gentlemen that if there is not enough money there for education and we have to arrive minute from minute and go by strikes and teachers being invited out to come out to cause a riot for to look for more money, it is not in today's estimates and could not be there because it has not happened lately.

Neither can it be in this budget for money for public works or for anything else, when wages jump from \$3.50 an hour to \$7.00. They will have to wait until next year to receive that into a budget and the cost of living and all the rest. As far as I am concerned, as a member sitting on the government side, I am not ashamed to be one to recognize, on the government side of this House, what we are after doing for the province and the district which I represent. I only wish that some of the honourable members who are trying to cut the legs off of some of these who are trying to do something would only get together and work together for the benefit of our province and the people who are in it.

We may be in a better position to arrive at more money for education, more money for public works and more money for roads and all divisions of government so that the coming generation and probably myself and some honourable members in this House who are getting up to the age, are getting on a downward grade so that we will have a province fit, just and honourable for these people to live in.

I want to inform this honourable House that this was my intention when I came into government. I have no bones about any honourable members, as far as any grudge against them whatsoever.

As far as that is concerned, in this honourable House, always buddies. It is not the word that changes or is turned around to cut the man down. It is the man who has the gumption, who is able to take his enemy by the hand, if he has one, and if they start off at the bottom step of the ladder, the trials may be hard but probably they will climb and attain the highest step. That is what happened with me.

I am glad of education and not against any man who has it. I have to go out and try to find someone who is educated to run my business, bookkeeper or whatnot, therefore I cannot do without them.

There are lots of them in this honourable House. As far as we heard about income tax gone up, who do not know income tax papers? Like some of the fishermen said to me, from my district, they never knew what income tax paper was in 1956 and 1957 and the sixties. But we talk to these people today and I am going to tell you they know what income tax papers are today. Sure, why not? How can we run a country or run a province without taxes?

Everybody is looking for services. I have heard in this honourable House since I have been sitting here the government being criticized for money for this and money for that. Well, my mind and contention is that if they do not put anything in, how can they expect to take anything out? I, as an honourable member in this House, am prepared to put something into this government. I will put something in for all humanity's sake, not only for my district. If I can be a benefit to the province, I will say anywhere.

I have a job to find out myself, to look at the honourable gentlemen on the opposite side, and when I come to the point and figure out for myself, I wonder are they serious. No doubt, probably in some sense of the word, can be serious. The serious part about it is that they are getting to the public that they are serious. This is getting across to the public, that they are serious. I think the opposition is getting across to the public they have shown that they are dead opposed to everything that the government has stood for, dead opposed to everything that the government side has stood for.

If the opposition are dead opposed to it, if they are dead opposed to everything good was done by this government -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Name one thing?

MR. WILSON: Name one thing? Go out in the districts, go out into mine and have a look around. Come out by and by, in the middle of August sometime, and have a look around and see what is happening.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: When the blueberries are ripe.

MR. WILSON: Never mind the blueberries. Leave that to the honourable member for Bonavista North, Mr. Thoms. He is going to look after the blueberries. We have somebody in this honourable House to look after everything. There is a man for everything. We have an undertaker. We have a builder. We have a blueberry man. We have a whole lot of lawyers.

MR. W. ROME: J.J. Hussey is getting all the credit for that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. WILSON: I have no regret to make if Mr. Hussey is getting the credit for it or who is getting the credit for it as long as it is done. No regret whatsoever. I am not out and not in this honourable House for publicity. My publicity is when I go and drive over a road, if that road is done and the pothole is filled. That is publicity enough for me because I figure that he who does the most, gets the most criticism. Surely that has been proven in this honourable House and throughout the world.

The main concern that I have, as far as that is concerned in government, is that we all try to do the best we can. In this honourable House, when I look at members here on the government side and members of the opposition, educated to the hilt and one educated person cutting the legs off the other, trying to get to the nitty gritty, I think myself that is fair spent. That is fair spent.

I look across the way and I see the honourable member for Twillingate.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: A good man.

MR. WILSON: A good man, he said it. I have shown it. I look over

and I see another member and I cannot help but congratulate him, Mr. Earle Winsor, Hon. Earle Winsor. I have travelled the Labrador shore with him from one end to the other. We are told in this honourable House that nobody on the government side knows anything about the Labrador. They were never down there. This is what we are told. It was mentioned to the government side that nobody knows anything about anything.

If the honourable members would just take it for granted and sit down and get down to the nitty-gritty of this, there can be more done in three months to get down to do the main issues, as has been done here for the last twenty-three years because everything as I see, has been hearsay, money thrown out here, money thrown out somewhere else. Who has to pay, to first for it? It is back in the lap of the Progressive Conservative government to pay off the debts who, Sir, while they are paying them off, are crucified and criticized trying to do it.

We as honourable members should sit down in this House and realize half the mistakes that have been made in the past and do what we can to try to straighten them out. I assure them if the opposition use the tactics that they are using at the present time, I am very much afraid the leadership will have to be about three leaderships. The honourable Leader of the Opposition now as far as I am concerned, is after falling out of the cradle. He is finished. He is out. The honourable member for Bell Island has him flooded already. He is a washout.

Now, I am sure the honourable member for Hermitage in his past few speeches has made it very plain to this House that he is going to be in no contention at all for leader.

Mr. Speaker, with those few remarks I have a district to represent. Myself, I am more than overjoyed this last three weeks with my government as far as my district is concerned. I have great praise. If I live to get back here when the House opens next fall, I will be able to tell them the story of them all. Thank you.

MR. F. ROWE: I move to adjourn the debate, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for St. Barbe North has adjourned

May 16, 1974

Tape 1659

IB-7

the debate.

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

The House resumed at 8:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for St. Barbe North, I think, adjourned the debate.

MR. F. B. ROWE: Well, Mr. Speaker, in view of the reception that I just received from the other side, I would like to give notice of a motion that I am prepared to make at the end of my speech. It is with the agreement of the Hon. House Leader and that is probably to adjourn the House at nine o'clock so that all honourable members who do still have some youth in their blood can go home and possibly see the last game of the National Hockey League.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. F. B. ROWE: So I will give notice to the Hon. House Leader. I will second the motion, Mr. Speaker, if the House Leader were prepared to or the Hon. Minister of Recreation can probably make that motion.

MR. MURPHY: It is a pleasure to second that motion.

MR. F. B. ROWE: Okay, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. F. B. ROWE: Now, Mr. Speaker, the budget speech, in my opinion, was a devastating blow or shock to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. After two years of what we could only consider to be Scrooge budgetary or Scrooge budgeting, we get a budget this year, Sir, that contains an increase in personal income tax and an increase in the sales tax and very little of an increase in anything else.

Now, Sir, I will admit that there was an increase in many of the votes contained in the estimates, an increase in absolute terms, an increase in concrete terms, but there was not an increase in the various votes contained in the estimates in relative terms. What I mean by relative terms, Mr. Speaker, is relative to the expectations that the honourable members on the other side of the House of Assembly manage to raise in the minds of

the people of Newfoundland during two election campaigns. Now unlike the Hon. Minister of Justice, I do not rely on telegrams to substantiate my statements. I rely, Mr. Speaker, on the travelling that I have done during the last few weeks throughout the province. Whenever the Hon. Minister of Justice has a profound statement to make or a criticism to make of the members on this honourable side of the House, he always qualifies his remarks with a great number of telegrams or telephone calls that he has received. In my own travelling throughout the province, Sir, the people of Newfoundland honestly believed that after two years of Tory planning and priorities and study and restructuring and this kind of thing that they would come up with a budget that contains substantial increases with respect to putting money into the province to increase the standard and the amount of the public services. We have not seen this.

MR. MARSHALL: To a point of order, Mr. Speaker. There is a rule of unnecessary repetition that has been brought in. I think the Hon. Member for St. Barbe North is really repeating substantially exactly the self-same things that were said by the sub-education critic, the Hon. Member for Hermitage, this afternoon.

MR. F. B. ROWE: That is not a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, if I may reply to that point of order.

The Hon. Member for Hermitage this afternoon did not mention one thing relative to public services, income tax increases or sales tax increases. I would expect that as far as the rule of relevancy is concerned or repetition is concerned, it would concern the speaker in question and not anything else that another member in the House of Assembly would have to say, Sir. It was a stupid point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair seems to have a bad memory with regard to what the Hon. Member for Hermitage said this afternoon. The Hon. Member for St. Barbe North may continue.

MR. F. B. ROWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the sadest aspect about this budget speech is that the -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. F. B. ROWE: Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask to be heard in silence. I am going to ask for a ruling right now, Mr. Speaker, that every time I am interrupted on a point of order or from noise from the other side that the time be deducted from the forty-five minutes of my speech.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

The Chair, I think, has made a ruling that the time with regard to points of order and so on will not be deducted when an honourable member is speaking.

I remind, however, the Hon. Member for Bonavista South that he is not in his own place and he does not have the right to speak out.

MR. F. B. ROWE: Now, Mr. Speaker, the saddest aspect about the budget speech is that the people of Newfoundland and Labrador sincerely wanted a change and they got their change but I am afraid that the change is a disappointing one to the people of Newfoundland. It was a complete antithesis, Sir, the complete opposite of what they expected. Yet, Sir, in spite of the fact that this administration has seen fit to do the exact opposite of other provincial administrations across Canada at a time when we have an increased cost of living and inflation, a lot of provincial administrations have seen fit to decrease taxes; this administration has seen fit to increase taxes.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

The Hon. Member for Bonavista South, although he is now in his right place, still does not have the right to speak.

MR. F. B. ROWE: In spite of this, Mr. Speaker, the Premier of this Province has the gall to come out and criticize the federal budget for not doing enough toward counteracting the cost of living in the nation after this administration itself has seen fit to increase the taxes in this province.

Now I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that neither the Tory Administration nor if we had a Liberal Administration nor if we had any administration on the mainland or in Ottawa could do enough to satisfy the people of Canada. It is not a matter of black and white, it is a matter of doing the best thing possible. Mr. Speaker, this administration has not seen fit to do the best thing possible in that respect.

Now, Mr. Speaker, some honourable members on the other side of the House tonight saw fit to comment on the decorum or the activities during the consideration of the estimates over the last seventy-four hours. I would remind honourable members that it was this administration that brought in the gag rule. It was not the previous administration, it was this administration that after taking a beating for two years in the consideration of the estimates have seen fit to bring in the gag rule.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. F. B. ROWE: We were forced to use up the seventy-five hours, Mr. Speaker, simply because of two factors. One is that we could not get answers from ministers who had questions put to them. We simply could not get answers from the ministers. Ministers insisted on long-winded answers to questions that were asked but at the same time they waltzed around the answer to the particular question that was put to them. This was further compounded, Mr. Speaker, by the fact that a number of backbenchers and even ministers saw fit to get up and give long-winded speeches during the consideration of the estimates, thereby using up much of that seventy-five hours themselves.

Sir, the House Leader had the gall to say that we should have made better use of our time. I would submit, Sir, that upon an analysis of the Hansard of this House or the verbatim reports of this House that we will find that just as much time was consumed during the consideration of the estimates by honourable members on the other side of the House as was by honourable members on this side of the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: Now never mind personalities.

MR. F. B. ROWE: Now there are no personalities. That is another thing, Mr. Speaker: When honourable members on this side of the House question the policy of a minister or his department, they start crying in their beer and start accusing members on this side of personality assassination and character assassination and this type of thing. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, they are firm believers in the rule that if one should say something hard enough and long enough, some people will probably begin to start believing it. That is not the case.

