

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6 p.m.
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 5, 1978

The house met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for St. John's East.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I have a petition to present from some 114 residents of St. John's, most of whom reside in the old and historic, as a matter of fact the district of St. John's East. The rest of them are fortunate enough to reside in the immediate environs of that district.

It is, Mr. Speaker, in the form as decreed by Your Honour and the rules and contains a prayer suitable to lay on the table of the House at Your Honour's feet. The prayer of the petition is as follows: The prayer of the petition is to request the government to take notice of a resolution passed by the Parent-Teacher Association of Our Lady of Mercy School on March 9, 1978 and request it to take appropriate action in connection with same. And that resolution reads as follows, Mr. Speaker: "Resolved that the executive of the Parent-Teacher Association of Our Lady of Mercy School be directed to protest officially to the government of Newfoundland their decision to reduce the teacher allotment to the Roman Catholic School Board of St. John's by fourteen teachers.

"It is our collective opinion that the dilution of programme standards will result in serious short and long-term effects on the quality of education in Newfoundland." Mr. Speaker, it is also pointed out that these people, the Parent-Teacher Association at our Lady of Mercy School are concerned that the Roman Catholic School Board has been cut by fourteen teachers in total. As a result, that school will lose three teaching units and it seems to the Parent-Teacher Association that the reason for this was twofold: "Number one, a drop in enrollment of our schools and a

1686

MR. MARSHALL: return to the student-teacher ratio from twenty-five to one to twenty-six to one." It goes on to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the school "has an excellent library, a well equipped gymnasium, an auditorium, music, French, drama, public speaking, arts and crafts, etc. The school can accommodate thirty additional students particularly in the primary grades, and the association is of the opinion that with large amounts of money being spent by all governments on the downtown areas, the present quality and standard of education in our school must be maintained so that the inevitable population shift back to the inner city can be accommodated."

Now, Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this petition I would like to join with the concern expressed by the Parent-Teacher Association of Our Lady of Mercy School for the quality of education in the Province and particularly as it applies to this school. I myself recognize that the drop in student population and the financial constraints on the Province have been the reason why measures have had to be taken by the government and I certainly am not quibbling with that. But I do point out that this particular school is a historic school with a distinguished scholastic record and there may be other considerations rather than the straight numbers consideration of the ratio of pupils to teachers to be considered. I think that it is essential, Mr. Speaker, to the rejuvenation of the older parts of St. John's that in addition to rejuvenating the older parts of St. John's that the other facilities, such as these schools, be not allowed in any way to have the quality of the education which they have historically provided to the residents of the area be in any way diluted. We all realize that this government has been instrumental in instituting, particularly in St. John's East, the Neighbourhood Improvement Programmes. There are three of them in my district and I take some credit in bringing this about. We brought Neighbourhood Improvement in in the city of St. John's to rejuvenate areas around this particular school and I think that it

MR. MARSHALL: has to be borne in mind that in order to rejuvenate an area we also have to be quite sure that all of the facilities including schools, etc., are maintained at the same quality which they had been before.

Maybe, Mr. Speaker, this is a matter in some respects of concern - it obviously is a matter of concern with the school board - but I know the Minister of Education with overall responsibility will certainly want to assure and give assurances to the effect that they will be in fact no dilution in the quality of education as a result of the measures that were necessary and had to be taken in the Budget. I table this petition and ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates, which is the Department of Education, in the sure and certain knowledge that the minister and the government will take it into account and assure that there is no dilution in the - and be aware of the concern of these parents and the concern of all of us that there be no dilution in the quality of education in the Province and particularly with this old and historic school, Our Lady of Mercy School, in the area of St. John's East.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to support the petition which was so ably presented by the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), and I appreciated his words when he said that we should not be concerned so much with numbers as with the quality of education.

This problem, Mr. Speaker, is one that many schools in this Province at the present time face. Three teaching units lost to a school is a tremendous number. It is going to mean that something crucial must be dropped and I believe that the minister should consider this particular petition seriously.

It has been predicted for many years, Mr. Speaker, that enrollments would decline in our schools and that they will continue to decline for years to come. Now this is the opportunity for this government to offer a quality education to students in this Province. Now this is a chance for Newfoundland teachers to tackle problems facing Newfoundlanders, educational and social problems, facing Newfoundlanders today. And it would give us a chance to gear the curriculum to the Newfoundland scene, to individualize instruction, to increase the number of remedial classes, to develop imaginative programmes in our schools. Instead of that we are experiencing a cutback in teachers which results in a cutback in programmes in our schools such as the one that is happening at Our Lady of Mercy School,

The minister went ahead and cut back the teachers or maintained the status quo in a time when the education of this Province was moving forward. And after that he commissioned, or has acceded to a study- to set up a task force to look into the problems that would be caused by the decreasing enrollments in the Province.

Now I think, Mr. Speaker, that the minister should have made the study first and that should have been completed before the

MR. HODDER: government set out on its present course. And I believe that the government must now accept the NTA's request to freeze the pupil/teacher ratio until such time as the task force has been formed and brings in its recommendations.

Mr. Speaker, our most valuable resource is the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. And we cannot tamper with their future without knowing what we are doing. The task force proposed by the Newfoundland Teachers' Association is a good suggestion, and I call on the minister to move quickly in its implementation.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Province has only recently achieved an educational maturity. Anyone who is familiar with the school system knows that good things are happening in the schools and many plans are being laid for the future and I believe that the children of this Province should not be deprived of a decent education and I urge the minister to accept and act on this petition.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Sir, as a parent, and as a taxpayer, and as an elected member, Sir, to this House, I whole-heartedly support the petition presented by my hon. friend on behalf of 114 members of the staff of Our Lady of Mercy School - parent/teachers and probably some of them are staff.

Mr. Speaker, for several years past now I have been advocating both inside and outside of this hon. House that we establish in this Province a fact-finding committee to look into our whole educational system right from kindergarten, right on up through university. I have been advocating now, Sir, for the last several years, if hon. gentlemen who have been sitting in the House with me will recall, both when I sat on that side of the House, when I sat down there as an independent, and now up here and I am going to repeat what I have been saying for years and years and years, that it is about time that we found out once and for all whether we are getting the value that we should be getting for

MR. NEARY: our educational dollar, whether we are headed in the right direction with our educational system in this Province. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion money is not the problem - it may be part of the problem - money is not the whole problem in education. You can put all the money you like into the educational system, but it is not going to solve the problem. The quality of education is still going down and will continue to deteriorate unless we take the bull by the horns and examine the whole educational system in this Province.

I argued it when I was in Cabinet.

I do not know if my hon. friend who used to sit to my left, the present Minister of Justice and Minister of Finance - I argued then that we should take a look at our whole educational system in this Province.

MR. HOUSE: How can you prove that the quality is going down?

AN HON. MEMBER: Do not get excited now. Do not get excited.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the argument I used to get - it has gone now even worse since we got a weak-kneed Minister of Education, Sir, a gentleman who should resign -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I might point out to the hon. gentleman that he may not debate under the heading of Petitions, and also that the subject matter here, although fairly broad, does not include the whole spectrum of education but the concept of the possibility of deterioration of quality of education as a result of a pupil/teacher ratio measure. It is still fairly broad but not the whole ambit of education.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I was proceeding in a civilized manner, Sir, until the lunatic Minister of Education interrupted me and got me off track. But, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about the quality -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I feel I should ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw that epithet.

MR. NEARY: I withdraw, Sir, and I would suggest that the hon. Leader not be putting ideas in my mind.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W. N. ROWE: I withdraw as well, Mr. Speaker!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, this is a very, very serious matter and I would commend my suggestion to the hon. the Premier and to the government, the whole matter of whether or not we should introduce Grade XII into our high schools. That matter comes up when we are talking about the quality of education. What is being taught at the university? We are turning out graduates over there who are coming off like they are coming off an assembly line and they are not equipped to go out and go to work. They cannot find jobs. They are not being trained for the employment market. All these things, Mr. Speaker, have to be looked at. And I am going to suggest again, Sir - and I have been at it now, I believe, for ten years; and I have four children in school myself and I know what I am talking about - that the quality of education is going down in this Province, it is deteriorating and will continue to deteriorate while the teacher/pupil ratio is a problem. It is one of many problems in the educational system, one of many.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, during the last five years there has been a very significant improvement in the pupil/teacher ratio. The hon. gentleman says that during the past few years the quality has gone down, so one, you know -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: The pupil/teacher ratio is one of a number of problems.

MR. W. N. ROWE: A hundred problems.

MR. NEARY: The teachers are using it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: I am delighted to see anybody supporting my petition, but the petition is for Our Lady of Mercy School and I want

April 5, 1978

Tape 601

EC - 3

MR. MARSHALL: attention centered on Our Lady of Mercy School, and I think that the hon. member is wandering into realms of education, is entering into debate -

AN HON. MEMBER: It is not fair.

MR. MARSHALL: - and under the rules of discussion of petition, debate is not permitted to that extent. I mean, I want Our Lady of Mercy School's plight considered, as important as all the rest of it may be.

1693

MR. SPEAKER: On the point of order.

MR. NOLAN: No one is, I am sure, attempting to downgrade in any way the needs of Our Lady of Mercy School but surely, Mr. Speaker, you know, as does the hon. member opposite, that you cannot discuss education in Our Lady of Mercy School unless we are prepared to address ourselves to the problems that exist in education throughout this land. So it is really not a good point of order, Mr. Speaker, in our opinion.

MR. SPEAKER: On the point of order: Certainly the submission of debate being out of order is a valid one. With respect to the material allegation of the petition, I understand the subject matter of the petition to be the fear of, or possibility of deterioration of the quality of education resulting from, or which might result from the pupil - teacher ratio measures and as that applies to a specific school. However, the general area of deterioration resulting from or connected with the pupil - teacher ratio programme would, in my opinion, be within the material allegations but not broader than that.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I thank Your Honour for Your Honour's ruling. And my hon. friend, maybe he does not want to hear the truth. Maybe my hon. friend wants to be partisan about this but, Sir, this is just merely a symptom. The petition that was presented could be one of a thousand petitions presented on behalf of a thousand parent - teacher associations around this Province.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. gentleman's five minutes have expired.

MR. NEARY: I thank you, Your Honour, and I do hope, Sir, that the government will take my advice and

MR. NEARY: set up this fact-finding committee without further delay.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Grand Falls followed by the hon. gentleman for Terra Nova.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I am just going to take a minute to focus on one particular problem. First of all I hope that we get a good chance to debate the issue because one thing that has happened with the issue emerging is that it has focused attention on education which tends to be overlooked even in the Legislature, as we have experienced over the past number of years.

I do believe it is much more complicated than the pupil - teacher ratio and I hope we can get beyond that kind of a consideration, even though that is the specific topic under question at the present moment. I am looking in the estimates and I see that this year we are addressing ourselves to the tune of \$305 million for education out of a budget of \$1,285,000,000 which is roughly 25 per cent of the budget. I have a feeling, and I am saying this as

MR. LUNDRIGAN: an observation that I have had since I have been involved in education myself for quite a number of years and I have seen the emergence of quality education in our Province and believed, having lived six years in Ontario and a couple of years in Alberta, that we do have a superior education system. But I do believe that we have to look at what is happening to the distribution of the educational dollar. Where is the dollar going? \$150 million of the \$305 million are going into salaries for teachers. Obviously, almost the equivalent amount of dollars are going into other costs. I have had the concern and I have expressed this on many occasions to my colleague, who is under pressure now in this particular debate but I am sure will follow through very effectively, that a good portion of our educational dollar is not going into curriculum development, is not going into the classroom, is not going into program development. I have got a funny feeling in my stomach that more money is not necessarily the answer, a higher or lower pupil - teacher ratio is not necessarily the answer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: - I think that too much of our money, of the \$305 million is going into administrative costs that are great in a Province like Alberta where they have got such a tremendous cash flow and a tremendous positive budgetary situation. But if you go back, and I can trace back to my involvement in Gander, for example, where we had a principal of a school and a vice-principal, both of them teaching part-time, and a staff of thirty-five or forty teachers, and a school board with a part-time administrator, and a handyman who would fool around patching up the walls and doing up a scattered little bit and piece around the building, and a janitor or two. That was your total administrative cost and a system with maybe forty teachers. Take the same school system today and it is my theory there is no evidence being brought forward on it. I would like the minister to really focus on this when the estimates are up because I want to get

MR. LUNDRIGAN: involved in this debate. I would like to see what happens today with the administrative overburden from your superintendant \$35,000 or \$40,000, your other supervisors -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. LUNDRIGAN: - your specialists. And then you have another crew called generalists who are not specialists at all. They are not religious education specialists or music education specialists, they are almost like executive assistants. NOW they are sacred cows and you do not talk about them.

