

VOL. 3

NO. 73

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
MONDAY, JULY 6, 1981

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to read this Ministerial Statement, I will just table it. It relates to the distribution of cheques to suppliers and it is just for information purposes for those who require cheques for services and goods supplied to government.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transportation (R. Dawe), and it has to do with the community of Greenspond. Representations have been made from the town council. Would the minister explain what is the responsibility of Transportation for roads within a community or roads passing through a community?

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

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, that would depend upon the particular community. In some cases the community has taken over responsibility for the main road and in other cases it is the responsibility of the Department of Transportation.

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: In a case where a council has taken over the responsibility for the main road, would the Minister of Transportation (R. Dawe) indicate what contribution or percentage of contribution is made to that municipality?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, the procedure is, in cases where the municipality decides to take over a road, the road is brought to an acceptable standard agreed upon between the department and the municipality, and after that point in time, the road is completely the responsibility of the municipality.

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, do I understand it, then, that it is the intention of the department to bring the roads up to an acceptable standard before turning it over to the municipality, which was the first area which he mentioned? The second area was that the department will maintain the main roads until they reach a standard that can be taken over. Could the minister indicate how much money has been allocated for the roads in Greenspond under either one of the two setups?

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

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, I would have to take that particular question under advisement and get the answer for the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, the truth of the matter is the Department of Transportation have not spent a nickel on the main road through Greenspond. In fact, it has not spent any money on upgrading or putting it in any kind of shape. It is the only community left like that in the Province and I

MR. STIRLING: would ask the minister if he would agree in principle - would agree to the principle that at least the Department of Transportation should do the same thing for the council in Greenspond as they do for every other council, say, in his district?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. R. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, it is the intention of my department and this government to bring the standards of roads in this Province up to an acceptable standard to all of the residents.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. DAWE: And based on the financial limitations in any given year, we will proceed to do that and will do it in due course.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: With regard to the minister saying that they will bring up the roads of a community, to standard under the Department of Transportation and then turn them over to the municipalities or town councils, in St. Lewis, Labrador, the Department of Highways reconstructed the road almost two years ago. But because this community had trouble being incorporated, and wanted to be incorporated and was not allowed to by this government, now they are incorporated but the road is gone through such a deteriorating condition that it is almost washed out and it is impossible for this newly incorporated community of St. Lewis to bring the road up to standard with the amount of money they would get from Municipal Affairs. Will the Department of Transportation make sure and undertake to bring this road back up to standard so that Municipal Affairs will be able to take it over by way of the town council of St. Lewis?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister for Transportation.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, the Department of Municipal Affairs will not take over the roads once they are brought up a standard, that is the responsibility of the individual town councils, worked out on an individual basis with the department. As it relates to roads that are under the responsibility of my department, we will do everything we can to bring them up to acceptable standard.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Public Works and Services. Would the hon. gentleman tell the House what work now is going to be done on Mount Scio House in the way of asphalt paving and curb and gutter?

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

MR. YOUNG: Yes, Mr. Speaker, paving the driveway and bringing the curb and gutter up to standard.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, hon. members are aware of course that this house is rent free and that none of the communities and municipalities can get any money for paving this year. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if this is a priority item? How much? What is the estimated cost of this curb and gutter and paving at Mount Scio House? Would the hon. gentleman give the House some idea?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Public Works.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I have not a clue, but I will take it under advisement and get the information.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier, the question was to -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Was he asking me? I thought he asked me.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

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

Is it the hon. gentleman's intention, seeing he wants to leap into this-my question was for the -

PREMIER PECKFORD: I am sorry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I think

the question was directed -

MR. NEARY: I will ask the hon. the Premier a supplementary question.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Okay.

MR. NEARY: Is it the hon. gentleman's intention, is it his intention to continue to take a house, rent free, free telephone, free lights and now have the driveway paved and the curb and gutter put in, is it the hon. gentleman's intention to continue to take all these gifts from the taxpayers free of charge?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I do not think on reflection, Mr. Speaker, given the supplementary, that the question deserves an answer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary. The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. gentleman tell the House-when Mr. Moores the former Premier was living in that house he paid X amount of money rent every month-would the hon. gentleman tell us the amount of rent the

MR. NEARY: former Premier paid and how much he paid while he was living in that house, how much rent he paid while he was living in that house?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I do not know the exact figure, Mr. Speaker. I will have to get it for the hon. member. I do not remember the exact figure so I will have to get it for the hon. member.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bellevue

wishes to yield?

MR. CALLAN: I yield.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: The hon. the Premier heard the statements made the other day by the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) in connection with Mount Scio House and former Premier Smallwood's house on Roaches Line. Would the hon. gentleman tell the House, the hon. the Premier tell the House, if he wishes to identify himself with these statements that no doubt were made on behalf of the government? Does he condone these statements made by the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter)? Is that a part of government policy? Was the hon. gentleman speaking for the government or himself when he made these statements about former Premier Smallwood burning in hell?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I think that deserves the same kind of an answer as the previous supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bellevue-

MR. CALLAN: I yield.