Now, Sir, I do not know how to describe this. Talking about personalities, Mr. Speaker, of all people in this honourable House to talk about personalities, when the honourable House Leader of the government stood up in the House this afternoon and exploited and took advantage of a gentleman's agreement between myself and the Hon. Minister of Education, to try to get some political advantage, talk about honour, talk about personalities.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with regard to this budget speech, I have been looking for a term to describe it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Magnificent!

MR. F. B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I do not know how to describe the budget speech. I do not know. I tried to say that it was retroactive distraction. I will try to describe what I mean by that for the Hon. Member for Burgeo-LaPoile in a few minutes.

MR. EVANS: (Inaudible).

MR. F. B. ROWE: It is certainly retroactive, fiscal tomfoolery if anything else. What I mean by that is this: I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that this government are embarked upon a stupid, fiscal plot they have started already. They have increased taxes. They will be hanging on by their fingernails next year. I would submit that they will increase taxes again. I would submit, Mr. Speaker,

that in the last year of their administration, their last budget speech, that the Minister of Finance will take great pride in reducing taxes in this province. What would he be doing at that stage? He would be simply reducing the taxes to what they were when this administration took over and trying to take credit for it. This is what I mean, Mr. Speaker, by retroactive, fiscal tomfoolery.

We have already had one example of this, Mr. Speaker. I will relate to the student allowance programme of the university. This administration gained power and one of the big factors for their gaining power was the fact that they convinced the students of this province and the parents of these students that the student-aid policy of the previous administration was a bad one and it was not enough. Immediately upon the assumption of power, this administration in two budgets decreased the amount of student-aid to our students in this province, to the Memorial University students. We had no-student aid programme? The Minister of Finance has the hypocrisy to stand up on budget day and take great pride in announcing a ninety-two per cent increase in the amount of money made available for the student-aid programme at the university. Sir, they have not even returned to the policy that was in effect when they took power. It was a policy, Sir, that they criticized extensively and I would submit, Sir, won a great number of votes on. The minister and this administration take this hypocritical pride in announcing that they are going back almost to the point of the previous Liberal policy with respect to student aid.

MR. MORGAN: The member for Memorial University.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is another typical, scummy kind of a comment. I can remind -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. MARSHALL: To a point of order. I am just trying to prevent the House from degenerating into nastiness, Mr. Speaker. I would invite the honourable member (I know he did not mean it) to withdraw the word, "scummy."

MR. F. B. ROWE: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. I do not know about the degeneration of the House, but I can see a great number of degenerates in front of me. I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, to the point of order that I did not refer to the Hon. Member for Bonavista South as scum. I referred to his remark as being a scummy remark and his remark, Sir; that I was the member for Memorial University, thereby he tried to leave the impression with this House and the people of Newfoundland that my only interest lies in Memorial University, which it certainly does not.

AN HON. MEMBER: The honourable gentleman has no interest.

MR. F. B. ROWE: Sit down!

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that that point of order is not a point of order. I still insist that kind of a remark is a scummy, low, vicious kind of a remark.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Green Bay.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order. We started off, Mr. Speaker, this session tonight with a very cordial frame of mind with all the members on the other side. Now the Hon. Member for St. Barbe North, who is a well-educated, well-respected man -

MR. F. B. ROWE: What is the point of order, Mr. Speaker?

MR. PECKFORD: I think in all fairness to the House and to the dignity of the House that he should withdraw that unparliamentary word, that nasty word.

MR. F. B. ROWE: That is not a point of order.

MR. PECKFORD: It is not necessary, Mr. Speaker. It is terrible.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, may I submit that I was twice ruled out of order for using the word, "scum." I am the most inoffensive person in this House, so I am sure -

MR. NEARY: To a point of order, Sir. It is my understanding in this House, Sir, that any unparliamentary remarks are aimed at an individual. In this case, Sir, my colleague used the word to describe words that were used by the member, not the member himself.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. NEARY: So, therefore, Sir, in my opinion the point of order should not stand.

MR. BARRY: To that point of order. I would like to make reference to the comments made by the Hon. Member for Bell Island. I would like to point out that one is not permitted to do by the backdoor what he is not allowed to do by the frontdoor.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

I hope nobody else now would like to speak to that point of order.

The comments made by the Hon. Member for St. Barbe North were indeed referring to a phrase and not to a member, although I think the wording itself could have been more carefully chosen. It is rather discourteous.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order.

MR. F. B. ROWE: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MORGAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, a second point of order.

MR. F. B. ROWE: Is the honourable gentleman appealing the Speaker's ruling?

MR. MORGAN: No, it is on another point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. F. B. ROWE: (Inaudible).

MR. MORGAN: Will the honourable gentleman sit down?

MR. F. B. ROWE: (Inaudible).

MR. MORGAN: Sit down and the honourable gentleman will find out.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman, prior to sitting down referred to members on this side of the House as degenerates. That is in the text of his statement. Now that statement to me is derogatory against all members of this side of the House of Assembly. He should be asked to retract that statement. There are no members over here who are degenerates.

MR. F. B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I was not referring to honourable members in the psychological sense but I was referring to them in the political sense. They are politically degenerated.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. F. B. ROWE: Now, Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted to continue?

MR. W. N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order. The fact of the matter is that my colleague used the word, "degenerate" not to refer to the physical or mental state of the honourable members opposite, although, Sir, we will not debate that, he was talking about the fact that their political position in the country is degenerating and has degenerated and their status as politicians has gone far below what might be called normal or even subnormal for a major political party. Now, Sir, that is point number one.

Mr. Speaker, point number two,

the Member for Bonavista South, Sir, has been harassing my colleague all night long and rising on specious points of order. I am speaking to the point of order, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROWE, W.N. Now, Sir, I have been looking at the honourable gentleman and trying to figure out how Your Honour can cope with his constant harassment. I have decided he should attack him where it hurts most, his vanity, Mr. Speaker. I would suggest that the next time the honourable Member for Bonavista South rises on a specious point of order, threaten to mess up his hair, Mr. Speaker, mess up his hair and I am sure that will keep him quiet for the rest of the night.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: Look, Mr. Speaker, I think we should end this. I originally raised it. The problem with all of this quite frankly is that the honourable the Member for St. Barbe North is repeating pretty well verbatim the speech given by the honourable Member for Hermitage this afternoon. That is the reason for the annoyance on the other side. I suggest that he withdraw his allegation and get an original idea instead of repeating slavishly what the honourable Member for Hermitage had to say.

MR. F. B. ROWE: Oh, is Your Honour going to make a ruling?

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, if I may.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member going to speak to that same point of order?

MR. F. B. ROWE: I submit seriously, I submit, Sir, that with the harassment from the other side and the number of points of order that are being raised it is just a simple attempt by members on the other side of the House of Assembly to curtail my speech. That is the only point that I want to make.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

This matter has been a debate not really points of order. The remark made by the honourable Member for St. Barbe South, the Chair feels that it was made in a political sense and not in the sense of describing honourable members.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. B. ROWE: Hush! No!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. F. B. ROWE: Now, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that I have been referred to as the Member for Memorial University, I would like to make a point that I was about to make when that comment was made and that is this: that one of the biggest disappointments in this budget and in the estimates is the fact that we did not see a dramatic increase in capital money being made available for the expansion of the vocational schools and particularly the College of Trades and Technology.

Now, Sir, there is one thing that the minister has not answered at any point during this session of the House of Assembly and that is this. We have a situation at the University where we have a decrease in enrollment which was caused substantially by the present government's student-aid policy, while at the same time, Sir, we had one out of five in some cases and one out of six and one out of ten students being admitted to the College of Trades and Technology. In some cases only one out of five is being accepted. There is a very serious space problem at the College of Trades and Technology. Sir, the minister himself in various ministerial statements and in answer to oral questions put to him by myself during the earlier part of the session in admission that DREE money was not going to be spent on schools in this province, the emphasis was going to be on vocational and the College of Trades and Technology and the College of Fisheries, we do not see in the budget speech any policy or any indication that money is being indeed taken from DREE and channeled towards the College of Trades and Technology and vocational schools where it is so badly needed.

I would like an answer from the Minister of Education on that one because, Sir, we have a serious situation arising in this province.

MR. EVANS: ... DREE down in Burgeo.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. F. B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, we have a situation in this province where the wages for skilled labourers or skilled personnel are jumping dramatically.

AN HON. MEMBER: Skilled tradesmen.

MR. F. B. ROWE: Skilled tradesmen. The wages are jumping dramatically. The latest example I think we saw of that was in the carpentry business, where carpenters in this province, Mr. Speaker, are making much, much more, I would submit, than many teachers in this province, and highly qualified teachers.

AN HON. MEMBER: More than members of the House of Assembly.

MR. F. B. ROWE: More than members of the House of Assembly.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that this is going to further complicate the problem that we have at the vocational schools and at the College of Trades and Technology. So I would like -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I am - would you name the Yahoo.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. B. ROWE: I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. F. B. ROWE: I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Education has to come to grips with the serious situation that we do have at the present time in the College of Trades and Technology and the vocational schools and the more serious problem that we are going to have as a result of these dramatic increases in wages, because more and more of our young Newfoundlanders are going to go to these schools for training as electricians, in carpentry and in the various trades and skills, the sort of thing that you get from the College of Trades

and Technology and the vocational schools.

So I cannot understand, Mr. Speaker, why we have expansion of the university with reduction in enrollment and we do not have any similar dramatic expansion of the College of Trades and Technology and vocational schools with the situation as I just described. So I would like to hear something about that.

Now another point, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to bring up is this whole business of DRFE money. How much has been made available? And what is the government's policy with respect to what they are going to do with this? The understanding that I had, Mr. Speaker, was the government were going to channel money away from DRFE school construction. Now the proposals that we made on this honourable side of the House is that, if the provincial government feel strongly that DRFE schools are too rich for our blood, why cannot they sit down with the federal government and renegotiate the specifications for the DRFE schools? That is one positive suggestion.

Another positive suggest or another comment, Mr. Speaker, is that I do not submit to that argument entirely. These DREF schools are standard schools throughout Canada. Are we in Newfoundland to be second classed citizens? Do we not deserve the same kinds of schools, the same standard of schools that they have in Ontario, British Columbia and Alberta?

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. F. B. ROWE: That is question number one. And if we cannot afford it, if we are to be second classed citizens in that respect, because the provincial government claim that they cannot maintain such schools, the obvious only solution is to renegotiate the specifications for such schools.

Point number, whatever it is, school bus transportation: The new school bus transportation announced by the Hon. Minister of Education, while an improvement over the disaster plan announced by the ex-minister, is still a plan that has been totally rejected by the Federation of School Boards.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is a very patient man, I would not put up with it.

MR. F. B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, the only effect that this new school bus transportation formula has in this province is that the school boards of this province will be saddled with approximately \$450,000 to \$500,000 additional expenses this year. The minister indicated something like \$8 million for school bus transportation. The school boards have to come up with eight per cent of it, so the school boards they are on the verge of bankruptcy at the present time and yet they are going to have to come up with an additional \$500,000, approximately, this year. This is something that is not acceptable to the school boards and I am only mirroring their feelings on this and I would like the minister to really and seriously consider this original school bus transportation policy of paying for one hundred per cent based on the calling of public tenders.