MR. SIMONS: You would know all about those.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion we should really address ourselves to this open it up and let us go the distance that the educator cannot go. Because he has got his political body as well has he not? His 7,000 or 8,000 teachers and he cannot talk as openly as we can here. I would be prepared to really get into this issue in a more fundamental way when the estimates are up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Terra Nova.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

MR. T. LESLIE: Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words in support of this petition on behalf of the 114 parents of the PTA of Our Lady of Mercy School. When I was a supervisor with the Avalon Consolidated School Board here in St. John's, to allay some of the fears of some of the people who believe that there is no co-operation between various school boards, I worked very closely with the other school board here in St. John's even though I worked with the Avalon, and had occasion to visit Our of Lady of Mercy School on several occasions. I knew the principal very well at that time. I do not know if it is

MR. T. LUSH: the same principal, it was a Mrs. Wakeham at that time, when I was supervisor with the Avalon. You can certainly appreciate the concern that the parents express in this petition, the concern of quality education. Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to be able to identify all of the factors that affect quality education there are so many. But certainly the pupil - teacher ratio must be considered one factor. Certainly the number of students that any teacher can work with effectively at any one time, certainly the number must have some relationship to the type of education, the way in which a teacher is able to work with the students. I think probably there is a tendency to pay too much attention to it maybe but it certainly has got to be considered a major factor. I, Mr. Speaker, had the privilege of teaching in schools where the pupil - teacher ratio was down as low as ten and I know what kind of achievements, I know what success can be achieved in that sort of a situation. I, personally, had the opportunity of teaching ten for a full year, I have also taught fifty for a full year, and I want to tell you there is no way you can work with fifty the way you can work with ten, it is a matter of common sense. What bothers me, Mr. Speaker, is for people to be suggesting that we can lay off 100 teachers in this Province and it will not affect education at all. I did not get the full impact of what the hon. member for St. John's East was saying, but I did believe that he said that there were three teachers to go, three teachers. Now, certainly no one staff can lose three teachers without affecting the quality of education.

MR. LUSH: if we were to say that we can lose three teachers from one staff, Mr. Speaker, it is a gross insult to the teaching profession, to be able to say that we can lose three teachers from a single staff and it will not effect the quality of education. It makes no sense. It does not make any sense at all. And I think as educators that we certainly cannot go along with that kind of statement that by losing teachers that this will have no effect on the quality of education.

And just one further point; I remember hearing this week on an open-line programme that some school was going to lose a guidance counsellor, and the question asked was, Would you identify what quality of education is going to be lost as a result of losing this guidance counsellor? Now, Mr. Speaker, there is no way that an educator or anybody else can talk in terms of the quality of education that is going to be lost as a result of the guidance counsellor leaving the school.

Let me assure this House that if I were a principal of a high school here in St. John's, there is no way that I would want to lose the services of a guidance counsellor, the person who does so much work within your school.

So let me finish by saying, Mr. Speaker, I hope the minister when he speaks, when he speaks to this petition now and when he speaks in public, that he certainly will come to the defence of his profession and not say that we can lose 100 teachers without affecting the quality of education. That kind of a statement is a gross insult to our profession.

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

MR. L. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, as one who was responsible for education for many years on the South Coast of the Province and also in the Bay of Islands, I would like to add my whole-hearted support to the petition so ably presented by our colleague from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall). And I would like to say in my comments as well that it is too bad that a matter with so much importance to the Province

MR. WOODROW: as education that we could not work in unison on this rather than use politics to make some brownie points for ourselves.

However, Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) said, we have this year in the estimates \$305 million, approximately, for education, which is certainly a very commendable sum. And there is another point which we are probably missing that I do not think it is the fault of any of us - it probably could be though - the fault of any of us in this House that the enrollment has dropped. The enrollment in education has dropped down through the years.

Now also we are living in a period of restraint and I think not only the members of this hon. House of Assembly, but I believe the teachers should be the first ones to show restraint as well. In fact, I have been and I still am extremely interested in what I call Christian education and the education taught in the schools of the Mercy Order, or the Presentation Order, in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador is unsurpassed anywhere. This is borne by the fact that everybody is trying to get to either the Mercy Schools or the Presentation Schools. I could naturally include the Christian Brothers as well. When I say that I am not at all underestimating the many good lay teachers that we have in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. But the government, I suppose I could say, is up against a proposition, what are we going to do? I think the whole thing amounts to this, that we have to do as Don Jamieson said -

AN HON. MEMBER: What? What? What?

MR. WOODROW: - with Ron Murphy and the hon. Bill Doody as well a few nights ago, we have to look at this thing in a non-partisan way, work together and I think we can do something good for our Province, for the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador in the field of education, which to my mind is the most important thing in our Province.

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

MR. SIMONS: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition presented by the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) in relation to Our Lady of Mercy School.

The member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) has admitted that he is one of the high paid people. I have never figured out whether he was a generalist or a specialist.

MR. LUSH: Specialist.

MR. SIMONS: The Minister of Education, I say for the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan), and I were also two of the high paid superintendents. Of the three the minister is only one who is not taking a cut in salary since coming in here, so we can talk fairly dispassionately about the issue under review.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education himself a moment ago, unwittingly or otherwise, put his finger on the problem we are talking about when he said across the House - how do you know it will affect the quality of education? And therein, Mr. Speaker, is the problem, that we do not know. I doubt if there is anybody in this House, Mr. Speaker, who knows with any degree of certainty what impact this teacher reduction is going to have on the quality of education at Our Lady of Mercy School or other schools throughout the Province. And

Mr. Simmons: that is the tragedy of it all - that a decision is being made quite arbitrarily without any real meaningful dialogue. I get the impression the only time the minister and the NTA President talk these days is on the airwaves. This is an issue, Mr. Speaker, this is an issue that ought to be properly and fully worked out of the public spotlight before a financial decision as full in ramification as this one is was taken in the first place.

So if the minister reflects his true concern when he mutters in an undertone about whether or not we know that the quality of education is being affected, either he has the documentation to support it, when his estimates come in this House, to support that there will be no adverse effect on the quality of education by this move, either he has that documentation or he will do the only honourable thing, he will move an amendment to the Supply Bill providing the additional money required to ensure that there will not be a teacher reduction; and then he will immediately take the initiative to see that the proper study or the proper dialogue is undertaken to see just where we stand on this whole question before we willy-nilly ram through a reduced vote to the detriment of the students at Our Lady of Mercy and other schools throughout the Province.

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

AN HON. MEMBER: Tourism.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry, Tourism.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, in saying a few words on the petition, I would fully support the petition if there were evidence that the quality of education was being reduced. And I am not convinced that the reduction of teachers in this Province, approximately 100 teachers, is going to substantially reduce the quality of education in our Province. Based on the fact that this year we are going to see a reduction in student enrollment in our schools throughout the Province of approximately 700 students, which is basically a 4 per cent

Mr. Morgan: reduction student enrollment, and therefore the reduction of 100 teachers is less than 4 per cent. So I am not convinced that the reduction of teachers is going to substantially reduce the quality of education in our Province.

The teachers who are concerned, I understand there are going to be three teachers less in that Lady of Mercy School. I do not know what the number of teachers are, and the number of students enrolled in that school, but the big question, as I am sure my colleague, the Minister of Education will agree, that it is difficult to determine whether or not the quality of education is being reduced if the enrollment is being reduced on one hand more than the number of teachers are reduced on the other.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point order has come up.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding of the procedure and the Standing Rules of this House and the tradition that has been carried on in this House that you cannot stand to speak on a petition unless you are supporting the petition.

MR. W. ROWE: You cannot speak against a petition really.

MR. NEARY: You cannot speak against a petition, and my hon. friend is speaking against the petition presented by the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall).

MR. W. ROWE: Exactly.

MR. NEARY: I would like for Your Honour to rule on that matter, please.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. gentleman have a submission on that point of order?

MR. MORGAN: On that point of order, Mr. Speaker, on that point of order. I am pointing out that I am supporting in an unqualified way, if there is evidence that the quality of education is being reduced by the cutback in teachers.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: My hon. friend, Sir, when the hon. gentleman stood

Mr. Neary: in his place said that he could not support the petition. He said, 'I cannot support this petition.'

MR. MORGAN: I am looking for more evidence.

MR. NEARY: So I would submit to Your Honour that the minister is out of order, and I would like for Your Honour to so rule.

MR. HICKMAN: He is not out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman's submission is correct in that when a person is recognized to speak on a petition it is to support the petition. The hon. gentleman cannot speak against the petition.

MR. MORGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am indeed not speaking against the petition, I am speaking in support of the petition, but I am asking some questions which seem to be unanswered in connection with the number of teachers reduced in our education system this year. And I am sure that this can be put forward in more detail by my colleague, the Minister of Education. But I again repeat, I am supporting the petition from the 104 petitioners from the PTA of Lady of Mercy School on the condition that the quality of education is being reduced. But again I repeat I am not sure that that is the case.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: In speaking in support of this petition firstly may I commend the Parent - Teacher Association from the Mercy Convent School, for the very responsible position they took at that meeting - Our Lady of Mercy rather - and in indicating their concern also for the Province's ability to pay.

I am sure that the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) who was present, I believe, at the meeting, or certainly at a similar meeting in another institute of learning in his district recently, will ratify and confirm that.

The petition addresses itself, as hon. gentlemen have said, primarily to the concern that the continuation of the present pupil - teacher ratio may affect the quality of education, because there has been a very vast improvement in that pupil - teacher ratio in Our Lady of Mercy School in the last five years, and I cite as I support this the following facts:

Mr. Speaker, in 1972 the basic pupil - that is five years ago - teacher allocation was one to thirty-five in the Province. In addition, for every six room school there was an extra teacher, and a twelve room school, two teachers extra. This is in the high school and elementary schools. Today the pupil - teacher ratio, as the petition so ably sets forth, is now one to twenty-six and in addition there is a minimum of seven specialist teachers and a maximum of twenty-four.

Now, Mr. Speaker, according to Statistics Canada, and I will have to look to my colleague the Minister of Education or members of the teaching profession to interpret this, but Statistics Canada say that the teacher - pupil ratio considering full-time equivalence in 1972-73, the ratio overall was

MR. HICKMAN:

22.69 and this year it is 19.72.

Hon. gentlemen in supporting this petition may be interested in four more figures. In 1972-73, five years ago, the total number of teachers in the Province of Newfoundland, both specialists and otherwise, was 6,893. In 1977-78, this year we are in now, the number is 7,875. The enrollment, the total student population in 1972-73, full-time population, was 156,375. In 1977-78, this year, it is 149,900, so that we have a situation wherein during the past five years, Mr. Speaker, the number of teachers in the Province has increased by approximately 1,000 while the number of students in Newfoundland has gone from 156,375 to 149,900. These are the figures that were submitted, as I understand it, by Statistics Canada.

If the figures that I have are not correct, I certainly would yield to my colleague the hon. Minister of Education. It is a fact and I repeat, getting back to this petition, Mr. Speaker, that the pupil - teacher ratio was one to thirty five in 1972, it is now one to twenty-six in 1977. One can see with the improvement that we have seen at the Mercy Convent School, the reason why the Parent - Teacher Association want an assurance that this high standard that has now been provided will be maintained.

May I say in response to the hon. the gentleman from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) that we have had some excellent meetings with the executive of the NTA, the Social Policy Committee of Cabinet, and we have reviewed with them the various concerns that they have. Their concerns, like these of everyone else, is to be sure that the pupil - teacher

April 5, 1978, Tape 606, Page 3 -- apb

MR. HICKMAN: ratio reflects the declining population and does not do violence to the very excellent standard that we have implemented.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education;

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak to the petition and support the spirit of such because I think it is very refreshing to have a group such as the Home and School Association concerned about the quality of education. I think that is every educator's dream when people are concerned about that aspect of education. All too often we are concerned with facilities and school buildings and so on.

It is very difficult to speak to this petition without knowing a lot of the facts. One of the things that would have to be known, as my colleague, the Minister of Tourism, just mentioned, is the amount of population decline in that school. I have not got the statistics. There is no way I could get them. But if there is a three classroom decline in that school then, of course, the loss of three teachers would not, obviously, affect the quality of education there.

I just want to point out in relation to that board, Mr. Speaker, and again you cannot discuss a single school in the district without relating it to a board because while we do staff schools on the basis of the school population, the units are given to schools and the schools may allocate teachers as they like.

MR. SIMMONS: School boards.

MR. HOUSE: School boards? Right, based on schools. It is given to the school boards, so the school board allocates teachers as it sees fit.

There is in excess of 900 teachers on that board. I believe it is 919, I am not quite sure on that, and there is a loss of thirteen teachers which represents a fairly small percentage. That board's population decreased by just about ten per cent. It has gone from 22,000 down to 20,000 in the last six years, so obviously the reduction of teachers has not kept pace with the reduction of students. The board, as I said, has had this decrease, and next year the board's pupil/teacher ratio is still lower than the provincial

MR. HOUSE: status, the one to twenty-six that we mentioned. And I think with large schools, spread out through St. John's like they are, and most of this board's schools are in St. John's, I cannot see how the decline by thirteen teachers is going to affect the quality of education, and I have not received that kind of information from the board as yet.

I just want to make a reference to the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), he says that the quality of education is decreasing yearly and it would seem that as the pupil/teacher ratio goes down, according to him, the quality of education decreases. Because as my colleague just pointed out, four years ago -

MR. NEARY: Just look at Memorial University.

MR. HOUSE: I am not looking at Memorial University at all. This is a different problem. Four years ago the pupil/teacher ratio was one to twenty-two in the Province totally and this year it is one to nineteen point seven. That takes into consideration, of course, the specialist teachers and the special education teachers.

MR. NEARY: Is the quality going up?

MR. HOUSE: I would say the quality has gone up and I think we can get statistics to prove it. Yes. The quality is going up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I want to also say that we from government recognize that declining enrollments when taken to its extreme and there is a rapid decrease, will affect education. And we have no intention, and it is not our intention, to keep decreasing teachers as the pupils decrease until we have reached an acceptable pupil/teacher ratio.

MR. NEARY: What is that?

MR. HOUSE: Our objective, a couple of years ago, was to come up with a pupil/teacher ratio of one to twenty-five, plus increase our specialists by about thirty per cent. We considered that to be a fairly acceptable standard. And that is still our objective.

MR. HOUSE: But until we can put that across the Province, totally across the Province, it is just impossible for us to be discriminatory and give some boards better pupil/teacher ratios than others. And as I said that is our objective and that is what we are aiming towards.

Now the problem of declining enrollments. The hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) said that at the request of the NTA we were setting up a task force. I might point out that that was included in the NTA brief to us but prior to that we had met at the department with the General Advisory Committee and had recommended such. And I have asked the NTA, Federation of School Boards, the DEC, and the Research Branch of the university, to recommend terms of reference for the setting up of a study because it has more than pupil/teacher ratio implications, it has implications for operational costs of school boards, or busing, etc., and many other aspects of education. So that is being done and the House will be advised of that.

Mr. Speaker, I share with the government, all of us share the concern but we do not think there will be an appreciable loss of quality. I think if you take the Roman Catholic School Board here in St. John's, which this is related to, if the population does not decrease next year, it means one-third of a pupil more per teacher. You cannot distribute it that way but certainly no teacher will be overburdened, and I cannot see the loss of quality of education.

I want to correct a figure there that the hon. member stated. It was the fact that six years

MR. POWER: is commendable considering the economic times that we live in. It is not perfect but it is also not perfectly bad as some people - not the educators opposite, but some people have said that the monies we spend on education are really producing very little and that the quality of education is deteriorating. In Newfoundland this government in 1976 spent \$127 million, \$140 million in 1977 and over \$150 million in 1978 on teacher's salaries alone, the salaries of teachers and superintendents. To say that to spend such massive amounts of money produces a deterioration in education is nothing short of untrue. In my own district of Ferryland as an example, in 1972 we had 2,600 students and 113 teachers. Today we have 300 students less and twelve teachers more to prove that over the last five years, in the district of Ferryland at least, the quality of education if it is based on pupil-teacher ratio has been increasing because we have more teachers and less students and that is happening throughout the Province. For members opposite to say that the quality of education is deteriorating because of pupil-teacher ratios is absolutely untrue. It is untrue.

SOME HON MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I must point out that all hon. members as long as they speak to the allegation of the petition obviously may express their views. Debate is not permitted and a direct confrontation of viewpoints I would regard as being the essence of debate.

The hon. member.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, I will say two things. This is not the first time in Newfoundland that monies in educational fields have been cut back. I was a young student at Memorial, who attended school because the former Premier of this Province saw the value of education and was willing to pay university students \$100 per month towards their expenses. I have to say that, in all honesty, through former Premier Smallwood I received a university education that my family could not have afforded to give to me.

Mr. Power: But I also remember a very sad statement that the former Premier made when he realized that that programme was simply too expensive for Newfoundland. He said when the programme was curtailed, that Newfoundland as much as it wanted to improve the quality of education and give university students money, we could not afford to do it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! A point of order has come up. Certainly a debate on university education is outside of the ambit of this petition.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I will make this one statement, that again the cutbacks seem to be dramatic, they seem to be overly harsh, but they are only harsh in relation to the fantastic improvements that have been made over the past five years.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. RIDEOUT: I wonder will he get in the Cabinet after that.

MR. FLIGHT: He should. He certainly should.

MR. SIMMONS: He makes a better speech than the fellows in the Cabinet.

MR. NOLAN: I hate to interrupt, Mr. Speaker.

MR. RIDEOUT: The less said the better from half of that crowd.

MR. NOLAN: But in speaking in support of the petition I am sure that many people listening to the debate, because that is what some of it is, even if it is in order or not, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that there are certain nuances that apparently spread some differences amongst those that are involved in teaching directly or indirectly, who seem to have some differences, and this is healthy because I suppose those who are in the teaching organization, the NTA, are as much of a union as, say, the law society, the medical association or the IBEW, and so it is interesting to hear what they have to say. But there are a number of things that those of us who are not directly involved in education have not really - we do not really have the answers to. For example, if the minister says, if my figures

Mr. Nolan: are incorrect I hope he will correct me, if there is a reduction of 135 teachers, if that is the figure, and it is -

MR. HOUSE: 127.

MR. NOLAN: Pardon?

MR. HOUSE: 127.

MR. NOLAN: 127. Well if there is a reduction of 127 teachers in the Province, and if it does not, in fact, seriously affect adversely education in this Province, does that mean that if it were 135, it would be seriously affected, or is 200 the magic number? I mean I speak -

MR. HOUSE: It is related to pupil loss.

MR. NOLAN: Pupil loss. And 127 is now the magic figure determined on the basis of information that is available to the minister and his officials.

MR. LUSH: Measured just like a -

MR. HOUSE: It is based on the number of pupils in the school, on the basis of 126.

MR. NOLAN: Yes.

Before the NTA mentioned this, we have certainly talked about it, I cannot help feeling that if we are wrong that I personally may not be the one who is going to be seriously affected, or even the minister, it is some child who is now in Our Lady of Mercy School, as the hon. member mentioned, or in any other school throughout this Province. I feel that if we are to address ourselves to this situation today, here in this House or anywhere else, and in speaking in support of this petition, Mr. Speaker, as I do, it seems to me that we are as elected representatives faced with a very solemn duty and that is to speak for those who cannot speak for themselves directly in this House. I mean we are all interested in jobs for the teachers, obviously, and I hope we are all equally concerned about those who are unemployed in any other field of endeavour in this Province, and will speak up and lobby and do whatever is necessary

Mr. Nolan: to protect their rights when they are unemployed.
And may I remind this House there are many unemployed in this Province.

But if we do not have the answers, all of them right now, and I suggest we do not, it is time we found out exactly what the situation is, not merely to protect the teachers on the one hand, or the school boards or anything like that, or the minister or the members of the Opposition, but how are the young people on whom we are allegedly spending massive amounts of money in education, whether it is enough, well it is not enough obviously, we are going to need more, but how are they being affected? And if there is any evidence at all that we are shortchanging the students, the students of the Province then it is our duty to present the facts so that the parents will understand, so that all teachers will understand, and so that all members of this House will clearly understand where the duty lies, but we have to have the facts. And I submit to you we do not have them now, because if the minister has the information he has not laid it on the table, and if he does have it then surely the NTA would not be asking for the study that they want done, and the minister would not be going along with it.

AN HON. MEMBER: You are against it.

MR. NOLAN: No, I am not against the petition.

AN HON. MEMBER: You were against the petition.

AN HON. MEMBER: I cannot wait to vote this time.

MR. RIDEOUT: You are the only one who does not know the rules.

MR. NOLAN: I am not against the petition.

I mean, I have heard of Labatt's '50' but Bonavista 50/50 really floors me!

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. NOLAN: So I certainly do support the petition.

MR. MORGAN: Dancing Dollars!

MR. RIDEOUT: You were dancing the dollars out.

MR. NOLAN: I certainly do support the petition,

Mr. Speaker, and I would hope that in all the flurry about who is going to be laid off and who is not going to be laid off, whether it is 127 teachers or 135 or 120 or whatever it is, I would like to see some clear indication here, and as quickly as possible without hurrying it to the detriment of the study, of exactly what effect there is going to be on the students in this Province as a result of the action that we are taking. Not a partisan statement from the NTA, from the Liberals, the P.C.s, but a clear study of the quality of education and how it is being affected in this Province. And when we have that, then we can talk about it, but whether we have it or not I can certainly support the prayer of the petition at this moment as it was so ably presented by my hon. friend opposite.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation.

MR. HICKEY: I would like to table the regulations pertaining to automobile insurance rates and also the report from the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities as it applies to the automobile insurance rates.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. DINN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to table the report of the Corner Brook Housing Corporation for the year ending December 31, 1976.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Development.

MR. ROUSSEAU: The 1977 annual report of the Workmen's Compensation Board, Mr. Speaker.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, talk about being alive. There are sixty-two questions on the Order Paper, all in the name of the hon. member who is the House Leader on the opposite side of the House.

MR. MORGAN: And leader of the party.

MR. H. COLLINS: That can only mean one, maybe two things. Maybe he is the only one who is permitted to ask a question -

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

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

I must interrupt the hon. gentleman.

MR. RIDEOUT: I want to know if that particular question is on the Order Paper that the minister is answering now and what number it is.

MR. H. COLLINS: I do not think that is a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I am referring to the number of questions on the Order Paper. It can only mean that the hon. member is the only one permitted to ask a question or otherwise the others do not have the energy to ask a question.

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

I had already interjected when the hon. gentleman to my right got up.

MR. SPEAKER: Under this routine proceeding number five, actually, the hon. gentleman is only permitted to answer questions and not to get into debate with respect to who asks them or who did not ask them.

The hon. minister.

MR. H. COLLINS: I understand that, but it is so obvious I had to draw attention to it.

Question number 32 in the name of the hon. House Leader, "To ask the hon. the Minister of Health to lay upon the table of the House the following information: What is the number of journeys involving public business which he has made since April 1, 1977 to places outside Canada, showing for each journey where he went and what he was doing and how much it cost and who he saw and everything else." Now, Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first part is 'None' - zero.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. H. COLLINS: Now, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. members are not willing to listen - they have been requesting those answers all those days, if they do not want to hear them, you know, we will not give them to them. And I propose to read them out. Another one, number 26 in the name of the same hon. member, "To ask the minister to lay upon the table of the House again a statement of the number of ambulances currently operating in the Province under the government's ambulance service and the total cost of maintaining this ambulance service." And it gives me a great opportunity to speak for ten or fifteen minutes on the great ambulance service which we have in Newfoundland -

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. H. COLLINS: - which this government brought in. I am sure the hon. member has a motive for this. I think he wants to give us the opportunity to be able to articulate and tell the people what a great job we are doing, the number of ambulances we have and so on and so forth.

At the present time, Mr. Speaker, there are eighty-one ambulances excluding ambulances found at hospitals. Eighty-one ambulances taking care of the health needs of the people of this Province, something that was unheard of until five or six years ago. The estimated cost, Mr. Speaker, is \$825,000 for the fiscal year 1977-78.

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

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

MR. STRACHAN: If he wants to go though it fully I hope he can go through it fully and explain the ambulance service and hopefully get into ambulance service in the Labrador part of the Province as well.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, we are talking about road ambulances. I can only respond to the question which was asked. We are just as proud, Mr. Speaker, of our air ambulance service, the best in Canada, no question about it at all in the world. If the hon. member wants to put a question on the Order Paper I will certainly deal with that, Mr. Speaker.

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

I must point out that under this routine proceeding, Answers to Questions for which Notice has been Given, my understanding is that the hon. minister is confined to giving answers and not a speech upon the subject matter of the question.

The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the next

MR. H. COLLINS: question is number 14 in the name of the same hon. gentleman.

"During the financial year that commenced April 1, 1977, what amount of money was expended by the government for the purpose of supplying drugs to indigents throughout the Province and what system is used to determine whether or not a person qualifies as an indigent so that they can receive drugs paid for by the government?"

The answer, Mr. Speaker, is this: The subdivision covering the expenditure for the cost of drugs also contains the lesser amounts spent on eyeglasses and other appliances. It is estimated that when all invoices are in in 1977-78, we will have spent \$3.6 million. Over \$3.5 million in providing drugs and other appliances to the indigent people of this Province.

The hon. member also asked what criteria is used. The criteria used is that the Department of Social Services do the usual examinations, investigations and the money is provided, as I said, in the Department of Health. A great programme!