Now the minister during his comments and during the question period, following his ministerial statement regarding school bus transportation and the ninety-five per cent formula, left a very strong indication that the school boards of this province are not to be trusted to conduct their own business affairs.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. B. POWE: Well he could have said it. I find that to be quite a serious charge, Mr. Speaker. I think the minister almost needs to apologize to the school boards because these school boards, the members on these school boards are dedicated members and if there is any way that - if there is any hanky-panky going on, it is incumbent upon the government to set up regulations whereby this kind of hanky-panky cannot be carried on.

So I would submit that the minister should trust the school boards just a little bit more, allow them to call public tenders and open these tenders publicly and the government pay one hundred per cent of the shot for school bus transportation.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. F. B. ROWE: Operating grants, Mr. Speaker, everything that can be said about operating grants has been said over the past two years. The school boards are still saddled with the same problem. Capital grants to the school boards, everything that has been said has been said over the past two years. I cannot add to it. The government have not come up with any particular solution to that problem.

The grant this year is \$10 million. The stated need by the denominational educational authorities is a minimum of \$18 million for this year, yet this government have come up with \$10 million.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would like for the minister to comment on the fact that \$23 million is being passed over to Memorial University this year without analysis in the Committee.

AN HON. MEMBER: None whatsoever.

MR. F. B. ROWE: None whatsoever.

I would like to hear the minister's reaction to something that was debated very heavily when the Hon. Minister of Education was Opposition Leader and the Liberals were in power, the whole business of opening the books of Memorial University to the public when the people of Newfoundland are paying a substantial sum of \$23 million to the university. My own personal feeling, and that should give you some indication of what kind of a member I am for the university, is that the books of the university should be open to the public of this province.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. F. B. ROWE: Or certainly open to this honourable House and to the Committee.

I cannot see how any institution whether it be a church or a university, a Lion's Club or the City Club, when they are dealing with millions of dollars of the people's money how they are not answerable publicly. I would like to get the minister's -

MR. W. N. ROWE: It has nothing to do with academic freedom.

MR. F. B. ROWE: It has nothing to do with academic freedom whatsoever. It would take more than forty-five minutes to deal with that subject alone. But I would like to hear the minister's comment on that particular proposal.

I would like for the minister to indicate when they are prepared to reopen the contract with the teachers for their salaries. I would like to hear, and we have been asking for two and a-half years for this, what is the government's policy on regional colleges. We do not know what the government's policy is with respect to regional colleges. All we know is that there is some structure being stuck up out in Corner Brook, as a result of an impulsive announcement made by the Premier himself at a dinner being held out there a year or so ago.

I would like for the minister to comment on revenue for educational purposes. My colleagues and I are strongly of the opinion that a multiplicity of school tax authorities throughout this province is the most cumbersome, inefficient, ineffective, inequitable system of collecting money for school purposes.

School taxes - If we are to get money from the people for purposes of education, we have to do it on an individual's capacity to pay. I cannot see any other alternative, equitable, fair, reasonable, efficient alternative than to have at the minimum a centralized school tax authority or let the government itself take the full responsibility for the collection of revenue for educational purposes, and it should be based upon the principle of a person's ability to pay.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. B. ROWE: The honourable Member for Bonavista South had an opportunity to make all of the comments he wanted to this afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

MR. W. N. ROWE: A human rights reject. He should be ruled out of order.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. B. ROWE: Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to turn from the field

of education for just a moment in my closing remarks and say something with respect to this whole business of ownership of our natural resources and the BRINCO business.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have a very great fear and I am not an expert in the area of natural resources nor industrial development nor the business world but I do have a fear that an awful lot of Newfoundlanders who are not experts have the fear and that is, Sir, the government's handling of the BRINCO deal may turn out to be an awful disaster for this province.

Sir, I submit that this administration attempted to confuse the take-over of BRINCO with the control of our natural resources and that they deliberately tried to polarize us in such a way that we would look like we were going to be defending BRINCO and we are against ownership of our natural resources. That was not the case, Sir. That is why we had terrible moments during these negotiations when we were doing a great deal of thinking and very little saying.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who? Him?

MR. F. B. ROWE: Honourable members on this side of the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. B. ROWE: Sir, I would like to point out to this House that there is a big difference between the control of undeveloped natural resources and the control of developed natural resources. Sir, this is a case where this government have taken control of undeveloped natural resources. Now, Sir, what does that mean?

MR. W. N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I am trying to follow my colleague's learned and reasoned arguments and the Civil Rights Reject keeps interrupting. Sir, would you rule the Human Rights Reject out of order and tell him that he is not permitted to speak while another person is speaking and has the floor? The Human Rights Reject, Sir, should be taught a lesson.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. EVANS: On that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Burgeo-Lapointe.

MR. EVANS: To that point of order. Sir, I think someone should remind the Member for St. Barbe North that the BRINCO bill is going to come up before the House before too much longer and then he will have a better chance to debate it without being irrelevant.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I assume the Member for White Bay South is referring to the honourable Member for Bonavista South. I am also sure that the honourable Member for Bonavista South is well aware that when a member is speaking he does have a right to be heard in silence.

MR. F. B. ROWE: On the next occasion he gets out of order, Mr. Speaker, he be named.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. B. ROWE: I do not want to be confused on this one because this is a very difficult and complex situation, this BRINCO deal, I realize as do honourable members on the other side. I am trying to explain the feeling of an awful lot of Newfoundlanders and basically it is this: That there is a difference between gaining control of developed natural resources and gaining control of undeveloped natural resources. The Lower Churchill is still an undeveloped natural resource. Sir, by the government taking over this kind of a situation it means that they have to find a number of things, one of which is just plain dollars and cents.

Everybody knows that we are talking in the realm of \$1.1 billion, which is likely to escalate as the months go by. Sir, the concern of all Newfoundlanders is this; Will the government's move on the development of the Lower Churchill mean that they will have to raise money and spend money for the development of the Lower Churchill that would otherwise be spent for public services in this province? Sir, I submit that that is a legitimate concern on the part of the people of Newfoundland. Will money be tied up that could be used for these public services? Because, Mr. Speaker, there is an expression circulating

around this province that certain parts of the anatomy of members of the government have been caught in the proverbial wringer.

AN HON. MEMBER: They roofoed! They boo-booed!

MR. F. B. FOWE: Sir, I would suggest that it might be many other parts of the anatomy that have been caught in the proverbial wringer on this particular one. It is a concern of the people of Newfoundland, a very big concern.

Sir, I have a funny feeling and a suspicion that this administration were most anxious to get an issue during that period when the negotiations were going on, and they would have loved nothing better than for us to have come out and get the tinge of an appearance that we were the big defenders of BRINCO.

and that would have been made an issue to distract and camouflage all the other issues that are important to the people of Newfoundland. So, Sir, I will just close by saying that this is a legitimate concern. I sincerely hope that as a result of the government's move we will not see people in this province suffering from lack of water and sewerage, proper school facilities, proper roads, electricity and what have you, as a result of money that it has been necessary to take away from expenditure in these areas for expenditure on the development of the Lower Churchill.

Sir, if the government do not find the money itself, it means that they are going to have to find some other outfit to do it for them. I ask this question. Why was it necessary to take it away from BRINCO if they have to turn around and find some other corporation, firm, institution or what have you that may not have the experience that BRINCO had?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: That was the whole reason.

MR. F. ROME: I submit, Sir, that these are questions that we should know answers to before this Budget Speech closes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Oh, Mr. Speaker, before I sit down, with the leave of the House, I was going to make a motion, I understand, seconded by the Minister of Recreation and Rehabilitation, that the House do adjourn at nine thirty o'clock to give those of us who are still young at heart an opportunity to see what might be the last Stanley Cup Play-Off Game of the season.

MR. SPEAKER: I am afraid that the Chair is not in a position to accept such a motion as that. The Chair will not accept the motion.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I am going to be very brief, as usual. Since our great colleague, the financial wizard, the benefactor of this province has brought down a document commonly known as the Budget, which contained many dollars and much sense and has been criticized by the members across the floor with much foolishness and little sense, I think that there are a few more words to be said.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. EVANS: Just a minute. Take it easy. I notice that the junior

member from White Bay North is not here. I think he ran away so that he would not have to speak in the budget debate. It was over the ten dollar mark. He could not understand it, especially if it had been broken down into one dollar bills, he would have been lost completely. We appreciate the fact that he is not here to confound the situation.

I have heard a lot of foolish and futile arguments in my day but some of these that have been advanced from the opposite side in connection with the estimates this year, I think take the cake. We have heard guys over there - we even had a dispute today as to who is the education critic. We have two of them over there now. Lo and behold!

It is not only enough to learn how to read and write, we have to know a little bit about arithmetic. In this case, I think if the members opposite had known a little bit about long division, about twenty departments of government, they could have timed the amount of debate on each one of these departments and would have had them all included in this debate, whereas they used them up in three or four.

We have seen deliberate attempts to downgrade ministers of this government and also -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: By whom? By whom?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Do not interrupt the man.

MR. EVANS: They do not want to be named do they? Because we might get the speaker's name here in addition. So that will be worse, will it not?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. EVANS: I would say he would. Never mind his chin. My chin can take it, his cannot.

MR. NEARY: The honourable member has nothing in his mouth to knock out anyway.

MR. EVANS: Well, that is all right. The honourable member has. All he has to do is come close enough.

MR. SIMMONS: That is low. That is pretty low.

MR. MORGAN: That is typical of the member for Bell Island, typical of him.

MR. EVANS: He has been underground all his life. I forgive him.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. EVANS: I forgive the member for Bell Island. He has been underground all his life. One cannot go any lower than that.

MR. DUNPHY: A point of order, please.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. DUNPHY: I am sure the honourable member for Burgeo, La Poile has much to say. I am terribly interested in what he has to say but there is so much rumpus coming from the other side there that I cannot hear the man. I cannot hear the member. I would appreciate it if Your Honour would rule that we get silence on the other side so we can hear the honourable member from Burgeo, La Poile.

MR. SIMMONS: To that point of order. I can understand that the member for St. Georges cannot see around too far to his left and he probably did not notice that the member for Bonavista South is really inciting us to riot over here. If you should ask him to keep quiet, we shall keep quiet as well.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I am sure that all honourable members are aware that when a person is speaking he does have the right to be heard in silence. I would ask all honourable members to please adhere to that rule.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, as I said in the beginning, I am going to be very brief. I think that I have covered the main point that I wished to make.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. EVANS: The main point? Oh, I know that the density that I have to encounter there is a bit too great to be encountered by any ordinary man because it would need a cold chisel, hammer to loosen up the concrete a bit, and then one might get it through there.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Do we have an interpreter in the House?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. EVANS: Interpreter? I was wondering what country the honourable member came from.

MR. NEARY: Slow down! Slow down!

MR. EVANS: What country did the honourable member come from originally?

Mr. Speaker, as I said, the main point that I considered had to be made here is the fact that the opposition through a willful waste of time and not using the opportunity that they have had to debate the estimates that were presented in the budget - no doubt their intention was, seeing they did not know enough about the estimates to be able to debate them properly, they just concentrated on a couple or three departments and they figured that they would get the public of this province to blame the government for the lack of debate. The public of this province are not green enough to buy that. They know that they had lots of time and will not be green enough in my estimation -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: "Green enough," he says.