The same hon. member, question number 10. "To ask the hon. Minister to lay upon the Table of the House, again, the statement of arrangements with Public Health Nurses who refused last Fall to use their own vehicles unless mileage rates were adjusted to a more realistic figure."

The answer, Mr. Speaker, is, the Public Health Nurses who refused to use their vehicles last Fall were not paid their car allowance for their idle days. Since then the collective agreement with nurses has been signed and that provides for an automobile allowance of forty dollars per month with a mileage rate of twenty-two cents per mile and with a guaranteed annual amount of \$750. The difference between

MR. H. COLLINS: private and business automobile insurance is also paid for and parking meter costs up to two dollars per week.

On tomorrow and the next day we will continue the process of answering some of the questions which the hon. member feels are most important. I do not see too much importance about them other than it gives me the opportunity to articulate and announce and tell the people of Newfoundland the great programmes we have.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. W.N. ROWE: I wonder, Sir, if the Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation is within earshot if he would not mind taking his seat because I have one or two questions to ask him. He does not seem to be around, Sir, so I will have to -

MR. NEARY: Ask the Premier.

MR. W.N. ROWE: - direct my questions to the -

MR. NEARY: Premier.

MR. W.N. ROWE: No, I will not bother with the Premier today, he seems to be shellshocked from his return to the Province yesterday. I will leave him alone today, let him relax. I will have to ask the question, Sir, of the former Minister of Recreation and Rehabilitation, now the Minister of Health, since the information I require concerns his tenure in that office.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. HICKMAN: There was a rule by Mr. Speaker Jerome very recently in the House of Commons

MR. W.N. ROWE: On that point, Sir, I am going to ask the minister certain questions which concern the government as a whole and his office as Minister of Health. They are broad questions, Mr. Speaker. If, as and when the Minister of Recreation and Rehabilitation gets the courage to come in and sit down I will direct some of the specific questions which I have to him. But in the meantime, Sir, perhaps the House Leader opposite would do me the courtesy of hearing my question to see whether it is out of order or not, if Your Honour would allow that.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. House Leader.

MR. HICKMAN: The only reason I rose on the point of order is that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition will recall, in the preface to his question, which he said he had hoped to ask the hon. Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation, that he would now direct these questions to the Minister of Health with respect to his tenure of office in that portfolio. And that was made very clear in the preamble to the hon. Leader's question.

MR. NEARY: You should have let the hon. member finish.

MR. HICKMAN: And if that is the case then maybe Your Honour will favour us with a ruling so that we will know how to proceed.

MR. NEARY: Well hear the question first.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) I think is on the same point of order.

MR. SIMMONS: To the specific point of order, Mr. Speaker, some of us are aware that Mr. Speaker Jerome did make that ruling. I think we are equally aware that we look to the precedents of the House of Commons only when there are not precedents in our own House to meet the requirement.

MR. HICKMAN: When our rules are silent.

MR. SIMMONS: And while our rules are silent, as the Government House Leader so well said, There are precedents, Mr. Speaker. Indeed we had one as recently as yesterday in this House where my colleague,

MR. SIMONS: the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) put a question to the present Minister of Tourism in relation to matters involving his former capacity as Minister of Transportation and also I recall one day last week -

MR. MORGAN: I refused to answer?

MR. SIMONS: Mr. Speaker, whether or not the minister refused to answer is not the point. My point is that there is a precedent where the Speaker of this House has allowed questions.

There was an example last week, again by way of example, where questions had been put to a minister in relation to his former capacity as a minister of another department.

I would maintain, Mr. Speaker, that the precedent is well established in this House and should be allowed to continue because it is an excellent practice and a good way of getting some information.

MR. SPEAKER: Actually on the point of order, it is I think to a large extent academic because I understood from the hon. Leader of the Opposition he was wishing to ask the hon. Minister of Health a question which he understood to be within his jurisdiction as Minister of Health. However, the point of order is there and should be dealt with. The hon. Government House Leader referred to a recent ruling of Mr. Speaker Jerome and I draw to the attention of hon. members section 178, page 152 Beauchesne, "Questions addressed to Ministers should relate to the public affairs with which they are officially connected," and that would tend to suggest the departments for which they are now responsible. The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir did refer to what he considered could be precedence for a contrary practice in this House. My understanding would be that the general rule is that ministers are responsible in questioning for the departments for which they are now responsible.

I do not deny that there may have been an exception or two to that somewhere along the line through an inadvertency on the

MR. SPEAKER: Chair's part, or an inadvertency on hon. members parts to bring it up to the House's attention. But I do not think an oversight establishes a precedent. If an hon. gentleman says something unparliamentary and nobody hears it or nobody brings it up it does not mean the day after the same thing would be parliamentary.

So I do think that in general our own practice will establish - there might be exceptions-but in general our practice will establish that ministers are responsible in question periods for the area of responsibility which they currently hold.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W.M. ROBE: I was hoping to let the Premier off the hook today, give him a little break, he has been in the Province for a day or so. So I am going to have to direct my question to him.

April 5, 1978

Tape 613

DW - 1

MR. W.N. ROWE: He cannot keep his colleague the Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation in the House -

MR. NEARY: He is out trying to get A.B. Walsh straightened out.

MR. W.N. ROWE: - so I will have to direct my question to him. I would ask the Premier what procedures his government has established for the appointment of people to such offices as administrator of government institutions such as children's homes, Exon House and that sort of thing, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: In all respect I will have to take that as notice and refer it to the minister if I can find him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, Oh!

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, serious matters are going on in our Province for which the Premier is responsible, the minister's are responsible. It is obvious what I am referring to. I want to ask the Premier how it is, Sir, that his administration permitted, through whatever procedures were in existence at the time, a gentleman such as this man Syrett, or whatever his name is, from Toronto, a self-confessed, by his own reported testimony, moral reprobate with a grade ten education to become the administrator of a House such as Exon House dealing with handicapped children, physically and mentally handicapped children? What procedures are followed by the administration to appoint people to those highly responsible positions?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, as soon as the minister can be found he will answer that. We were discussing it at lunch today and as a matter of fact he was saying at that time that in the case of Syrett, the unfortunate instance of Mr. Syrett being in Exon House, is that he did have grade thirteen education, that he had passed various courses, that he had been screened by people who were knowledgeable at that time in the appointment of such

PREMIER MOORES: people. That goes for national and provincial bodies who had been involved in the recommendations of people to be appointed to that sort of post. It obviously was not a wise decision for the also obvious reason. I think the situation is much better now. I am certainly not standing here in defence of Mr. Syrett, but I think as soon as the minister comes back he can give a complete detailed answer as to the methodology in which he was appointed.

MR. HICKMAN: I think he is in the building somewhere.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Let me also make quite clear, Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the present administrator, administratrix of Exon House is doing an excellent job and whatever procedures were used to appoint that lady must have been proper because she is doing an excellent job. What I want to know, Sir, from the Premier and the minister, wherever he might be, is does the government intend to conduct any kind of a public enquiry or investigation into the procedures followed by the government or boards or the institutions themselves which allow a gentleman such as the one we have referred to to bubble to the top and become the administrator in such a highly delicate responsible position as the administrator of Exon House? Is there going to be an enquiry, an investigation of a public nature in order to discover whether the procedures are correct or not?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: I have just been advised, Mr. Speaker, that he was employed through the Public Service Commission which is the normal way of doing it. But to answer the Leader of the Opposition's most recent question I would not see at this time, from the information I have, that there would be a specific enquiry into that because as the Leader of the Opposition knows there was a very comprehensive enquiry going on at the same time

April 5, 1978

Tape No. 613

JM - 3

PREMIER MOORES: as this sort of thing was taking place, particularly with the unfortunate death of the person who was in there just a few months ago. That enquiry covered a great many areas of concern and not just the administrator as such but the whole programme of rehabilitation of this sort of person and that report has been and it is being implemented as quickly as possible. We are also in consultation with various volunteer groups,

PREMIER MOORES: people who have concerns in this area, people who basically want to see rehabilitation of handicapped and other people carried out as quickly and as best as possible. And together with the report, together with the emphasis that is being put before it, plus the volunteer groups and the associations who are attached to this, hopefully, Sir, we will have the institution in exactly the form that we would all want it to be in.

MR. W. ROWE: A final supplementary, Sir, if I may.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. ROWE: Will the Premier or the minister tell us, whatever minister is responsible for the matter in the absence of the Minister of Recreation and Rehabilitation, will the Premier indicate, Sir, whether it is the government's intention to set up different procedures for positions which go beyond the mere Civil Service, the public service jobs which are found in this building and other government buildings, is going to look into the possibility of setting different procedures when the responsibility for handicapped people, young people, delinquent people for example, immature people, people who can be easily victimized and therefore there is a question of high moral standard involved in the interference or conduct of other people's lives? Is the government intending to set up different guidelines, different procedures to make sure that the likes of this gentleman or anyone like him is not in a position where he can take a culpable advantage of his position, and to make sure that such people do have high moral standards with a proven record of high moral standards in their past history.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. COLLINS: The hon. Leader of the Opposition knows and all other hon. members of this House, one of the first reforms which were brought about by this administration was the establishment of a completely autonomous independent public service commission. That was one of the first reforms, Mr. Speaker, which was brought in by this government and applauded by members opposite because

MR. COLLINS: they wanted to get in on what they thought was a good concept.

Now, Mr. Speaker, is the Leader of the Opposition now suggesting that we go back to the whole principle of employing people depending upon the way they voted, upon the party they support?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! I must point out that the rules with respect to both questions and answers are similar in that they preclude debate and also preclude unnecessary preamble. The only information to be given in a question should be enough to make the question intelligible.

The hon. member for LaPoile, a supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to, Sir, ask the Minister of Recreation and Rehabilitation if he has ordered an investigation into one of the facts that arose from this situation involving the administrator and that is in regard to the admission of a young girl to Exon House who was not considered to be mentally retarded. Could the minister explain how that happened, how a young girl would be admitted to an institution like Exon House who was not mentally or physically handicapped?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Recreation and Rehabilitation.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I think first of all we should clear the air on one thing and that is that the statement has never been made categorically that upon the time of admission that that child was not retarded. There is a lot of supposition that might be directed in that area but that statement has never been made by any medical doctor. Let me as quickly as I can inform the House of the system which is used for admitting children to Exon House. It is a committee system which is made up of a doctor well qualified in her field. It is made up of representation from the department, from the two institutions which the department has control over with regards to mental retardation, namely, Exon House and the Children's Home. The admissions are made after investigation and based upon

April 5, 1973

Tape No. 614

JM - 3

MR. HICKEY: three areas - one, the degree of retardation as determined by a medical examination of doctors.
case three different doctors

MR. HICKEY: - in this particular case three different doctors - based upon the behavioural pattern and problems of the child and based upon the ability or inability of the family to care for that child in relation to those behavioural problems.

The case in point; this girl was examined by three doctors over a period of time from late 1970 to 1973. The first by a psychiatrist, showing an I.Q. of fifty, the second by a medical doctor, well regarded and well respected in the area, showing the child to be retarded, a degree of retardation, thirdly by another psychiatrist showing an I.Q. of forty-five, subsequently by the doctor who sits on the Committee and who acts on the Committee for admissions to the home and her diagnosis indicating an I.Q. in the low fifties. Based on that the child was admitted, taking into account all the pertinent information and especially the situation in the home, namely the inability of the family, the parents to cope with the behavioural problems of the girl.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary and then I recognize the hon. member for Burgoo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the information the hon. gentleman just gave the House is merely hearsay. Obviously the hon. gentleman did not read the evidence that came out in the court. I think I saw in one of the statements where the I.Q. of the girl was eighty-five.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Dr. Pryse-Phillips said that.

MR. NEARY: And this was by Dr. Pryse-Phillips.

Sir, the hon. minister merely said that the young lady had seen three doctors, two psychiatrists and one medical doctor. That does not prove a thing, Sir. The question I am asking the minister, that obviously - and from the minister's answer by the way, I have gathered that this young lady should not have been in. I do not know whether the minister - the minister gave a very weak answer. The young lady should not have been in Exon House. And what I am asking the minister

MR. NEARY: is this, What pressures were used? Were there any pressures? Were there any political pressures? Was there any member of the government used any pressure on the administration of Exon House to get this young lady admitted to Exon House? That is really what I am getting at.

The minister can give me all the hearsay evidence he wants but I really think there should be an investigation into this. It would appear that there was pressure of some kind and I would like to find out if it was political pressure and from where it came.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I remind my hon. friend that he is quoting me inaccurately when he says I gave hearsay information. What I have given the House today are facts. He is the one who deals in hearsay, not me. We can go back a long way and demonstrate how my hon. friend deals in hearsay and how we have proven that you know through commissions of one kind and another.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I would ask the hon. gentleman to confine his remarks to the irony of the question.