MR. EVANS: No nor naive enough if one wish to term it that way. But they certainly will not be green enough to elect that party over there to office in the next election whenever it comes. Even with the new, brilliant leader they have, I will see him probably sitting alone after the next election. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to be long but just to review some of the points raised during the afternoon and evening by the two education critics of the opposition. I must say that I am somewhat flattered in that whereas last year there was one education critic, this year there are two. Perhaps next year - I do not know - there might be three.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: One and a-half.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Well, that is unkind. The Minister of Industrial Development is unkind. Which one was the half? However, I must say I was somewhat flattered in that they have doubled their ranks and that there are now two education critics, the honourable member for Hermitage and the honourable member for St. Barbe North.

To briefly review some of the points made there:

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted, as a point of clarification arising from his various remarks. We had a very serious

caucus, Mr. Speaker, to decide that I am so versatile that I have been assigned to various departments from now on. So, that might clear up the point for the honourable Minister of Education.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Right! Well, Mr. Speaker, I am certainly glad to hear that because obviously versatility is a great attribute in all walks of life and certainly is for honourable gentlemen opposite. It was certainly surprising but flattering that there were two versatile education critics.

On some of the matters, as I say, I do not intend to be long but to review some of the matters. One, with respect to grants to school boards. The amount voted in that area has gone up from \$11.7 million last year to \$14.7 million this year, an increase of twenty-six per cent.

Now, I would be, as Minister of Education, extremely disappointed, very nervous about the future of education in this province if after this budget or any budget in education the federation of school boards were ever to say, "That is enough." If they ever said, 'That is enough', we would say to ourselves and I would certainly say to myself, What is wrong with the federation of school boards? They are complacent. They are not fighting for more. They are not after every dollar they can get for education, because that is their mandate, that is their total responsibility." I do not expect to see the day and indeed I hope I will never see the day when any budget will ever come in for education and the federation of school boards will say, 'That is enough.' I would be very upset and very worried, as we all should be, if ever a president of a federation of school boards said, 'That is enough!'" Because that is not his job, that is not his responsibility.

His responsibility is to say, "That is not enough. If instead of \$14.7 million that were \$15.7 million, I expect he would still say it was not enough. If it were \$16.7 million it would not be enough, nor from his point of view or from the federation's point of view should it be enough, because that is their job, that is their responsibility.

From the education critics, the opposition, I suppose one would be surprised as well if they did not say, "That is not enough!" One would

be surprised as well because obviously it is a great temptation to the opposition, in any field of expenditure, grants to school boards, water and sewerage, roads, fisheries loans, agricultural development, forestry development, whatever it is to say, "We need much more." So that is an inevitable fact of political life. That is the way most oppositions work. That is part of the political facts of life.

There are also the economic and governmental fact of life and the responsibility of government to govern with a sense of financial responsibility. Twenty-six per cent of an increase in grants to school boards is a significant and worth-while and indeed rather dramatic increase and the government is very pleased that it was able to give that amount of increase.

In capital construction, both honourable critics also mentioned the capital construction grant. Let us look and see exactly what is voted. \$10 million under the regular capital construction grants; \$2 million as a step to equalize proportionately the funds available for school construction to the various denominational school boards. That is \$12,000. And thirteen point something million for DREE. Now that \$13 million for DREE is half federal and half provincial.
AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: A quorum call.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. DUNPHY): Would the clerk count the House, please.

We do have a quorum.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I thought we did. They were always superfluous - I was going to say there were some superfluous members but I had better rephrase that.

On grants for capital construction: The total amount voted is \$25 million. That is broken down as follows: \$10 million, the regular capital grants; \$2 million, equalization on a proportional basis because of DREE expenditures. That is \$12 million. Then \$13 million for DREE. That is a total of \$25 million. Of that \$13 million, half is provincial. So, the total education construction vote is twenty-five point something million of which \$18 million is provincial money. Half the money voted under the DREE heading is provincial money. That is the amount the honourable gentleman said that the

education authority said was required this year. The amount that is actually there, and what they said was \$18 million was necessary for school construction \$18 million in toto they meant. They were not breaking it down. They did not particularly care if it were federal or provincial or what it was. The \$18 million was necessary for school construction this year.

In fact there is \$25 million for school construction this year of which \$18 million is provincial funds. Mr. Speaker, I think the government in its budgeting both in grants to school boards and in capital construction has made very significant gains.

Now, both honourable critics also referred to the bus transportation programme of the government whereby there will be a cost-split of ninety-five per cent - five per cent. Ninety-five per cent of the cost for school transportation paid by the provincial government and five per cent by the school boards. I think the honourable member for St. Barbe South had said that it was an improvement over last year.

Actually under the programme last year roughly half the school boards lost money. Roughly half the school boards, in fact, made money on this particular programme. They did not make money in their overall budget. There is no school board in the province - they have all deficit financing. I do not think there is any municipality in the province not deficit financing. I do not think there is any province in Canada not deficit financing. On the particular aspect of school bus transportation, roughly half were losing and roughly half were gaining.

While one can well understand the people will say that we should pay 100 per cent - that is understandable - there is no doubt that ninety-five is a vast improvement over the previous system. Indeed even the executive secretary of the Newfoundland Federation of School Boards himself stated that it was fair and equitable but he said obviously that the whole amount of the pie was not enough. As I say that is to be expected. I do not expect ever to live to see the day when the federation or anybody - I am not being facetious there but I do not expect ever to see the day when such a person would say that

school boards have enough. I think it would be most unfortunate probably if they did. So, that is on school bus transportation.

Now, the grant-in-aid to Memorial University, this year, \$23.7 million. That is based, as honourable members know, on an amount per student under a full time student equivalency formula. Really what it is is that one projects the number of students that are expected to be there and comes up with an amount per student and makes the multiplication. It is based upon an allocation or a cost of \$2,563 per student. That is the way this government and indeed the previous administration has made the budgetary allocation for the current account vote for the university.

A matter has come up as to whether the budget of the university should be tabled in this House. Of course to a certain extent it is academic right now, because obviously we did not do the estimates of that department. There are two points of view there. That is something which bears very serious thought.

The theory which has been gone on up to now by the previous administration and by this administration is that the principle of accountability is observed in that the government is accountable to the people. The government puts forward the amount to be voted on current expenses for the university. The government justifies that in its confidence, as I say, in the administration and its confidence in the Board of Regents, appointed and partially elected by convocation, who are there with a mandate to protect and ensure the public interest. That is the theory, a justification, if they wish, of the way in which this matter has been handled both by the previous administration and by this administration to date.

That is a matter of which I am the first to admit is something that must be kept under review.

On the matter of DREE schools: Until there is a renegotiation or an opportunity for an amendment, there is not an opportunity for an amendment to the general agreement until a year after it is signed - I think it was in January. It was either December or January. The general agreement as it is now signed makes no provision for DREE schools. It makes no provision. In a sense that is academic at least until the opportunity comes for any amendments thereto.

On the teacher allocation programme: Certainly there has been a lot said on that; I do not intend to say a great deal more. One can say that it is not enough, that it should be more, that the ratio should be lower, that there should be more teachers, etc. There is no doubt that one can say that. The fact is however that in the first year of its implementation there will be 300 additional teachers. Next September, there will be 300 additional teachers because of this new programme, costing \$1.4 million. The September after there will 200 more and the following September there will be 364 additional. The additional expenditures for 1974-1975, because of that teacher allocation programme, are \$1.4 million. In 1975-1976 they will be \$3.3 million. In 1976-1977 they will be \$5.6 million. There is an extremely large amount of money involved. One can say that there should be more teachers, the ratio should be lower, the allocation should be greater, etc. One can well say that but obviously this government or any government can only do or can only spend what money is available.

Finally, I would just like to point out that in the consideration of the budget in general. (All honourable members have to bear this in mind) if we were to accept even half of the suggestions of the opposition, there would be at least \$50 million more necessary to be spent. Maybe in Education there would be at least an extra \$15 million or \$20 million. In Highways maybe there

would be an extra \$10 million. For water and sewerage maybe there would be an extra \$10 million. Fisheries, Agriculture, all of these, perhaps there would be at least \$15 million more spent. What do we find? We find that the opposition suggest that we have \$23 million less in the pie. Spend \$50 million more and have \$23 million less. They say that we should not increase the S.S.A. tax by one per cent. That brings in \$10 million. We should not have that. We should not increase the income tax. That will bring in \$4 million. That is \$14 million. We should not apply the \$9 million made available under equalization through the export tax for petroleum. We should not make that available to general revenue but only to subsidized petroleum products. That is \$23 million less we would have in revenue but yet we would spend \$50 million more. There is an additional deficit of \$73 million. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that is not financially sound nor responsible and that one cannot spend \$50 million more and have \$23 million less. There is no way that that can be done.

Mr. Speaker, I believe, in education and in government's programme in general, that money has been allocated in a reasonable manner in order to assure the continuation and development of the essential services of this province. No government ever will or will expect to fulfill all of the expectations. What is important is that we identify the real important needs and make sure that public resources are used in those areas. That I think we have done reasonably well.

On motion that the House go into Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

On motion that the Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Dumphy): The Committee of Ways and Means have directed me to report that they have considered the matters to them referred and report having made some progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received and adopted.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I have a message from His Honour, the Lieutenant Governor.

MR SPEAKER: This is addressed to the Hon. Minister of Finance.

"I, the Lieutenant Governor of the Province of Newfoundland, transmit estimates of sums required for the public services of the province for the year ending 31st day of March, 1975 by way of further supply and in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Act of 1867, as amended, I recommend these estimates to the House of Assembly." This is signed by His Honour, the Lieutenant Governor.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I move that the message received from His Honour the Lieutenant Governor, together with the amended estimates, be referred to the Committee of Supply and that Your Honour do now leave the Chair for the House to resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

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

On motion that the committee rise, report progress and ask that the resolution be reported to Committee of Ways and Means, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Dunphy): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred and report having passed estimates of Supply totalling \$542,576,400 in addition to the initial sum of \$103,450,000, authorized for like purposes by the previous Supply Act, and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received and adopted.

On motion that the House go into Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Resolution: That it is expedient to introduce a measure to provide for the granting to Her Majesty for defraying certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending 31st. day of March, 1975, the sum of \$542,576,400 in addition to the initial

sum of \$103,450,000 authorized for like purposes by the Supply Act, No. 1, 1974.

On motion resolution carried.

SCHEDULE:

On motion following heads of expenditure, carried.

I.	Consolidated Fund Services	200,000
II.	Legislative	1,189,100
III.	Executive Council	1,705,100
IV.	Finance	6,520,300
V.	Manpower and Industrial Relations	1,492,300
VI.	Education	149,568,400
VII.	Justice	12,021,900
VIII.	Social Services	43,796,700
IX.	Rehabilitation and Recreation	18,261,900
X.	Health	98,826,400
XI.	Mines and Energy	20,253,800
XII.	Forestry and Agriculture	22,378,300
XIII.	Tourism	8,888,300
XIV.	Fisheries	13,329,500
XV.	Industrial Development	2,249,800
XVI.	Rural Development	3,191,800
XVII.	Transportation and Communications	65,991,300
XVIII.	Public Works and Services	37,230,300
XIX.	Municipal Affairs and Housing	34,387,600
XX.	Provincial Affairs and Environment	1,093,600

On motion that the committee rise, report having passed a resolution for the granting of Supply to Her Majesty and that a bill be introduced to give effect to the same.

Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. DUNPHY: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Ways and means have considered the matters to them referred and direct me to report having passed the resolution for the granting of supply to Her Majesty and recommend that a bill be introduced to give effect to the same.

On motion report received and adopted.

On motion Resolution read a first and second time.

On motion, a bill, "An Act for Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for Defraying Certain Expenses of the Public Services For the Financial Year Ending the Thirtieth Day of March, One Thousand Nine Hundred and Seventy-Five And For Other Purposes Relating To The Public Services," read a first time, ordered read a second time now, by leave.

On motion bill read a second time, ordered read a third time now, by leave.

On motion bill read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

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

MR. NEARY: I would like to point out to the House, Sir, that in the interest of seeing that the business of the province is conducted as quickly as possible that we are going to agree with it and we are granting leave but I want to point out, Sir, that we have been denied this privilege on this side of the House every time we have asked for it, Sir. But we are not going to be nasty, Sir, we are not going to try to delay the proceedings of the House, we are going to agree by leave to have this matter dealt with immediately.

On motion, a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Retail Sales Tax Act, 1972," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave.

On motion, a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Local Authority Guarantee Act, 1957," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave.

On motion, a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Loan And Guarantee Act, 1957," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Authorize The Raising Of Money By Way Of Loan By The Province," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave.

On motion that the House go into Committee of the Whole to consider Order numbers 41, 42, 43, 45 and 46, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

"An Act Further To Amend The Income Tax Act," On motion clauses 1 to 5, carried. Motion that the committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

"An Act Further To Amend The Retail Sales Tax Act, 1972." On motion clauses 1 to 10, carried. Motion that the committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

"An Act Further To Amend The Local Authority Guarantee Act, 1957." On motion clauses 1 to 2, carried. Motion that the committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

"An Act Further To Amend The Loan And Guarantee Act, 1957." On motion clauses 1 to 2 carried. Motion that the committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

"An Act To Authorize The Raising Of Money By Way Of Loan By The Province." On motion clause 1, carried.

MR. HICKMAN: Clause 2, Mr. Chairman, subclause (1), the second last line, it reads "renewal or refund," that should be "renewal or refunding," I move it be amended by adding the letters "ing."

On motion clause 2 as amended, carried.

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

On motion that the committee rise and report having passed Bills Nos. 51, 52, 53 and 73 without amendment and Bill No. 75 with some amendment, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. DUNPHY: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the

matters to them referred and have directed me to report having passed Bills No. 51, 52, 53 and 73 without amendment.

On motion report received and adopted.

On motion bills ordered read a third time presently, by leave.

On motion, a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Income Tax Act," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper,

On motion, a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Retail Sales Tax Act, 1972," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

On motion, a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Local Authority Guarantee Act, 1957," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

On motion, a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Loan And Guarantee Act, 1957," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Authorize The Raising Of Money By Way Of Loan By The Province," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

MR. DUNPHY: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report having passed Bill No. 75 with some amendment.

On motion report received and adopted.

On motion amendment read a first and second time.

On motion Bill No. 75 ordered read a third time presently, by leave.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Authorize The Raising Of Money By Way Of Loan By The Province," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

Motion second reading of a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Schools Act."

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Education.

HON. G. OTTENHEIMER, Minister of Education: Mr. Speaker, this bill No. 29, while dealing with fairly complex issues, is not I think a

controversial bill in itself. Actually, as honourable members know, just about all legislation brought in by the Department of Education is done so after consultation with and usually on the advice and with the consent of the general advisory committee which is a statutory body composed of the denominational authorities, the federation of school boards, the Newfoundland Teachers' Association, the University and the Department of Education. This bill is essentially required for two reasons; number one, because of the Collective Bargaining Act. Certain amendments are necessary so that The Schools Act is in conformity with a collective bargaining agreement and the act authorizing it. Other reasons are for legislative tidying up. I can assure honourable members that all of the matters covered in this bill are brought forward with the agreement and concurrence of the General Advisory Committee and those bodies that it represents, which are all the bodies immediately involved in education that I outlined before.

So as I say, I will repeat it, it is basically necessary for two reasons; because of the collective bargaining agreement, a number of matters which were covered by statute need no longer and therefore should no longer be so covered and also certain matters of administrative efficiency, and all of it brought forward with the agreement of the General Advisory Council.

What it does essentially is this; it broadens the definition of a private school to include nursery and other pre-kindergarten groups. It also covers a situation with respect to membership on school boards. They now hold office for four year periods and it is a legal technicality that if a person should die or should resign and for a replacement, the period of time for which the replacement would serve. It would not be for four years from his appointment but for the balance of the four year period.

It also makes provision for contingencies, for example meetings of school boards, if there should be no quorum or in the unlikely but always possible event that a board should be dissolved, or that a board would have jurisdiction of a geographical area outside of the delineation of the board and provides that an executive committee, through its executive secretary,

would exercise the powers of the board until that situation is rectified and if there were no such committee, that the Minister of Education would so do.

It stipulates that school boards are now obliged to carry insurance, both fire and liability. Before they were not obliged, it was optional. It also takes out a number of restrictive measures that were formerly in the act which are no longer necessary because they are no longer governed by statute but governed by collective agreement which governs working conditions.

Another matter, whereby previously boards which used text materials, different from those authorized by the department, could use these different texts upon the permission of the minister. It was necessary to apply a year before. This I think was an unnecessarily long time and this gets rid of that necessity for applying for permission a year before.

I should say that this permission is almost invariably granted because indeed we wish to encourage diversification. I could point out as well that such text or materials benefit from the same subsidies, that is from kindergarten up to grade six they would be free.

Another change is whereby previously it was stated that school boards may offer educational services to children who were six years old on or before December 31 of the school year, now the wording is they shall.

These I think are essentially the matters. Until this amendment goes through; certain conditions regarding the employment of teachers were covered by statute and now these are covered by the collective agreement so that becomes unnecessary. Those are the basic matters covered. As I say most of it or much of it is brought in in order to put the statute in conformity with the collective agreement and the rest, tidying up or clarification or administrative efficiency; the whole thing brought in with the concurrence of the denominational groups, the school boards, the NTA and the other bodies who have membership on the General Advisory Council.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for St. Barbe North.

MR. F. B. ROWE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is too much in this particular bill that we on this side of the House can criticize particularly in view of the fact that the advisory committee to the minister made these recommendations strongly. There are a number of questions that I had jotted down some months ago that I was going to ask him but I cannot pick out my writing on it now. Probably I could ask the minister these questions now and he could answer them and we could go through them, item by item, the clause by clause aspect of it fairly quickly.

With respect to Clause (3) Respecting that every school board shall hold office for a period of four years, you know, from the date of their appointment, could the minister just indicate what percentage of these members are elected now?

Clause (7)(b): This was a kind of controversial clause in the original bill, this business of having to wait for a year. I still take it that we have to go through the formality of getting the approval of the minister of course on this type of thing, which I think should be left in for certain obvious reasons.

Clause (10)(a): " Subject to Section (83) a school board shall not refuse to any child admission to any school under its control unless the child can be accommodated in (a) a school appropriate to his own religious faith, if any, reasonably available to him, or another school more reasonably available to him than the school under its control." I think that may just be still a little bit retrogressive in terms of making our schools a little bit more nondenominational. I do not know whether that goes quite far enough, but that is the only comment I have on that.

Clause(15)(3) is certainly reasonable and should ensure equal standards throughout.

So that is really about all, Mr. Speaker, that I can think about on this particular bill. If the minister can remember a couple of questions that I did ask him, I should appreciate an answer to them but in view of the fact that the advisory committee, the minister has

agreed with it totally, I cannot see too many more objections to it myself.

MR. SPEAKER: If the honourable minister should speak now, he shall close the debate.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, the first question, the percentage elected on school boards is mandatory now, that twenty-five per cent be elected. Am I right or do I have the percentage wrong?

AN HON. MEMBER: A third.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: A third, right. A third is it? Yes, my mistake. Right! Thirty-three per cent, right! Be elected! This of course is operative, well as of fairly recently, when the elections were held. Now in some areas there were no contestants or there was one candidate but nobody opposed him. So in a sense he is still elected because he was elected by acclamation just as if a member be nominated for a political party and nobody else runs, he would be elected but elected by acclamation without opposition, without anybody opposing him. So thirty-three per cent by law have to be elected. And the percentage of course of people voting in various areas varied and we do not have yet an overall picture because we do not have the reports from the various school boards. I do not know what it would be across the province; in some areas twenty and twenty-five per cent and in some areas considerably less.

With respect to Clause (7)(b) I think the honourable gentleman was in agreement there. Certainly the year is a long period and I think most people now will agree that it should be required to seek approval. There may be something very, very wrong if that approval were very frequently denied. Indeed, to the best of my knowledge it is, if ever, very rarely denied, I am not aware, the year and a-half I have been there, of it ever having been denied.

The matter of the building standards, of course that brings into legislation specific kind of building standard obligation.

Now Clause (10)(a), I had better read it out. That is fairly involved. "A school board shall not refuse to any child admission to any school under its control unless the child can be accommodated in a

like school appropriate to his own religious faith, if any, reasonably available to him or another school more reasonably available to him than the school under its control. If there is any dispute, the minister shall determine and his decision shall be final.

Actually this is a legal reference or incorporation of the denominational system that we have. I personally have never, again I can only speak for the year and a-half that I have been Minister of Education yes, only in one case, I was wrong, only in one instance has it ever been brought to my attention where a person was refused admission to a school because he was of a faith different from that school. In that instance, it was a case of misunderstanding. It was a case of a family staying in their summer home a month longer and applying for a school in the area where they have their summer home and the principal said no; that he should go where they are going to live. It was only about twenty miles difference, just outside of St. John's - but the child should go to school where they are going to live all year long. The parent thought at the time that the child was being refused admission because of denominational grounds, and that was not the case at all. The case was that the principal felt it was not in the child's interest to be going for a month in one school and then for the rest of the year back in St. John's. This is a summer home just ten or fifteen miles outside of St. John's. So that was a case of misunderstanding on the parents part and a misunderstanding of the principal's reason for not admitting the child, and perhaps a fault on the principal's part of not clarifying the reason that he would not accept the child. It was not on a denominational matter. So I say this is a legal reference to the denominational system. In actual fact, in reality it has never come to my attention nor has there ever been a reference to me to intervene on this matter because here it says; 'Where there is a dispute with respect to this, then the minister shall after an investigation determine the matter.' I have never been required to determine the

matter. The only time when any reference was made to me was the one I referred to and that was essentially on a matter of misunderstanding.

MR. F. B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, before the minister sits down and closes debate on it, would he permit a question?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes, Sir.

MR. F. B. ROWE: There was certainly a tremendous lack of interest in the recent school board elections. Has the minister made any attempt to ascertain the cause for this? Or if there is some mechanism whereby there can be a little more interest created? Was it lack of interest or just lack of knowledge of the fact that these school board elections were going on and the procedures that were to be used or what? I mean I was quite astounded myself when I heard how many of these school boards just did not have any people seeking election, for a small amount of twenty-five per cent of the total board. Has the minister's personnel attempted to find out the reason for this, and if anything can be done to rectify the situation?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we in the department have discussed it with a number of school board chairmen and superintendents, people involved with it in general. I suppose the consensus is or what it would appear to be that it is most unfortunate that more people did not partake because there are a large number of people, you know, whom make known their views and quite rightly so on education and, you know, criticize various things, which obviously is their privilege, and make various suggestions - and here is an opportunity to get in a position to make decisions, not just to talk about it but to put your money where your mouth is so to speak, and a very small percentage did.