MR. HICKEY: Your Honour, I thank you very much. I am drawing on all the patience and strength within me to stick right to the point. It is very difficult.

MR. NEARY: A.B. Walsh is worrying the hon. gentleman.

MR. HICKEY: I have not, Mr. Speaker, in any way indicated that the child should not have been admitted to Exon House. In fact, I will make the statement right now that based on the best information that is available in this Province, based on assessment at the time by people who certainly do not come into question, whose abilities and whose experience as medical doctors are not called into question, based on that evidence that child was admitted to Exon House and, in fact, should have been. There was no other place for the child to be placed, number one.

Number two, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman talks about admitting the girl as if just because today that child, that

MR. HICKEY: young lady has improved to a great degree as a result, Mr. Speaker, as a result of a programme that we are very, very proud of on this side of the House, a training programme.

MR. NEARY: But I opened it.

MR. HICKEY: The hon. gentleman opened a hospital, and nothing more, to have the retarded children of this Province put in a hospital and kept there. Mr. Speaker, the people who introduced the training programme -

MR. MORGAN: This administration.

MR. HICKEY: - who turned around Exon House as a training programme, as a transient institution so that those children who are retarded may reach new heights in their development taking their place in society, there is no doubt about what administration done that, it happens to be this one.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, finally, hon. gentlemen must understand that when a child, and it takes no medical doctor to understand that, surely goodness

Mr. Hickey: anyone who has dealt with retarded children or retarded adults knows this full well, that when a child is assessed based on an I.Q. or to establish an I.Q., a pertinent part of the results of that test is based on the environment in which that child was living, the ability or inability of the parents to cope with the child which may allow the child to function at 100 per cent capacity or 80 per cent or 50 per cent capacity. This young lady could not function at 100 per cent capacity. And any doctor in the land will tell you that based on that situation that child had an I.Q. of 50 or 45 at that particular time, given the right set of circumstances, given training, given the property environment her I.Q. improved. Does the hon. gentleman want to challenge that?

MR. NEARY: Yes, I do.

MR. HICKEY: If he does, let him challenge it with the doctors, the medical profession.

MR. DINN: We do not need a Mifflin report to prove this.

MR. SPEAKER: I have indicated I will recognize the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir next. I can see that it is a matter of extreme importance in which hon. members are very interested. I certainly do not wish to prejudice the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir the right to ask questions either, so I think I will say I will allow one more and then I will go to the other hon. gentleman. That will not preclude other hon. members to come back to the subject after. This will be the final one before a new subject.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if this young lady was as mentally retarded as the hon. minister is leading the House to believe - and, Sir, I am sure the psychiatrists and the medical doctors will be interested in hearing that you can raise an I.Q. you can train people.

AN HON. MEMBER: You can. Of course, you can.

MR. NEARY: You can? Well then it is about time we started trying to raise the I.Q. of hon. gentlemen.

MR. HICKEY: You would never do it with the hon. gentleman.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the hon. gentleman under what authority and on whose instructions was this young lady put out to live in the administrator's house? Who was responsible for that? Is that aspect of it being investigated? Who authorized it? Did the administrator do it himself? Was there a board? Was there a consultation with Dr. Browne? Was there consultation with anybody? That is a very important fact and should that fact not be investigated?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, one can go on on the subject and make irresponsible statements that the hon. gentleman is alluding to. That girl was placed in that home in full concert with the people in that institution, a social worker, the administrator himself -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKEY: - the department. Hon. gentlemen can snicker all they like. Let them remember - and this is in no way condoning the incident which has happened "there but for the grace of God go I." Easy for them to poke fun now and snicker all they like, but let them. Mr. Speaker, the girl was placed -

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. NOLAN: I think it is very important, Mr. Speaker, that we clear up the fact that the minister has now apparently attempted to imply that gentlemen opposite are poking fun at a very sad and unfortunate situation. I mean these are the words of the hon. -

MR. MORGAN: That is the Opposition poking fun, nobody else.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I ask that this be withdrawn because no such fun in any way was ever intended.

MR. MORGAN: No?

MR. NOLAN: No, it was not. Not by anyone on this side of the House.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Who is the hon. gentleman referring to?

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make the point of order without interruption.

MR. NEARY: Who is the hon. gentleman referring to? Where are your guts? Who was the hon. gentleman referring to?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Has the hon. gentleman completed his point of order?

MR. NOLAN: No.

MR. SPEAKER: I would ask him to complete the point of order.

MR. NOLAN: It is difficult, Mr. Speaker, as I am sure you will appreciate. Mr. Speaker, the point of order seriously is that the minister has attempted, wittingly or unwittingly, to imply motives to members opposite, that they are poking fun at a very sad and unfortunate situation. This is not so and we demand a retraction.

Mr. Speaker. It is as simple as that.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation.

MR. HICKEY: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. That is not a point of order and the hon. gentleman is well aware of the fact. He is just drawing attention to it and that is all he can do is draw attention to it under the disguise of a point of order. There is no point of order. I have not indicated in any way that my hon. friend across is poking fun at that situation. What the hon. gentleman is attempting to do, and what

MR. HICKMAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN:

To that point of privilege. Your Honour ruled yesterday on exactly the same situation where a point of order was raised and the Chair dealt with the point of order and disposed of it and then some hon. gentleman rose on a question of privilege; and Your Honour will recall that the decision was that when a point of order has been disposed of it cannot be raised again under the guise of a question of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:

As I understand it, and my ruling was I did not hear anything which appeared to me to be an imputation of motive. Now, obviously, when I have an opportunity to see the Hansard or to hear the tape, if there is something there which is an imputation of motive then I will be in a position to deal with it, and I understand from hon. gentlemen to my right that that is their position.

AN HON. MEMBER:

As you would a point of order?

MR. SPEAKER:

Well, I think we will leave it at that until I have an opportunity really to see what has been said or to hear what has been said. My ruling is that from what I heard there was no imputation of motive.

MR. NEARY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HICKEY:

Privilege takes precedence.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! I think we may be getting into an unnecessary procedural anomaly. My ruling was that I was not aware of anything that was said which was an imputation of motive or base motive, unavowed motive on the part of the hon. minister. The hon. Leader of the Opposition then gave notice that he thought that the record would show there was, and when we have an opportunity to see the record or hear the record we will be able to deal with the situation in a concrete manner. Now, obviously, there is nothing anybody can do.

MR. HICKEY:

Mr. Speaker, if you are -

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman is up on a point of order. The hon. gentleman to my left is up on what?

MR. HICKEY: Your Honour, I was just trying to be helpful with regards to the point of privilege raised by the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps this matter will clarify itself if we allow the hon. gentleman to the left to -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: It may, I do not know.

MR. NEARY: If the hon. gentleman wants to apologize -

MR. HICKEY: I am not going to apologize, Mr. Speaker, I have nothing to apologize for. I am quite prepared, and I have very clear recollection and know precisely what I said. If the hon. gentleman opposite wants me to repeat what I said, I will gladly repeat it, okay?

MR. SPEAKER: Okay.

MR. HICKEY: He asked me by whom was the girl admitted to the home - not the Exon House but the foster home. And I went on to state who approved of that placement,

MR. HICKEY: I included the Administrator. And when I included the Administrator, the hon. gentlemen opposite said, "Oh yes, we know."

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. HICKEY: And began to smile. And I said, You can poke all the fun or laugh all you like, but this is a very serious situation and you should not make irresponsible statements. Namely the irresponsible statements are, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Well actually -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Actually that Hansard or that type can be located very quickly and it would appear to be the best way to dispose of it as we will adjourn, hopefully for no longer than five minutes, and continue what is left of the Question Period thereafter.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Hon. members will recall that the ruling was that what I heard or did not hear, from what I heard there was nothing unparliamentary. Actually by way of aside although it is related to it, this does show the advisability of having the process like they do have in the House of Commons where, apart from the transcription recording, everything is taken in shorthand and one can have it ten seconds after; however, because we do not have that then obviously these situations arise where it is necessary to adjourn and hear the tapes. It is impossible when there are a number of people interjecting and debate gets heated to hear everything.

I have however heard the tape and there was a remark there, quoting directly by the hon. gentleman to my left, "It is easy for them to poke fun and snicker all they like." Given the delicacy and seriousness of the subject matter under discussion - I think these matters have to be applied in their context. We are not discussing the fishery or discussing agriculture or forestry,

MR. SPEAKER: - given the delicacy of the events under discussion I think one could reasonably assume that to be an imputation of motive. There are arguments to the contrary as well; obviously there are arguments to the contrary. One can say, No. One can say it was a difference of opinion, you know, Did people snicker? Did they not snicker? And one could resolve it that way. It is an area where personal judgement has to be used. And in the context, given the seriousness of the events, then the reasonable and appropriate thing would be for the hon. minister to withdraw those remarks and then having done that I obviously would allow him to continue his answer. I will then recognize the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons). I will do that even though his time is, strictly speaking up, because I did give him an assurance that I would recognize him having allowed an additional supplementary. So I call upon the hon. minister.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, out of respect for Your Honour and the rules and traditions of this House, if my remarks impugn wrong motives -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. HICKEY: Are you going to listen? I might change my mind, you know.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! I do think you should let the hon. member continue. He has not completed a sentence yet.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, may I be heard in silence? Put a button on your mouth for a few minutes, if you can.

MR. NEARY: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. I have sat here, Your Honour, and I have not said a word, Your Honour, not a word. I am just sitting here listening to the hon. gentleman. Somebody to my right -

MR. HICKEY: That is the hon. gentleman's problem, even when he is in his seat he cannot keep his mouth shut.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! It is necessary to dispose of this matter. The decision has been made and I would ask hon. gentlemen

MR. SPEAKER: on both sides not to intervene or to interrupt and I believe-I have no way of knowing-that the hon. gentleman, knowing him as I do, will certainly comply with the request of the Chair and that will dispose of the matter.

MR. HICKEY: Thank you, Your Honour. I started to make my statement of withdrawal. I will try again now.

Out of respect for Your Honour and the rules and traditions of this House, if my remarks impugned wrong motives on the part of the hon. gentleman then I withdraw them and in doing so I make the assumption that the snickering that went on at the time was because of the fine weather outside.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman has withdrawn from the statement and added a sort of gratuitous remark, but I do not think it affects the withdrawal of the statements.

Does the hon. gentleman wish to complete his answer?

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to just repeat what I said, that there is no question whatsoever in terms of the admission of this girl to that foster home. It was approved by all parties concerned which are normally used to give such approvals for placements in foster homes of this kind.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir and I will not be able to allow any supplementaries.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I want to put a question on one of the same subjects to the Minister of Recreation and Rehabilitation or, if it is in order, to the Minister of Health. I will direct it in the first instance to the Minister of Recreation and Rehabilitation. I want to come back to the matter of the appointment of the former administrator, not the present one, and raise the question to the minister of whether or not - perhaps I should also preambule by saying that it has been pointed out in the House by the Premier today that it was a Public Service Commission appointment. With that in mind, would the minister indicate whether the department was involved in any way in the appointment? Did the department approve of the appointment? Is it correct to assume that there was at least one representative of the department on the selection committee? And related, was the position publicly advertised? And was there more than one applicant for the position? And in view of the circumstances which have become public knowledge in the past few days, is the minister now prepared to agree to a full public enquiry to determine whether the appointment was decided in a dispassionate way as we have been led to believe in this House today or whether in fact there were some other considerations, perhaps political pressure or personal influence?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Recreation and Rehabilitation.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I want to answer and state categorically that the appointment of this gentleman to the post of administrator of Exon House was above board from start to finish. The applications, I do not know how many were received by the Public Service Commission but I know that three recommendations came back from the Public Service Commission. The gentleman in question who was appointed was number one on the list. The Public Service Commission have that gentleman rated as having an education of grade thirteen. The gentleman took a number of courses, three or four different courses in hospital administration, attaining a mark of three out of a class of, I believe, seventy-one; rated by the departmental staff during his administration of being very satisfactory in terms of the administration of that home; rated by the National Institute for Mental Retardation when they did the assessment on that institution as being a competent administrator. To my knowledge one member of my staff sat on the selection board. The interviews were conducted and the gentleman was head and shoulders over anybody else who was interviewed. The decision was unanimous as to who was number one on the list and then the decision was unanimous that number one was in fact to be accepted and placed. Now, what else can I say? I do not know anything about this suggestion of the grade ten education if in fact it was made. If it was made by the gentleman I do not have the foggiest notion how or why he made it. But one fact is -

MR. NEARY: You should read the paper.