I suppose a certain apathy is really the only answer. Well it is certainly an important factor in many areas. Of course, you know, people are reluctant and of course there is no pay involved, absolutely no pay. It is a responsibility that one assumes. I suppose there is a certain amount of apathy, I think, as well, I think before the next elections come that the regulations, you know there were regulations drawn up for this school board election, resembling almost a provincial election,

of voting cards and if people were not on a voting list being sworn in and of going to polls, you know, a very legalistic approach as it were and the same kind of procedure to block people from voting twice and all of that stuff.

I think, myself, in future, and I am open to correction on this, from school board members and from officials in the department as they make a sufficient study of it, but I am inclined to think it is hardly necessary to go through all of this election machinery. I am inclined to think that if only twenty-five per cent are going to vote once, you do not have to worry very much about people voting twice. That a person on his honour, you know, would just be announced. Citizens for whose children, or for whose children if they had any, educational services would be provided by such and such a board, will vote in such and such a place and people will go and, on their honour, give their name and vote and, on their honour, attest that they have not voted previously. I do not think actually that all of that legal machinery is necessary, and that it could be, on that, if that were not necessary it could be that the people would be more spontaneous. These are the only reasons that I can put forward. I really do not think that all of that time and expense checking off who is voting and mailing out voting cards, I do not think that is necessary. I think that people when the time comes, you know at such and such a time, at such and such a place, as to where you vote all you do is come and on your honour give your name and say that this is the school board membership for which you are entitled to vote. I certainly do not see that there is any benefit at all in people, you know, checking or voting more than once.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, before the minister sits down could he just indicate what was the change in Section (8), what change is involved there, the age of children coming into school?

MR OTTENHEIMER: Section (8). Yes. Allow me to look up the previous bill, Section (61) of the previous bill. Oh, yes, right. This is

something of a technicality as well. The former Section (61) had the same substance as this one but a sub-paragraph which said, "This section shall come into force on a day to be proclaimed by the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council." It is just a deletion of that section which is the substance of this.

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

Motion, second reading of a bill, 'An Act Further To Amend The Education (Teaching Training) Act':

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Education.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, for some weeks I prepared notes on this, I want to make sure that I can make them out. Actually these amendments are necessary or follow logically from the amendments that we just voted.

Section (77) of the Schools Act was repealed. It deals with the employment and duties of teachers. It is replaced by the collective agreement, so similar provisions here should no longer be operative.

There is a paragraph which dealt with the suspension of teaching certificates or licences for reasons of breach of contract, and these procedures are now covered in the Teacher Training Act. Actually these amendments, as I think the explanatory notes say, follows upon both the collective agreement and the changes formerly made in the Schools Act. It is pretty much of a technical and inevitable change.

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

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act Respecting The Appointment and Powers Of the Newfoundland Geographical Names Board":

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister Without Portfolio.

MR. W. W. MARSHALL (MINISTER WITHOUT PORTFOLIO): Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple bill, lengthy but simple just the same. The Hon. Minister for Provincial Affairs, who is not here tonight, normally would be introducing it. But this is a bill to replace or repeal the Nomenclature Board Act and to substitute herewith the Geographical Names Board Act in place of the Nomenclature Board Act. The proposed legislation

is designed to meet the requirements of the Canadian Permanent Committee on geographical names. The provisions are here. They are very much similar to that set forth in the Nomenclature Board Act. Also really it is to stage a uniform legislation, adopts it towards the general principles throughout Canada, of boards of this nature, and I have much pleasure in moving second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for White Bay South.

MR. W. N. ROWE: We are in complete agreement with it, Sir. I have a point that I would like to raise which is vaguely related to the whole idea of nomenclature and names of communities throughout the province. I notice that the Department of Transportation's maps keep dropping names off that map from around the province. If, for example, a community has resettled, a Community like Pushtrough, for example, or Muddy Hole or some similar community on the South Coast, I notice that the Department of Highways from its maps drops those names. They do it because I suppose some civil servant or some public servant says that no people live down there any more or there is no road there any more that is maintained and this sort of thing, therefore we will drop it. But, Sir, I think from a point of view of history, since these road maps are so widespread and used for tourism purposes and this sort of thing, I think it would be a shame if these names which have great historic validity in worth and merit, if these names were allowed to go out of the public memory, and that perhaps (The Minister of Transportation is not here now.) although the names will always be preserved in some documents or other, in charts and this sort of thing, I think that on a map that is used generally by the people of Newfoundland and tourists coming into the province that there is no reason why that these names should be deleted. Perhaps the Minister of Justice might make a note of it and recommend to his colleague, the minister, that on the next issue of road maps in Newfoundland that all these names be put back in again. There could be some sort of a symbol to say they are no longer inhabited.

AN HON. MEMBER: A different colour.

May 16, 1974

Tape 1665 (Night)

PK - 8

MR. W. N. ROWE: Or a different colour or something like that. "No longer inhabited," but it would be a shame if these went out of the general public memory, because they have great

historic worth. I do hope that the minister - perhaps the minister might give an assurance now that he will take it up with his colleague and make sure that in the next issue of the road map of Newfoundland that all these names will be reinstated on the map.

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

MR. MARSHALL: I concur wholeheartedly with the honourable member, Mr. Speaker. It is certainly a very valid suggestion which will be passed on to the minister concerned. Also it is a matter of some regret to the government that through, as he says, the civil servants in the centralization of Canada and through the Canada post office, I believe a lot of the old names have been lost or changed purely and simply to comply with the computers up in Ottawa or what have you.

Certainly it is a suggestion, a meritorious suggestion, which will be brought to the attention of the Minister of Transportation and Communication and indeed of any minister in the government charged with that responsibility.

On motion a bill, 'An Act Respecting The Appointment And Powers Of The Newfoundland Geographical Names Board,' read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Motion second reading of a bill, 'An Act Further To Amend The Social Assistance Act, 1971:'

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, this bill will essentially accomplish two matters. It will amend the act and specifically confer right of appeal to the supreme court. After the decision of the appeal board, welfare clients further, if it be agreed, have the right of appeal to the supreme court. It will also delete from the act the word "Persistently". This is with respect to improper practices. The object of this is that if any action is taken that it not necessarily need to be taken under the criminal code which is not the intention but under the Social Assistance Act. Those are the two essential provisions of this amendment, the right of appeal specifically affirmed to the supreme court and also to facilitate any action if indeed it is to be taken, that it may be taken under terms

of the Social Assistance Act.

MR. F. ROWE: Is this bill number 15, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. F. ROWE: This amendment, Mr. Speaker, is good from the point of view of the protection of the school board. I think it is -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: No, no.

MR. F. ROWE: It is not the right bill? Oh! Bill number 15.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: That is all right. Well, speak on that one.

MR. F. ROWE: No, I will speak on that one later, Mr. Speaker.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I do not have bill number 15 here so I cannot speak on it.

On motion a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Social Assistance Act, 1971, read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House tomorrow.

Motion second reading of a bill, "An Act Respecting Fraudulent Conveyances:"

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple, straightforward bill. We found that we are one of the few provinces in Canada where there is no legislation dealing with fraudulent conveyances other than that provided under the Bankruptcy Act. There is no recourse against any individual who would transfer title to property after an action has been commenced and no protection against anyone defrauding as a result thereof. This bill simply provides under clause (3) that any conveyance of real property or personal property or bond, suit or judgement made for the purpose of defrauding creditors, shall be void.

There is a saving clause properly in the bill which says that this does not apply to a person buying for valuable consideration, bona fide, a purchaser for value who has no knowledge of the fraudulent transaction.

MR. W. ROWE: It certainly seems to be a very salutary addition to our civil law, Mr. Speaker. Maybe the minister can let us know - was this causing a great deal of trouble? Some of the other lawyers

might have some comment on it as well.

How did so many years go by without this amendment having been made? Everybody proceeded under the Bankruptcy Act, did they? And did not bother with this? When the minister gets up he might tell us what addition this makes to the body of law as far as fraudulent conveyances generally are concerned. What additions? What added protections were not available under various other acts or various other pieces of legislation we might have in the law today?

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a very brief word on this. I think this is a good piece of legislation. I think it is necessary. Under some of the other acts that the member for White Bay South spoke off, there may be redress but it would be a round-about, cumbersome thing. The other problem would be the third party, the person who purchased. Well, this bill goes right to the root of it, that a conveyance made to avoid creditors be set aside.

The usual thing that occurs to me when a man gets in financial trouble or business trouble and he knows that there are going to be judgements against him, very often he tries to convey off his property to his wife or his friends or whoever and can escape in that way. The bankruptcy procedure, as far as I can see, is very cumbersome anyway.

One other point on the general principle of this that I would like to mention is something that I feel ought to be done. I raise this for the minister's consideration. Something ought to be done with section (5) of the Conveyancing Act also because under the Conveyancing Act a mortgagee can sell without notice, without anything. I think there have been cases of abuse in this country, sometimes where solicitors have used it too freely on behalf of clients and sometimes where other persons have used this conveyance under section (5) of the Conveyance Act.

Now, I think to go hand in glove with this and to fix a considerable loophole in the law, especially as things are getting

more complex in this province, I would suggest to the minister that he consider an amendment to section (5) of the Conveyance Act making it more difficult for a mortgagee to sell and requiring a certain period of notice and requiring one or two of the things which appear in the foreclosure procedure to give the mortgagor a chance to raise the money, a chance to know what is going on and a chance to do something about it before sale takes place. So, I raise that for the consideration of the minister.

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

MR. HICKMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, referring to the comments by the honourable the member for St. John's South, I agree that that is a body of law that needs reform. The Conveyance Act itself, I hope will be the subject matter of some fairly close study, not just on the power of sale given to a mortgagee but I believe there should be some protection, say for second mortgagees under the act, so that the first mortgagee has to give notice, give the second mortgagee the right to redeem; that there has to be an obligation imposed on a mortgagee that if he sells under the power of sale that he is accountable to the mortgagor, not only for the surplus of any raise but accountable to the mortgagor to show that he took proper steps and prudently sold the property, because there have been cases where I suspect the mortgagee was not too concerned over the rights of anyone other than his own.

Some solicitors will argue that the foreclosure proceedings are too cumbersome, that the six month period between the order and the time when I sign the order, actually, it is too long. But again one does need a fair amount of time to enable the adequate and necessary accounting to be taken by the registrar and also to give a second mortgagee the right to come in and protect his interests or the mortgagor the right to redeem. I have never been very happy as a practicing lawyer with that provision. I think it is peculiar to Newfoundland. So, I thank the honourable gentleman for drawing this to my attention.

The reason for this act: I had some representation from the Legislation Committee of the Law Society, going back to 1972, and also from the Canadian Bankers' Association. In a sense it compliments the Bankruptcy Act because as honourable gentlemen are aware if the two acts are in conflict then the Bankruptcy Act prevails under the provisions of the British North American Act.

On motion a bill, "An Act Respecting Fraudulent Conveyances," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Motion second reading of a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Conditional Sales Act:

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, this is a bill transferring the jurisdiction with respect to conditional sales from the jurisdiction of the Minister of Justice, Department of Justice, to the Department of Provincial Affairs and Environment, in whose name this bill stands. It will require a lump sum payment or can require a lump sum payment from a professional searcher. It also provides that the fees payable under the bill be prescribed by regulation. This has been recommended in order to be able, so that the act be able to be administered more efficiently. It is really, just merely I think in the nature of housekeeping legislation.

On motion a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Conditional Sales Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Motion second reading of a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Bills Of Sale Act:"

MR. MARSHALL: The remarks pertaining to the Conditional Sales Act pertain exactly to this Bills of Sale Act and is exactly the same. We are transferring jurisdiction to the Department of Justice and making the other provisions similar to the one that was just passed.

On motion a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Bills of Sale Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Motion second reading of a bill, 'An Act To Amend The Community

Councils Act, 1972:

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, this bill has just some relatively minor amendments to the Community Council Act. The explanatory note I think is quite clear. It is to enable the imposition of a tax of two cents a gallon on propane gas. The emphasis there is on a gallon because the previous act stated only by the pound. Propane is now sold quite frequently by the gallon. This is just to allow it to be sold by either the gallon or the pound and the tax collected in that way.

Also a section deals with animals other than dogs in the community, allows the community council to deal with these. Dogs of course are covered under a separate dog act but this pertains to all other animals, to prevent them from running loose and so on without control in communities.

The third provision is that fines be forwarded direct to the community council. Previous to this the fines were sent to the Department of Justice. It was just a simple matter of delay where they had to go to the Department of Justice and then were eventually transferred to the community council concerned. To speed things up, it is suggested in this bill that they go direct to the council concerned. These are the amendments to the act. I have pleasure in moving their adoption.

MR. F. ROWE: I assume that the imposition of the two cents a gallon on propane gas is equivalent to the amount that it would be on gas or oil or anything like that.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: I am just saying the amount of the tax on propane gas would be equivalent to the tax on any other type of fuel or anything else.

On motion a bill, "An Act To Amend The Community Councils Act, 1972," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Motion second reading of a bill, "An Act Respecting The Newfoundland Teachers' Association."

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, this bill is brought in at the request

of and after consultation with the Newfoundland Teachers' Association. It essentially updates that legislation. Some of the changes are required after the passing of the Teachers' Collective Bargaining Act because certain provisions formerly covered in the Newfoundland Teachers' Association Act are now covered in the collective bargaining.

As a matter of fact, one article in the collective agreement requires government to introduce amendments to existing legislation to accommodate those changes brought about by collective agreement. This is actually brought in consequent to the collective agreement.

One section, (4) (b) (3), is a redefinition of the objectives of the association and enables it to participate in collective bargaining. Another change is that up to now there was a provision in the act for a teacher to write out of the association and to be exempted from paying fees by giving notice to the minister. Under the collective agreement all teachers in the bargaining unit are required to pay an amount equal to the association's fee. In other words, if they write out, they still have to pay. It would certainly appear no longer necessary that writing out, that that be communicated to the minister. There is no particular reason for that. So that requirement is dropped and anybody who writes out, all they would need to do would be to notify the association.

I do not know if any do write out. I do not imagine that there are any. If so, the number must be pretty infinitesimal.

There is also an amendment which enables administrative officers of the NTA, people on their staff, to participate in the teachers' pension plan, if they were teachers any time prior to their entering the employ of the association. Previously or until these changes are made, that employee had to be a teacher immediately before becoming an employee of the NTA.

The other matters I think are purely internal administrative, introduced at the request of the NTA. A provision, for example, for the inclusion of all members of the executive as voting members at annual, general meetings and also a new designation of the officers of the association which was previously covered in the association's bylaws

May 16, 1974

Tape 1666

IB-8

and now their request will be covered by this bill. Those essentially are the provisions in the bill.

MR. W. ROWE: I am not going to go into the details of the bill, Sir,

6424

we are missing out on a very valuable procedure in this House. This bill is essentially a private bill. There may be some matters in this which are public in nature and therefore should be supported by the government and this sort of thing.

There is a provision in our Standing Orders whereby private bills (This may not be one of them) where things like various professional association bills and hairdressers' bills and this sort of thing can be brought into the House and referred to a committee and then public hearings held on private bills and some public discussion can take place on them. I think, Sir, I would commend this to the House Leader (I notice that the note says, very explanatory note.) that on bills such as this, this bill would repeal the Newfoundland Teachers' Association Act and replace it with an up-to-date act in keeping with the present wishes of the members of the association concerned. It is very explanatory.

Here we are, Sir, rubber stamping here, the Legislature, something which is essentially private, private in that it is an association whose members want certain things done and have the force of legislation, an act passed. Why does not the House Leader every now and then in keeping with his much heralded intention earlier of sending things to committees in this House, whenever bills of this nature come in, which are essentially private, have them brought in by somebody as a private bill, not a private members' bill but a private bill? This one may not be. This may not be but I notice that the minister referred to certain internal arrangements and operations of the Newfoundland Teachers' Association, which is essentially a professional association as are the lawyers, the doctors, the dentists and this sort of thing. What they are doing is that they are calling upon us to give the force of law to their club rules. This is what it amounts to. It is a private association.

Now what I am saying is that for private bills of this nature, a body of procedure grew up over the years which required that they be introduced as a private bill, that they be referred to the private bills committee and that that committee hold hearings and that people who are interested in that, whether pro or con, members of an association. How do we know how many people are agreed in this particular association. Perhaps the executive has conferred with the minister. I do not know the answers to these questions.

In any event, I think we should follow that procedure whenever we can. Have a committee which can receive private bills, have a hearing on it, have people make representation to that committee, pro and con and then the committee report back to the House and have the thing passed on the recommendation of that committee. It seems to me to be a superb procedure rather than we merely being used or a government, not the House so much because we are entitled to read the bill, but a government merely being used as a tool. I think this is a great bill, and the amendments are good and this kind of a thing I would imagine. Rather than the minister just bringing in something as a government measure, which is essentially private and this one may be a little more public than some of the bills we have had, why do we not go through that very good procedure which has grown up over the years? It would also give backbenchers of the House something to do, Mr. Speaker, and to get involved in some of these things.

MR. WELLS: I have had some familiarity with this over the years and I have to make a comment on the comments of the Hon. Member for White Bay South. He is quite right, of course, insofar as people like the hairdressers are concerned. In fact, I think, if I recall, the Hairdressers' Act was passed in the early 1960's. I remember acting for them at the time and appearing before the committee of the House. I do not suppose there was ever a bill that got the same painstaking consideration as that one did in the committee. It took several days. They were locked up in a little room down there.

I think that the reason the Newfoundland Teachers' Association Act is a public act is essentially a historical one in that, of course, the whole business of teachers and the governing of the Newfoundland Teachers' Association was a matter of considerable importance. It stemmed, I think, out of the close relationship of the churches and government to teaching over the years. When the Newfoundland Teachers' Association Acts were introduced, to my knowledge and recollection they were never introduced as private acts. Although in the strict sense of the word, they did govern the private workings of an organization. At the same time, it was an organization that had such public implications that I believe it was historically felt that the Newfoundland Teachers' Association offhand ought to be introduced as a government measure by the government of the day, whatever government it was. This was followed on.

Of course, that sort of thinking has also been enshrined in the Collective Bargaining Act, the Teachers' Collective Bargaining Act, when it refers to the Newfoundland Teachers' Association Act and, as I recall it, refers to the Newfoundland Teachers' Association Act in a way that requires amendments to be introduced into the Newfoundland Teachers' Association Act so that collective bargaining can go on. I think that that is the reason for it. It is a historical one which has grown up over the years.

With regard to this bill itself, I may say that I think we should be all pleased that this bill is being passed by this House. It recognizes that the Newfoundland Teachers' Association, from very humble and small beginnings, has now become a very important organization, not just to its members but in the proper and effective governing of its members for the province as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased myself to see this, having had in past years an association with this. It seems to me also that the bill deals with something that is very germane now that the school system has become more complicated and complex and that is

it deals in an exhaustive and very thorough way, I believe, with the question of disciplinary measures for members of the teaching profession. Because, of course, of their importance, their day to day contact with members of the public and children, I think perhaps even there there is something even worthy of the passage of a public bill. Certainly, I think I expressed the hope for all of us that this bill will work well for the Newfoundland Teachers' Association and that that organization and the people that it serves, which are all of us really, will benefit from the passage of it.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I have just a few words before a vote is called on this bill. I simply want to say how pleased I am to see it come before the House. As I listened to the Member for St. John's South reminisce concerning his involvement, I was reminded, of course, that the bill we have before us tonight is one that has been ready for the House for some time. It was during my period of active involvement with the association that we hammered out the two or three new principles that appear in the bill, particularly Section 16 which was referred to by the Member for St. John's South, the matters affecting the disciplining of members of the association.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say before the question is called that I am delighted to see that this important piece of legislation, important certainly in the education context, important to the 6,000 or more members of the Newfoundland Teachers' Association, is now before the House.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to comment on the points made by my colleague from White Bay South. Certainly in endorsing it he said insofar as private or quasi-private bills are concerned, certainly a comment would apply in some measure to this particular bill. Perhaps I might add that in a case of this particular bill, there is another procedure which is operative and that is that I gather until such time there is a pretty complete

agreement within the Newfoundland Teachers' Association that the bill does not get before this House, and that is a kind of an unwritten rule. It is perhaps not one that can be relied on. I would gather that its very presence here would indicate that it has the endorsement of the Newfoundland Teachers' Association. That is not to subtract at all from the point that my colleague from White Bay South has made. I would certainly see the need for the kind of mechanism that he proposed. It would have the effect even in the case of this particular type of bill of affording the members of the House who for some particular reason were not following this kind of legislation or who were not particularly involved in the affairs of the Newfoundland Teachers' Association or who were not particularly interested in its affairs. Of hearing the viewpoints of the Newfoundland Teachers' Association, the people or whatever people were involved, whatever organization or private group were involved.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say again that I am certainly pleased to see this before the House and to see that it is about to become legislation. A new Newfoundland Teachers' Association Act was needed for some time. This tends to not only tidy up a number of matters but also to give the force of legislation to a number of other important matters affecting the membership of the Newfoundland Teachers' Association.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

On motion, a bill, "An Act Respecting The Newfoundland Teachers' Association," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Motion second reading of a bill, " An Act Further To Amend The Child Welfare Act, 1972:"

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, this is a very minor bill. We have something in its wording which may obviously have much more importance in its effect. Until this amendment is enacted in the Child Welfare Act,

the term "relative" does not include an adopted child, it means only those related by blood or marriage or at least specifically there is no specific reference to adopted relationship. That is what this bill is designed to do . It is to include adopted children in the same category of relations as by blood or marriage.

MR. W. N. ROWE: It is good to see that type of progress made, Mr. Speaker. I have only one question. Perhaps the (Acting) Minister or the Minister of Justice can answer it for me. Does this now obliterate as far as the government knows all legal distinction between children related by blood to their parents and/or the children adopted by parents ? Is this the last remaining discriminatory vestige in our law that we are now getting rid of? If there are any other points of discrimination, either under wills, acts or descendants, descending of property to children or any other discrimination, is it the government's intention to get rid of them once and for all?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, to the best of my -

MR. SIMMONS: Perhaps the minister in closing the debate could also educate me a bit on the point, the matter of the adoption of children as it comes under the Child Welfare Act. Is there any stated age of prospective parents, foster or adopting parents? Is there a point at which it is laid down in law a person is too old to adopt a child? I am thinking of a particular case. I do not want to go into it here. I just wanted to get some indication from the minister on this point. Is there some point at which the act says, or is it discretion on the part of the welfare officials that a person is not advisable for the family to adopt because of the age of the prospective parents there?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question that the Hon. Member for White Bay South asked, I have conferred with the

Minister of Justice and to the best of our knowledge, after this bill becomes law, there are not any other statutory discriminations or distinctions, at least to the best of my knowledge. If there are, certainly they should be changed. We are not aware of any.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the question that the Hon. Member for Hermitage asked, neither by law nor by specific regulations is there any age set with respect to parents who wish to adopt. Of course before any adoption there is quite a thorough procedure of interviews, references with respect to obviously the suitability of the prospective parents. This is weighed and assessed and obviously many matters are considered. There is no specific legal nor regulatory age limit.