MR. HICKEY: Read the paper? I read the paper and unfortunately I have to read some of that garbage that comes from the hon. gentleman. Mr. Speaker, the -

AN HON. MEMBER: Have an enquiry and clear it up.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, there is no basis for an enquiry. This is what I am getting to in response to the question by the hon. gentleman from Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir. If he refers to something in the paper which calls for an enquiry, does that mean we all rush out

MR. HICKEY: and announce an enquiry? The answer is no. Obviously there is no basis for an enquiry. As far as the records of my department are concerned, as far as the records that the Public Service Commission are concerned this gentleman had a grade thirteen education, was well qualified for his post and not only that, Mr. Speaker, but I think this is the overriding point, while in his post as an administrator carried out his duties in a most competent fashion. That being assessed by the people visiting the institution from my department who were in a supervisory, overseeing capacity and further substantiated by an independent organization such as the National Association of Mental Retardation who indicates clearly the gentleman to be a competent administrator.

What is there to inquiry into?

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER: It being Private Members Day, the adjourned debate on Motion 6. The debate was adjourned by the hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I want to give my support to this motion, this magnanimous motion, this rather big motion. I am glad to be associated with this motion. I am glad to be associated with the party that proposed it, that initiated it, and the party that got this motion on the Order Paper, the party of the people, Mr. Speaker, the party with vision and foresight and insight, the party concerned with unifying and developing every region of this Province, a party that is devoted to reducing conflict and friction and misunderstanding among the people of different regions of this Province particularly as they relate to the Island part of this Province and Labrador; a party that is devoted to promoting harmony and unity among its people and a party that is devoted to regional equity and insuring as much as possible that every area in this Province where there are developments of our natural resources that these areas get the maximum return from the developments that take place within their areas, that the people in these areas get maximum returns from the developments of whatever projects, whatever resources there may be in these particular areas.

This is the thrust of the motion, Mr. Speaker, the maximum development of the resources of Labrador with the maximum returns to the people of Labrador and to the people of this Province and to provide the proper infrastructure for the development of the resources of Labrador, such as transportation, and in this the motion refers to establishing a port, Port Labrador, and the railroad system that will connect this port with other areas of Labrador and with Central Canada, and the road system. I suppose the motion has built in it really, the expansion of the existing systems there, the railway system that now comes to Esker and a road system that is partially complete - expansion to these existing systems of transportation - and then the developing and processing within Labrador of its hydro energy and other natural resources for the benefit of Labrador and the rest of the people in this Province. Such, Mr. Speaker, sorry to say, has not been the case with previous developments in Labrador. Far too few people from the Island part

MR. LUSH: of the Province and fewer still from Labrador have really reaped the maximum benefits from the developments that have previously gone on within Labrador.

And this is what this motion is calling for, that we develop to the maximum potential the resources that are in Labrador, the considerable resources, for the benefit of the people there and for this Province.

If I might be permitted, Mr. Speaker, just to digress for a moment and speak of my experiences in Churchill to point out how it was that people from the Island and people from Labrador did not get maximum returns from the most obvious, and that is in the working with respect to the creation of jobs. Now I realize this is difficult to do. We have talked here of giving our people, Newfoundlanders and our Labradorians, preferential treatment with respect to any jobs in this Province. I know it is difficult to be able to carry this thing out according to the letter of the law, because there are so many loopholes, there are so many ways that companies can duck out from under various regulations, but this was one of the most offensive things that I found, Mr. Speaker, when I was in Churchill Falls for five years, to see the number of jobs that were being performed by non-Newfoundlanders, non-Labradorians,

MR. LUSH:

people that did not belong to this Province. And I am not speaking, Mr. Speaker, about jobs that required a high degree of skill or high degree of expertise. I was very flexible about this, had an open mind to these kinds of positions. But, Mr. Speaker, from time to time I would roam around the various construction sites and look at the number of people who were there from outside of Newfoundland and Labrador and it would just baffle a person to look at the numbers of people involved in labour work, involved in operating heavy equipment, not the highly technical heavy equipment, backhoes and bulldozers and this sort of thing, people that were not Newfoundlanders. To visit the catering people there and to see again the number of chefs and the number of whatever - I called them cookees, there is another terminology for them now I suppose - second cooks and this sort of thing, to see the number of people there again who were not Newfoundlanders and Labradorians. And I know that the government of the day tried to deal with the situation. The number of students that came in in the Summer, again the large number of students, or to put it another way, the few students that came from this Province. There is no question, Mr. Speaker, that there was discrimination against our people, no question at all. And I would hope - pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: It is a problem.

MR. LUSH: That is right. Exactly. I know that it is a difficult situation to control. I know that. But, Mr. Speaker, in carrying out the plan of this motion I would hope that we could come up with some legislation that would have some teeth to it and minimize this sort of thing, to maximize the number of Newfoundlanders there in as much as possible.

I do not want to bore the House with the kinds of examples that I am quoting but some are important, I think. I remember on one occasion when I moved in that there were a number of people there, supposedly carpenters, levelling up trailers, no carpentry work, levelling

MR. LUSH:

them up, just putting trailers into the sites allocated and levelling them up. Now there is not a Newfoundlander alive but can do that. Again the few Newfoundlanders were there was annoying to me and I looked into the situation. I made it my business. This was back in 1968, whenever the project started. I made it my business to look into the situation and was told that a requisition was sent out to Canada Manpower for twenty carpenters and they could only find five. That was all they got. I did some further investigation, Mr. Speaker, to find out by the time the requisition was at Canada Manpower what they were asking for was twenty finished carpenters. Now I do not know how that happens, how the requisition gets changed, how Manpower get that information but it was not finished carpenters they were looking for - people to level up trailers, they were not carpenters at all. But this is what the requisition asked for, twenty finished carpenters. I can relate dozens of examples, Mr. Speaker, of certain job requirements which were beefed up, were made sophisticated, almost -

AN HON. MEMBER: These were not forty hour a week jobs.

MR. LUSH: Pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: These were not jobs like they are today, forty hour a week jobs. They were sixty, seventy, eighty hour a week jobs.

MR. LUSH: Oh, sure. Right. No question.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. LUSH: Right. I mentioned those points, Mr. Speaker, just to illustrate the kinds of things that can go on and realising the difficulty that there is in forcing or bringing into effect a kind of legislation that would ensure that our people, that our Newfoundlanders and that our Labradorians were given the jobs for which they qualify. Certainly we must have that kind of legislation. But I realize that it is difficult to enforce. But we must have some monitoring agency to check these matters out and as they now exist in Labrador.

I think the Bartlett Enquiry certainly verified that there was and that there is discrimination against Newfoundland, unfair hiring practices, they referred to it as,

MR. LUSH: by certain companies. Right. And again I realize, as I have said before, the difficulty in trying to eliminate this situation but this is a question that I am going to deal with at a later date and actually get some information from the minister as to what precisely is happening with respect to this Bartlett enquiry, whether the minister is going to wait until the recommendations are implemented or whether there is something he is doing now. I do believe that he has made some efforts but as I say I am going to bring that up at a later date.

Mr. Speaker, I speak on this motion because I do have an intense feeling for Labrador. One does not spend six years in Labrador without getting some intense feeling for Labrador land and for its people, particularly in the kind of work in which I was engaged, teaching, teaching students, teaching people from Labrador, teaching people from Coastal Labrador, young people and adults, meeting people from all parts of Labrador and discussing with them their problems and discussing with them their aims and their desires for the development of that great land. Neither can a person work in a place like Churchill Falls for five years, rubbing shoulders with the engineers and the scientists that were there, people in very skilled positions, mixing with them and talking to them, without having some knowledge of the magnitude of that great development. Meeting all the people associated with the job, people in Brinco, Sir Val Duncan, Mr. Mulholland, Mr. Lambert, all of the big people, the men of skill, some of them engineers, some of them scientists, some of them financial experts, and meeting with these people from time to time, as I said before -

AN HON. MEMBER: The same situation.

MR. LUSH: - the same situation - one could not, Mr. Speaker, spend five years there associating with these people, without having some knowledge of the immensity of this job to which I referred yesterday, and also I might tell the hon. member I spent two summers in Labrador City, a Summer student employee, and I enjoyed it immensely.

MR. LUSH: I went there, I do not know what I was called, I went working with the horticulturalist?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. LUSH: I went working with him first, doing the lawns. So all of these lawns on that main street that runs in front of the cafeteria, I do not know what it is called now, I helped to put in the lawns there and the grass seed and all as it was but before I left I got promoted to a shovel oiler and that is what I was in my second Summer there, a shovel oiler, out in the Smallwood mine.

So I have spent almost a total, Sir, of five and a half years really, five years in Churchill and two Summers in Labrador City. And thus I have an intense feeling for Labrador, an appreciation of its people and their problems. So I speak to this motion with some degree of sincerity.

I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, the vastness of the job at Churchill and I do that because somewhere in this motion it mentions - and if I had a copy of it - it mentions, "Now be it therefore resolved that this hon. House urges the provincial government to commence immediate negotiations with the federal government designed to bring about the bold creative economic strategy of developing and processing within Labrador, its natural resources and raw materials." It is bold strategy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have precedent for this

MR. LUSH: in the formation of Brinco. This was a bold policy. In view of the tremendous amount of money that was needed to do that particular job, just about \$1 billion, in view of the kind of technology that was involved, Brinco, which was the company formed to bring together the finances and the people, the skills and the expertise necessary to do this job, was a bold venture to say the least.

Brinco, a syndicate of companies, of some of the largest companies in the world that at the time of their formation controlled \$20 billion of the resources of this world. \$20 billion. Now, Mr. Speaker, here was brought together something unparalleled almost in modern times, this big company, this syndicate of some of the world's largest companies to carry on the development of Labrador because it was not only to develop the hydro power, they also were employed to look into the mineral situation in Labrador, and we got Brinnex responsible for exploring in Labrador and for development of minerals. But the big achievement of Brinco was the completion of the Churchill Falls. And as I suggested, Mr. Speaker, my five years there certainly taught me and informed me of the tremendous accomplishment that this was. I have driven over every inch of road there, visited every major site, all the dams and all the structures, driven from Churchill to Sail Lake, Northerly from Churchill to Lake Gabbro, from Churchill to Lobstick and from Churchill to Esker, from Churchill to Ossokmuan, and fished every pond that was worth fishing and areas no doubt that the hon. member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) is aware of there.

AN HON. MEMBER: Did you do any fishing while you were up there?

MR. NEARY: Did the hon. member do any work when he was down there?

MR. LUSH: All kinds, Sir, but you had lots of leisure time, lots of leisure time in Churchill Falls. In the North you gets lots of leisure time. And I caught some great fish.

MR. NEARY: That is why they have large families down there.

MR. LUSH: Navigated the Churchill River, the big Churchill River for sixty miles, up to Disaster Rapids that no doubt the hon. member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) has heard about.

AN HON. MEMBER:

MR. LUSH: Disaster Rapids.

MR. W.N. ROWE: The former Premier, like the Smallwood -

MR. LUSH: And watched, Mr. Speaker, the gradual change as the rivers, as all of the waters were diverted to run into the power house area, and watched the Smallwood reservoir gradually fill up, that huge man-made lake, the third largest man-made lake in the whole world I think, that is where all the water is stored to the power house. But I believe it is the third largest man-made lake in the world. I think there is one in Central America somewhere, maybe one in, I just forget where. I think it is in Ghana maybe, but I am not sure on that. But it is the third.

I use that, Mr. Speaker, to illustrate that that was a bold plan. That was a bold plan and that was a large, magnanimous development, this undertaking by Brinco that established the example that this can

MR. LUSH: be done and in view of the previous developments in Labrador that there is no question that I believe that with some energy and with some effort that we can approach the objective and the purpose of this motion, to develop the tremendous and the considerable resources of Labrador, the hydro, a fantastic amount of power still to be harnessed in Labrador in the Lower Churchill and the other rivers, fantastic the opportunity that is there for the people of this Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. And, Mr. Speaker, no effort can be spared in developing that vast hydro resource that can change the entire economy of this province. I think this can be done. The precedent has been set. The example has been given and we can do it, I think, and then the vast mineral resource - I know we are into a little world slump at this moment with respect to demand of mineral resources but I am sure that that is going to cure itself in a short while and when it does we can get on to developing the vast potential, the vast mineral potential in Labrador, the iron ore and uranium and other minerals that we know are in Labrador and in abundance the vast forest potential.

Many people, Mr. Speaker, fail to realize the vast forest potential of Labrador around the Lake Melville area and Sandwich Bay, great stands of timber there. Some of it is cut and in the woods now lying there and rotting, I understand, as a result of the close down of the Labrador Linerboard, wood that was cut and never got moved out of the woods, thousands and thousands of cords. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is an unfortunate situation and we hope that something could be done to salvage that wood and to get it harvested so that the people of Labrador can get some returns from what has happened there. But there are still vast, huge timber stands in that area of Lake Melville and Sandwich Bay and certainly there must be some plan that we can come up with to develop the forest industry for the people of Labrador. The resource is there. It is not something we do not know about, Mr. Speaker. We can see it. It is there standing right in front of our eyes, a vast resource.

MR. LUSH: The fisheries still can be made a major industry in Labrador. This summer we got treated to the smoked artic char and that was delicious and the smoked salmon. I do not know who was responsible but I hope they can get some more for us next summer. It was delicious.

AN HON. MEMBER: The whole Department of Fisheries got it.

MR. LUSH: Did they? It was delicious stuff and I hope that we can get some more. But the vast potential here, Mr. Speaker, as indicated in that effort, smoking artic char and the salmon.

Also of course we never talk of tourist development for Labrador because of the difficulty of getting there. Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that there are people here who would go through a lot of expense to get down in Labrador and catch the kind of fish that are down there, the trout and the kind of hunting that is there, fantastic. Gas and oil, well the government has been making plans for gas and oil for future development. As I intimated yesterday, we on this side of the House, all of us, are in agreement with the plans that will ensure the maximum development of any resource that is in this province.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, that is down the road, as the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Peckford) is so prone to say, down the road. I only wish it were a little closer to us. I hope down the road that we do find quantities of oil. I hope that we do come up with the technology that will allow us to get that oil without any destruction to the environment, to the marine life, and I am concerned. I certainly hope, am living in the hope that we are going to find oil there. But, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about now too because I have listed off the natural resources that there is no speculation about, that we are not dreaming about that are there for the development, the hydro development and the minerals and the fish and the forestry. They are all there. And that is not at all to make any derogatory remarks about the minister's activity with respect to his gas and oil plans and regulations, none at all. But I think we have got to be concerned with what we now have there and make the maximum effort and take the energy to see that these is developed in accordance with this motion.

The minister mentioned about the Greeks knowing about inflation. Well Aesop, that great fable writer knew something about wealth and natural resources. He said that wealth unused might as well not exist. So I would hope that we would develop the resources that we have and -

AN HON. MEMBER: That is a fable.

MR. LUSH: No, that is no fable. Aesop had some very good views on development, really. So it is no fable that, Mr. Speaker, no fable at all. I think what we have to do, Mr. Speaker, is to put together this plan to develop the resources of Labrador in a way that is going to be beneficial, in a way that we are going to reap the maximum returns for the people and for the people of Labrador and for our own people.

We have mentioned in this House so often the need, the desire by all of us to bring Labrador into the mainstream of the political and the economic life of this Province. I think, Mr. Speaker,

MR. LUSH:

we have proposed a plan, a plan if followed will change drastically the standard of living of the people, not only of Labrador but of this entire Province. I think the onus is upon the government to see to it that this is not only a plan on paper, as good as it is, but that some positive action is taken to develop that wealth. If the minister does not like Aesop's philosophy, John F. Kennedy, the former President of the United States said, "Wealth is the means and the people are the ends. All our material riches will avail us little if we do not use them to expand the opportunities of our people."

Mr. - Pardon?

MR. PECKFORD: The citation.

MR. LUSH: The citation. That is from, Sir, I Chose Canada.

MR. PECKFORD: I always knew that the Bolshevik Army had their eyes on Kennedy.

MR. LUSH: Pardon?

MR. PECKFORD: I always knew that the Bolshevik Army had their eyes on Kennedy.

MR. LUSH: That is not its original citation. Its original citation comes from Profiles in Courage by Kennedy himself. But it is a secondary - I do not know. I should recall, though, because I have read the book several times. I should recall. I was

MR. LUSH: just kidding around with the minister, I thought that he might believe that it did, indeed, come from I Chose Canada, Profiles in Courage, Sir, and again I would like for the minister to hear that, "Wealth is the means, people are the ends", that all our material riches will avail little if we do not use them to expand the opportunities of our people. And that is what this motion is asking for, Mr. Speaker, that we develop the natural resources of Labrador to provide a better standard of living for our people, to provide them with a better opportunity. That is what the main thrust of this motion is asking. And as I said, I hope that it becomes more than just a motion on an Order Paper, something that we all support, and I understand that this is going to receive the support of both sides of the House, which is certainly a good thing, and it shows, I think, the real concern maybe of all members for the concern with Labrador and the development of that great land, a land of vast potential. But I hope it gets further than the Order Paper. We have one part of it solved really - one part of the motion is solved, because this principle, this philosophy is accepted by the federal Liberal Party, accepted at a recent convention, so we have got that part - they are sold on this, they are committed to it. So we have the first part of the resolution over which says 'approaching the federal government' - we have that part done for the government almost -

MR. HICKMAN: The Liberal Party (inaudible) alter its course (inaudible)

government does not and that is the difference, a big difference.

AN HON. MEMBER: A big difference.

MR. LUSH: I do not know what they now do, but I think as a result of our presentation at that convention there is no question about it that they have accepted this proposal in total, so now the provincial government have the first hurdle over with. All they now have to do is to take some initiative themselves.

So, Mr. Speaker, I just want to finish

MR. LUSH: by saying that I hope that this becomes more than a motion on an Order Paper. I hope it takes some form of action, some tangible plan, some policy that we will see initiated in the near future and hope that this will become the starting point of a great master plan for the development of Labrador, the resources of Labrador, the considerable resources of Labrador, so that its people and our people, the people of Labrador and the people of this Province will reap maximum returns. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I only have a few words to say. First of all, this resolution, certainly the operative part of this resolution, can be supported, brought in by the Leader of the Opposition. Although I re-echo what the previous speaker, the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) has said, I hope it becomes more than a motion on the Order Paper, because it is going to need more than just the words that are here, and I hope that it is merely not just going to serve to foster high hopes in Labrador that are not realized and that these hopes indeed become in vain. But there is a part of the resolution, Mr. Speaker, that I do not feel belongs in it and the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, I would hope, would agree with it, because certainly it is very unprecedented to bring in a motion of this nature containing the second recital. And I think when it was brought in, as all of these motions are, on a Private Members' Motion, that perhaps the Leader of the Opposition did not at the time figure that there was going to be the unanimous consent that this resolution may get

MR. MARSHALL:

and he put in a prong for his own party in there. But it is unprecedented, as I say, and I do not really think that it really belongs in a resolution and surely a government is not going to accept a resolution referring to the National Convention of the Liberal Party any more than really they should accept a resolution, the National Convention of the P.C. Party or the National Convention of the New Democratic Party. The resolution can stand on its own as it is without detracting from the recital. But the fact of the matter is that this recital which says that, "Whereas at a recent National Convention of the Liberal Party from which the Federal Government of Canada is now formed there is unanimous support for a resolution presented by the Newfoundland and Labrador delegation advancing the idea of developing and processing within Labrador of its hydro energy and any other natural resources for the benefit of Labrador and the rest of the Province rather than exporting the hydro power and other resources as raw materials for the use of industries elsewhere."

Now I find myself, particularly I find that that recital does not, I believe, belong in this resolution because it is going to be used for political purposes. It is quite obvious it was. The member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) who has just spoken, who is one of the less political, if I may say, in the sense he is one of the less political people in the legislature itself - he does not engage in partisan political chat back and forth and argument back and forth as some others of us do, you know, from time to time. He indicated what is going to be done with this particular resolution just before he sat down. He said, "We have got the first part done." You know, the Liberal Party has the first part done for the government and as a result of our proposal we have had, you know, in effect a giant step forward and all the government need do is just follow our lead. We have got the first part over, he said, and all the government has got to do is follow it through. Now I do not know whether the present government is prepared in its

MR. MARSHALL:

magnanimity to support this particular type of expression of faith in the federal party because that is really what that recital indicates. I do not want to dwell on this to any great extent but certainly I cannot join in in unanimous accord with the expression of faith as supplied by, not only the resolution, but the recital as the whereas.

What the Liberal Party will do - I have no more faith, really, quite frankly that the Federal Liberal Party will do more now than what they did in the past because of the fact of history that we have gone in before and I do not think that it serves any purpose really to perhaps go into it to any greater extent but only just to mention that, you know, the Upper Churchill, to which we have referred to before, what happened there, the crass attempt by the federal Minister of Energy recently in Ottawa to extract a large, giant share of the royalties from the Lower Churchill, that unacceptable attempt by him, the words by Mr. Don Jamieson before the Upper Churchill went in, that all Newfoundlanders could perhaps expect jobs from the Upper Churchill, that is, i.e., construction jobs. And that is the philosophy -

AN HON. MEMBER: All power to go West.

MR. MARSHALL: And all the power to go West and sure it will. And that was the policy that they followed in the past and quite frankly I have no confidence that they will follow any different policy in future and I do not feel that that particular recital belongs in the resolution.

So therefore, Mr. Speaker, before I get on to talking about the amendment, I am going to make a proposal that the resolution be amended in the following manner and make this proposal, seconded by the hon. the Minister of Tourism, that all words in the second recital be deleted from the resolution. I would trust that in an understanding way that the members in the Opposition in view of the fact that the government has taken the positive position that they are accepting, as we all do, the operative part of the resolution,

MR. MARSHALL:

will also accept the deletion of what I, myself, find, and I gather that perhaps other members of this House, certainly on this side, would find to be an objectionable part of the resolution which indeed make it such that it, in my case anyway, I shall not be voting for it unless the resolution as amended carries.

AN HON. MEMBER: The second whereas?

MR. MARSHALL: The second whereas, delete the second whereas, the words, "At a recent National Convention of the Liberal Party" over to "the use of industries elsewhere." Just delete that from the resolution. We do not need that in.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. MARSHALL: I am not going to vote as the member.

MR. NEARY: Do not be so -

MR. MARSHALL: No, it is not. It is a very real observation, I mean the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) has just indicated what is going to be done with the resolution if that whereas is placed in, it is going to be used so that they can say, you know, "We got the first things going," what have you.

MR. NEARY: Well so we did.

MR. MARSHALL: Now on this resolution, as amended, as I hope it will go through, you know everything has been said I suppose that can be said but there are a few points that I would like to make in speaking to it.

First of all the resolution as amended would talk about the - "The hon. House urges the Provincial Government to commence immediate negotiations." Well of course we can have that but that really should be understood I think in the sense of immediate continued negotiations because, as has already been pointed out by the Minister of Mines and Energy when he spoke to the resolution, indeed very direct representations have been made by the provincial government to the federal government to bring about a large measure of these things, such as the port of Labrador, the construction of the railway, etc. The use of resources in Labrador, for Labradorians I do not think the right to this can be disputed.

As the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) has indicated in another debate, particularly with respect to the Lower Churchill we just cannot afford to export the power for export as was apparently urged by Mr. Jamieson and concurred in by him, but we must develop the power for export, not for export but for use in Labrador, in the short-term as the resolution puts out. We will probably have to sell some of it elsewhere but there must be

MR. MARSHALL: recapture rights and this is a matter that has not been dealt with in the Legislature and I hope it is before the session closes, that when in respect to the development of the Lower Churchill it is absolutely essential that there be adequate recapture rights put in, unmistakable recapture rights, not recapture rights that we have got to consume years perhaps of litigation in order to see if we do have the right. But there have to be recapture rights so that when the power is needed for the Province it can be taken back for use in the Province for the development of industry and certainly that industry should logically take place in Labrador.

Before that occurs we must have infrastructure and that part of the resolution referring to a railroad or a road going through Labrador is absolutely essential. I do not myself see how there can be any effective development of the Labrador area without a Trans-Labrador Highway, and indeed without a railway. I think it was the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) who spoke about the significance of the railway and the development of Labrador. And it is rather unfortunate that really we have not got one and I think one of these days I should like to see an independent and objective assessment of the negotiation of the terms of union of Newfoundland with Canada. Because it really is a rather sad fact, even though Labrador at the time was not as developed as it is now, it is a rather sad fact you know that all of the Western Provinces of Canada when they entered into Confederation, and they in those days had tracks of land which were equally as uninviting perhaps as Labrador was at the time, uninviting from the point of view of being a wilderness territory and the main reason why they were drawn into Confederation, as we know from the history of Canada, was the provision of railways through Canada, through the Western parts. And it is rather unfortunate as I say, that this was really not negotiated in the terms of union and the net result of union in Canada, instead of

MR. MARSHALL: gaining a railway, what in effect what we have as the result to this Province is we have lost a railway. But a railway, it would seem, would be absolutely essential to the development of Labrador. The development of Labrador would have occurred in a much more rapid fashion, as I say, if we had gotten the same rights on joining Confederation. We are going back to 1949 now but as I say I would like to see some time an article or research done on the effectiveness of those people who negotiated the terms of union of Newfoundland with Canada because in hindsight, maybe not in foresight, but in hindsight we definitely seem to have come on the wrong end of the stick. We seem to have certainly entered into the terms of Confederation without any kind of a full knowledge of Canadian history and particularly as I say one of the major items of enticement of provinces other than the four founding provinces into Confederation was the founding of a railway from Ontario over to British Columbia. When we joined Confederation we had a railway through the Island of Newfoundland which we in effect subsequently lost. But it is rather a pity, as I say, that the terms of union did not contain at the time a railway through Labrador and I think, although you cannot reopen terms or what have you or go back that distance, but I think that is one of the arms and the arguments that should be

MR. MARSHALL: advanced to the Federal Government for at least assistance if not in the provision of a railway and provision of a trans Labrador highway. I was interested in the debate in the description given by the Leader of the Opposition when he talked about the five rivers flowing into Quebec, because this comes up from time to time and there has been a considerable amount of discussion and talk from time to time of Quebec's desire to harness these rivers. And I just caution against one thing; we own the head waters of these rivers and there apparently is growing up somewhat of a psychology in the province that these rivers are really Quebec rivers and the head waters lie in this province. I caution against this kind of thinking because eventually what will happen is that we will end up giving away to Quebec probably more in that area than we should do. Because obviously if the head waters lie within this province it is this province which really has the say as to what can be done and I would think that this province has the ability to get the major use and the benefit out of these rivers. So I would prefer instead of hearing talk from time to time - and I am not talking about the Leader of the Opposition now, I am talking about the way in which this is presented by everybody here in Newfoundland - about these five rivers as if they were the rivers of Quebec. But they are not the rivers of Quebec yet if we continue talking along those lines before too many years are up we are going to find that Quebec is going to gain the major in some trade off or what have you or whatever may happen in the future with respect to it that Quebec is going to get a major share of our resource in that area.