Mr. Speaker, I could point out as well that certainly for children five and under, there are now more requests from parents than in fact there are children for adoption. This is especially the case, of course, for newly borns or infants.

MR. SIMMONS: In the case of a couple who had been the foster parents to a child for about three or three and one-half years and sought then to adopt the child and who were turned down, the stated reason was a matter of age. The parents were too old. The lady, I think, was in her early fifties, fifty-two or fifty-three at the time. Without getting into the merits of the case itself, I wonder would the minister indicate whether there is any kind of an appeal process in a situation like this?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: To the best of my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, there is no appeal process that is within the department. Of course, there could be an appeal presumably on the point of law. There could be an appeal, I presume, to the Supreme Court. If a public official were not performing his duty properly, there might be a remedy through prerogative writ. I would presume that that is operative for every public official performing his duty or not performing his duty properly. There is no departmental appeal structure.

On the other matter, I am not familiar with the particular case the honourable gentleman has referred to. I suppose many factors are taken into account by those who make the assessments and make the recommendations. I cannot speak with any knowledge on this specific one because I am not aware of it.

MR. SIMMONS: I was not at all wanting to get caught up in the merits of this particular case. When I heard of it I was a bit distressed that a situation like this should have transpired. There may be all kinds of good reasons. As I say, I am not at all wanting to get into the merits of this particular case. I did wonder as a matter of principle whether there were some field process. I am not at all saying that the official concerned did not do his job or he was negligent in doing his job. It was just a question. Everybody knows the reason for the appeal process anyway. It is often the case that officials make the wrong judgement on the matter. My question really is: Is there some mechanism, short of indicting the official, to offer to the parents the possibility of having the decision reversed? That was my real question.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I am not aware that there is. No doubt as in every function of government, any citizen would obviously have the right of appeal, writing to the minister and ask the minister to review. He, of course, has a kind of responsibility for the performance of all public duties under his jurisdiction. That is a right and an access that all citizens have. There is no organized structured appeal board like there is, i.e., in the case of welfare recipients and people who may not agree with the zoning regulations and various other activities. There is not to my knowledge any actual structured appeal board.

On motion, a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Child Welfare Act, 1972," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Motion second reading of a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Welfare Of Children Act:"

MR. OTTENHEIMER: This bill actually does no more than what the explanatory note does in fact state and that is the change of the composition of the youth guidance authority, and the components of the board are listed there in 2(1) of the bill. I think the reason that this is required is because of that great governmental initiative of a year ago commonly referred to as restructuring, whereby this youth guidance authority is responsible to or comes under the Department of Social Services. Certain members of the authority are officials in the Department of Rehabilitation.

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

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Maritime Hospital Services Association Re-Incorporation Act, 1949".

HON. T. A. HICKMAN (MINISTER OF JUSTICE): This bill speaks for itself, Mr. Speaker. I move second reading.

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

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Crown Lands (Mines And Quarries) Act."

HON. L. E. BARRY (MINISTER OF MINES AND ENERGY): Mr. Speaker, this is a bill which proposes to amend the Crown Lands (Mines And Quarries) Act to develop a little more efficiency in the method whereby mining claims may be set out in Newfoundland. The bill would change the method of deciding which if more than one application is received for the registering of a mining claim for the same piece of land, for determining which of the conflicting claims should be accepted. At present the application that is first received and filed in the department was accepted, as set out in the explanatory note. The proposed amendment would give preference to the claim which was first staked out rather than to the first application for registration. This is based upon the advice of officials in the Department of Mines and Energy based upon consultations which they have had with members in the mining industry and who all agree or most in any event agree that this is the most expeditious way of settling such a dispute.

The same principle would apply in respect of boundary permits. Under the amendment the time of staking out would be the date and hour appearing on number one boundary post in each case. The bill would also require that the boundary lines be laid out astronomically instead of magnetically and would permit geochemical surveys. These are again, Mr. Speaker, technical changes which follow from consultations, the officials in the Department of Mines and Energy have had with the participants in the mining industry in Newfoundland.

Some minor alterations are proposed to the principal act dealing with the time of re-opening of abandon claims for restaking. The bill would also authorize in treeless territory the burial in an aluminum container of paper or fabric on which is written the information that would normally appear on the boundary post of a mining claim.

All of which, Mr. Speaker, should make it easier for individuals to implement the policy which our government have adopted of encouraging the staking of mineral claims rather than the concession approach to the obtaining of mineral rights. I would ask that this bill be given second reading or I would move that this bill be given second reading.

MR. W. N. BOWE: It seems to be straightforward and sensible, Mr. Speaker. I do not have the parent act in front of me. As a reference to section (5) At the expiration of the time limited by subsection (1) of Section 19, the Minister shall review the applications filed under subsection (1) of Section 21, and if there is more than one application in respect to the same mining claim etc. Then the dispute is resolved some way.

Is it possible, the minister might be able to tell us from his own knowledge of the main act, is it possible, for example, say Advocate Mines has something registered, you know, in the department, for a claim that they are working up around Baie Verte, if somebody had staked a portion of that out prior to 1960 or whenever it was that Advocate or Bovlen or whoever it was registered that particular claim, is it possible for them now to come in? If somebody had staked something out in 1943, for example, is it possible for somebody to come in now and start disputing whether to file or to register and then dispute as to whether Advocate has the valid right to the claim that they are working now or they are exploring on?

MR. BARRY: If they did, they would be liable for an offense under the act.

MR. W. N. ROWE: I see. Well this is the kind of information I am after because I asked a question. Although it sounds like a foolish question, the fact of the matter is: somebody called me up the other day, a fellow who had left Newfoundland in 1930, he is now about seventy years of age, retired back in Newfoundland and called me up and said, "Listen back in 1930 my friend and I staked out some claim up there around Fleur de Lys somewhere and we are now wondering if we can work it." I said, "Well my understanding is that some of the land, not necessarily the one that you are talking about, but some of the land has been taken over and has been worked and explored upon by various companies, Advocate being one of them." I asked him to check with one of the mines. This is just a matter of interest. I wonder if the minister could give us this information.

What I am asking basically is; does this now raise the possibility of more disputes because it opens it up somewhat in an attempt to be fair and equitable to all concerned, does it raise the possibility of more disputes rather than if the old law prevailed? It was the sort of race to the registry whoever got there first won. Under this it is not necessarily the guy who gets to the registry first but is the person who is staked out first. So it does seem by broadening it, it seems to open up the possibility of more disputes. Of course there are other saving provisions or precautionary provisions that I do not know anything about. The minister might have some information on it.

MR. BARRY: I have to confess, Mr. Speaker, that I do not have all the details of this act at my fingertips. It is a while since I have gone through it. Again it is a fairly complicated little act. There is a lot in it. But basically the act has a Section (16) which says; "That no person shall for any purpose having properly staked out or caused or procured to be staked out a mining claim neglect or fail to record the mining claim in accordance with this act." In other words, there is an obligation to record after you staked out. I would assume this is here to prevent somebody else from coming along and wanting to stake the claim but seeing trees blazed or posts up or rocks up, saying that

well somebody else has got that, and going on somewhere else, thereby having land lie unexplored.

So they have to have records. Then there is another section which says that; Section (19) 'A permanent holder who has staked out a mining claim shall within thirty days after the staking out, as far as the island is concerned or within sixty days after the staking out in Labrador, shall come in and record the claim.

Now as I understand it, this amendment broadens the principle in setting up a more equitable situation where, and it can only happen where there were honest mistakes, it is not the normal case. Well, I suppose even the race to the registry has got to be usually a bona fide purchaser. But the only time where this would occur would be if say there was an overlapping, two people were out staking and staked overlapping claims by error, not knowing that, the second person not knowing that the land he staked had already been staked.

Under the present system, if the second person went in and staked say across an area which had already been staked and he got his application to record in first, he would have the claim. It appears more fair that the person who has complied with the act and has actually staked at a certain time which is recorded and which would have to be proven, it seems more equitable that the person who did this work first should have the right to record. This is what this amendment would do, this bill. There are still possibilities of fraud if anybody is foolish enough to attempt it but, of course, whatever the system that could apply.

MR. W. N. POWE: Before the minister sits down, Sir, I wonder would he yield for a question. Since the new staking, the new legislation brought in by the minister, I believe in the first year that he was minister, for prospectors, making it easier for prospectors to prospect and to have their rights recognized and such things, have there been any possible mines discovered by sort of private, small-time prospectors in the last couple of years or a possibility of mining operations?

MR. BARRY: Why does he not ask me that question when the press is here, Mr. Speaker? Or why did he not ask this during the estimates?

I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that this new policy appears to have been very successful not in the number of mines established. Obviously it is too early to tell, Mr. Speaker. The average time in the mining industry between exploration and the development of a mine is ten years but, Mr. Speaker, the statistics which we have, they show the amount of money spent on exploration in Newfoundland for 1973, for the past year, is higher by some twenty per cent, I think. It is at least twenty per cent, in excess of twenty per cent. I have the figures and I might be able to provide this to the honourable members at a later date. But it was higher by an amount in excess of twenty per cent than the amount spent in any previous years since 1949, except for the two years when they were drilling and spending money to delineate the iron ore reserves in Labrador.

Now this is the sort of statistic that we have to look at to determine whether our policy is working. As far as we can determine, based on these statistics, on the reaction from the people who engage in the mining industry here in Newfoundland, the policy seems to be working very well.

AN HON. MEMBER: Very good. (Inaudible)

MR. BARRY: I have to confess, he is one of two persons who have objected or who have made some objections or reservations about the policy.

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

Motion, second reading of a bill, 'An Act To Confirm The Setting Up And Closing Out Of The Children's Trust Account And Matters Relating To The Operation Of The Account:'

MR. W. W. MARSHALL: The recitals to this bill, Mr. Speaker, speak for themselves. The \$1 million provided on the sale of the Newfoundland Savings Bank building which was put in a children's trust account, subsequently a children's hospital at Fort Pepperrell was built, the money dedicated to it was provided by the government at the time. The \$1 million stayed there as transferred, as happens to these accounts from time to time, from department to department, found its way back. The \$1 million

is now intact. The hospital is there and the purpose of this bill is to provide that the trust account can be closed out and the monies reverted to the province where it belongs, since the thing has already been provided for the purposes I have stated.

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

MR. MARSHALL: It is five minutes to 11:00 P.M., I think for members of the House, because we have consumed and have had so much progress and members now are waiting to get to their districts, I know I certainly want to get to my district tomorrow, I move the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Monday at 3:00 o'clock in the afternoon and that this House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: It now being 11:00 P.M., I do now leave the Chair until 3:00 P.M. tomorrow Monday, May 20, 1974.