MR. NEARY: How? How can they get it?

MR. MARSHALL: Because of this particular psychology that we are getting out and we are thinking -

MR. NEARY: Deal more with legalities, psychology is not going to -

MR. MARSHALL: Psychology has a heck of a lot to do when we come to negotiation and we come to negotiation as to what would be done.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. member should know enough about psychology. Anyway I do not choose, Mr. Speaker, I do not really choose to respond to the hon. member. I really do not and I have no intention of responding to him so he can keep his little chippy comments to himself. I have better things to do than bother with the hon. member. If the hon. member wants to be useful perhaps he might like to make another pilgrimage to Panama or something like that. He would probably do a heck of a lot more than he is accomplishing in this House.

MR. NEARY: Is the hon. gentleman jealous or what?

MR. MARSHALL: No, the hon. gentleman is not jealous at all. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, if the Panamanian pilgrim would keep quiet I could perhaps finish my remarks which are almost coming to a conclusion, Mr. Speaker.

As I say, I endorse this resolution but I am not going to vote for any resolution which imposes and expresses any faith in the Federal Liberal Party or for that matter in any organ of the Liberal Party because as far as I am concerned I have no confidence that they will do any more with their seventy-nine or eighty seats in Quebec in the future than they have done in the past. But I wholeheartedly support the rest of the resolution with the caution that I hope that it is more than just academia speaking, that it is more than a motion on the Order Paper as the member for Terra Nova has indicated, and that something will be done because it is really a serious situation. It is the only means, Mr. Speaker, by adopting policies such as this not in words but in action that I feel that the people of Labrador can be made to feel that they are part of this province as they certainly deserve to do.

So with those observations, Mr. Speaker, I propose the amended and I say that I support the resolution as amended.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: I have to formally put the amendments moved by the hon. gentleman for St. John's East and seconded by the hon. Minister

MR. SPEAKER: of Tourism that the second recital of the resolution be deleted.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would submit to Your Honour that the amendment is not in order because it takes away from the original resolution.

MR. NEARY: You can add to a resolution, Sir, or a motion, but you cannot take away and you cannot destroy the principle of the resolution, and I would submit, Sir, that the deletion of this particular part of the resolution destroys the principle of the resolution and takes away from it. And under the rules, Sir, of this House, you cannot do that, and I would submit that the amendment is not in order.

MR. MARSHALL: To that point of order,
Mr. Speaker, if I may.

MR. HICKMAN: May I?

MR. MARSHALL: Yes, okay.

MR. SPEAKER: One of the hon. gentlemen to my left.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, to the point of order,
I would submit that the point of order is frivolous, vexatious,
contrary to the rules -

MR. NEARY: Who says so?

MR. HICKMAN: Because I say so. What better reason!

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKMAN: - and, Mr. Speaker, contrary to the rules of this House, contrary to the rules of the mother of parliament and contrary to the rules of the House of Commons. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that a recital is nothing more than an explanation of the principles in the resolution. If both recitals were totally taken out it would not in any way affect the resolution, because a recital, as Mr. Speaker knows full well - and I look forward to hearing from the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) along these lines - a recital is only a matter of explanation. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition is fully aware of that. And therefore, Mr. Speaker, striking out the resolution only removes, in this particular case, an odious reference designed to take away from the non-partisan approach that we have seen developing so desirably during the debate on the resolution itself. I would have

MR. HICKMAN: anticipated that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition would have seconded the motion of the hon. the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) because it was made very clear early in the debate that a non-partisan approach to this resolution was very desirable and this rather odious recital which does not go to the root of the matter at all, but is there only for purposes other than would be in the best interest of Labrador.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Leader of the Opposition and the hon. the member for St. John's East.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Thank you, Sir.

Sir, I arise to support the point of order raised, because, first of all, Sir, it is simply a manifestation of the political bigotry, bias of the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), but that is not the main reason I am rising to the point of order, Sir, and I withdraw that - I withdraw that, Sir.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of privilege.

MR. MARSHALL: I could have raised it, Mr. Speaker, that the member is raising a motive, but it is not an unavowed motive or a bad motive that he is raising so I do not object to his words.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman did withdraw the remark.

MR. MARSHALL: All right.

MR. W. N. ROWE: That is right, Sir. The only reason I said it to begin with was because I am so hurt, like, I suppose, a father with his child or a mother with her child, to see my resolution, Sir, being -

AN HON. MEMBER: Butchered.

MR. W. N. ROWE: - emasculated and butchered by the hon. member for St. John's East that I could not control myself. But I do withdraw my imputation of unworthy motives to that gentleman.

Sir, the reason why the amendment is out of order, we submit, is that that recital is so important, Sir,

MR. W. N. ROWE: that the removal of it goes to the root and substance and fundamentally affects the motion itself -

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. W. N. ROWE: - and by removing it would be virtually the same, Sir, as simply voting against the resolution altogether -

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. W. N. ROWE: - and therefore, it is not in order because he can achieve the same political bias, show the same political partisanship, Sir, simply by voting against the motion, by saying 'Nay' when the motion is brought to a vote.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. W. N. ROWE: So the reason that I put in that recital is simply this, that I wanted to explain that now that the Government of Canada through the party which it represents, the Liberal Party, has shown, Sir, that it goes along unequivocally with the sum and substance of this resolution by having passed it at the policy convention in Ottawa, that now is an opportune time, Mr. Speaker, to get this passed by this House and get it up to the Government of Canada -

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. W. N. ROWE: - whatever government happens to be in power and get these negotiations started. And by removing this, Sir, you are emasculating, you are butchering, you are massacring that motion and destroying it utterly- and I say that as the author of the motion - and you achieve the same thing, Sir, as if you simply said, 'Nay', we vote against the motion.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. W. N. ROWE: And therefore, Sir, the amendment is completely out of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I indicated I would hear the hon. gentleman for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) next, which I will. What I would then suggest is at six o'clock I leave the Chair but that we not call it six and a decision can be made on this, unless hon. members wish to leave it until next Wednesday because I will need to know. Is it agreed that we not call it six for a couple of minutes or so?

The hon. member for St. John's East.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, a tragedy, a real tragedy. We have rules and precedents under Beauchesne. It is sort of a tragedy that the hon. gentlemen there opposite get up and raise points and do not even refer to authorities and are just attempting apparently to run the House from their own subjective feelings. But I refer Your Honour to Beauchesne, page 172, which clearly says, "An amendment, substantially the same as the original motion, but omitting considerable matter of recital both of fact and law of said main motion, is in order." Now there it says in Beauchesne, page 172. There is also other authority but that happens to be right on point.

As the house leader has indicated a recital does not destroy the main motion. It does not affect the import of the motion at all. So therefore it is in order. And if you take the position, the unfounded and unresearched position of the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) who says that it destroys the motion, I just say that if it is essential to the motion and it has to go into the motion, that surely not even this government that has given everything to the Opposition is going to be soft enough to vote for an endorsement of the Federal Liberal Party.

MR. SPEAKER: I think I am in a position, having first of all to thank the hon. members for their learned submissions, to make a decision. First of all I draw the attention of hon. members to our own Standing Order 36, "A motion may be amended: (a) by leaving out certain words;

MR. SPEAKER:

(b) by leaving out certain words in order to insert other words;
(c) by inserting or adding other words." So one can make an amendment in order by omission alone.

In addition to that I would draw to hon. gentlemen's attention, section 201, page 168 of Beauchesne, "The object of an amendment may be to effect such an alteration in a question as will obtain the support of those who, without such alteration, must either vote against it or abstain from voting thereon, or to present to the House an alternative proposition either wholly or partially opposed to the original question. This may be effected by moving" - well it says essentially the same thing as our Standing Orders says there, that there are three ways of doing it by omission, omission in order to insert, insertion.

Therefore the only question I have to decide on is whether the deletion of the recital negates the substantive part of the resolution. And while obviously it modifies it, it deletes something and modifies it, it in my opinion does not delete the substantive, operative part which I take to be, "Now be it therefore resolved," and what follows after that, the four areas of a resolution which follow after that. So I do rule the amendment in order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman has adjourned the debate. It being six o'clock I leave the Chair until tomorrow, Thursday, at 2:00 P.M.

1774

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

APRIL 5, 1978

QUESTION # 10

Mr. Neary (LaPoile) - to ask the Honourable the Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

Statement of arrangements with Public Health Nurses who refused last fall to use their own vehicles unless mileage rates adjusted to a more realistic figure.

ANSWER

APR 5 1978.

Public Health Nurses who refused to use their vehicles last fall were not paid car allowance for their idle days. For most staff this was only one day. The monthly automobile allowance last fall prorated to \$1.84 per day.

Since then the collective agreement with nurses was signed on March 6, 1978. It provides for:

- (a) automobile allowance of \$40 per month and mileage rate of .22¢ per mile with a guarantee of \$750 per annum.
- (b) the difference between private and business automobile insurance.
- (c) parking meter cost up to \$2.00 per week.

APR 5 1978

QUESTION #26

Mr. Neary (LaPoile) - to ask the Honourable the Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

- (1) Statement of the number of ambulances currently operating in the province under the Government's ambulance service.
- (2) Total cost of maintaining this ambulance service.

ANSWER

This information excludes ambulances which are hospital based.

- | | | |
|-----|---|--------------------|
| (1) | 36 Community Ambulance services with | 43 vehicles |
| | <u>24 Private ambulance services with</u> | <u>38 vehicles</u> |
| | <u>60</u> | <u>81</u> |
-
- | | | |
|-----|-------------------------------------|-----------|
| (2) | Estimated cost of operation 1977/78 | \$825,000 |
|-----|-------------------------------------|-----------|

April 3, 1978

APR 5 1978

QUESTION # 32

Mr. Neary (LaPoile) - to ask the Honourable the Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

What is the number of journeys involving public business which he has made since April 1, 1977 to places outside Canada, showing for each journey:

- (a) the names of the countries visited;
- (b) the dates of the journey;
- (c) the total cost to the Government for hotel accommodation, meals, ground and air transportation and other expenses;
- (d) whether or not any member of his staff or any other public servant accompanied him for all or a portion of his journey, and if so,
 - (i) what is the name of each such person,
 - (ii) what is the title of the position each such person holds or held,
 - (iii) what was the total cost to the Government for hotel accommodation, meals, ground and air transportation and other expenses for each person;
- (e) the nature of the public business attended to on the journey?

ANSWER

No travel at Government expense outside of Canada
since April 1, 1977.

APR 5 1978

QUESTION #14

Mr. Neary (LaPoile) - to ask the Honourable the Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

During the financial year that commenced April, 1977, what amount of money was expended by the Government for the purpose of supplying drugs without charge to indigents throughout the Province and what system is used to determine whether or not a person qualifies as an indigent so that he can receive drugs paid for by the Government?

ANSWER

The subdivision covering the expenditure for cost of drugs also contains the lesser amounts spent on eyeglasses, appliances, etc. It is estimated that when all invoices are paid to the end of the 1977-78 fiscal year, the annual cost will amount to \$3,600,000 for health care to indigents.

Drugs, etc., are provided free of charge to residents who have been assessed by the Department of Social Services as being unable to pay for their prescriptions. In most

instances, a drug card issued by the Department of Social Services serves as the initial identification and authorization with certification applied when the drug invoices are presented for payment.

March 20, 1978