MR. SPEAKER: -yields to the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, now I would like to come back to the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) again.

The government cannot find money for essential things but they can find money for the Premier's house. Now would the

MR. NEARY: hon. gentleman answer the question and tell us how much it is going to cost to put curb and gutter and to pave the driveway in Mount Scio House?

MR. YOUNG: It is all up to the tender, Mr. Speaker. It is all up to whatever they bid.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Another supplementary. The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman must have a figure in mind. They must have some estimate in mind. When the estimates are passed in this House, the hon. gentleman must know what the estimated cost of that project is going to be.

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

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, yes, it was in the estimates but at the present, right off the top of my head, I cannot tell you what it is because there are quite a few dollars in the estimates for different things pertaining to public works and I am sure if the hon. member scrutinized the estimates when they were going through he would have found out.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: I yield.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. gentleman tell the House if it is his intention to continue to provide all these goodies for the Premier of this Province free of charge or will the hon. Premier have to pay for these services?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: And what other work is going to be done? I hear there is going to be a chain link fence put around Mount Scio House. Does the hon. gentleman have any plans to put a chain link fence around Mount Scio House and also put up a gate that will be electrified? Does the hon. gentleman have any plans to call tenders on that project?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary, the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. gentleman care to elaborate? What is it that they are going to do? Are they going to put up a chain link fence? What kind of gates are they going to put up? Could the hon. gentleman give us a few details of the plans they have? They cannot find money for anything else and essential services -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - but they can find all kinds of money for Mount Scio House where we have a rent-free house.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, we will be calling a public tender and if the hon. gentleman wants the specs I suggest that he tender on the bid.

MR. NEARY: Public tender for what?

MR. YOUNG: Chain link fence.

MR. LUSH: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transportation.

Some time ago I asked the minister what criteria was used for allocating funds for paving of roads, secondary roads particularly, throughout the Province, and the minister indicated that it was based on need and the representation by the member. Can the minister confirm that that is the criteria used by the provincial government and by his department?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, I do not really know if that type of question deserves an answer; however, by all means, the criteria used for establishing road projects is based on need and the particular concerns and interests of the area, as I indicated at that time, perhaps a little short, and one might elaborate on it. It is also very important that representation from the particular elected member of a district plays an important role in deciding what the priorities are in various parts of the Province.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, if I could be allowed just a brief preamble. During the year 1980 - 1981 I can recall two petitions being presented on behalf of the residents of Terra Nova for roads to be paved, two briefs, three visits with Transportation ministers, one with the present minister who just came lately to the portfolio, and two with the previous minister and at least fifteen letters from different individuals and organizations; that is twenty contacts with the department in 1980 - 1981. Does the minister not consider that fair representation?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, I am not entirely sure what the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) wants me to do, either to help with his next election campaign and indicate that he did represent his constituency. I will concur that there were a number of representations from his particular area both on behalf of himself and other residents of his district. At the same time there are also a great number of representations from a great number of districts -

MR. MORGAN: What about Bonavista South?

MR. DAWE: - including Bonavista South -

MR. BARRY: Mount Scio.

MR. DAWE: - including all parts of Labrador, all parts of the Island portion of the Province.

These petitions and the concerns of all the residents are taken into consideration when deciding upon the projects.

MR. LUSH: Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Final supplementary, the hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Is the minister willing to table the requests made from the various communities and so forth and by members throughout the Province? Is the minister willing to table these requests, Mr. Speaker? I am willing to let my record stand in comparison with any members on the other side or this side.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, I do not really think that deserves a reply.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Premier a question. About a month and a half ago the Premier was in Hodge's Cove, in Southwest Arm, and announced \$650,000 worth

MR. CALLAN: of road work, \$100,000 of that was to be spent on the road between Hillview and St. Jones Within. Now in the roads programme tabled by the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Dawe) a couple of weeks or three weeks after that, it mentioned only \$50,000 for the road between Hillview and St. Jones Within. Will the Premier explain the discrepancy of \$100,000 as announced by him in Hodge's Cove, \$100,000 for the road between Hillview and St. Jones Within, and in the roads programme only \$50,000 has been allocated?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, if we can correctly determine how much will be spent on that particular road that the hon. member mentions we are looking in that range, but until the tenders come in or until we see what the tenders show then we will have a better handle on it. But it is our intention to spend in the order of between \$50,000 and \$100,000 but we do not know exactly how much until the tenders come in and we get a look at what the lowest tender is. It is our intention to spend in that area; that is just an estimate, the \$50,000.

MR. CALLAN: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, the hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Well in that connection then, Mr. Speaker, let me put it to the Minister of Transportation and Communications with a supplementary on that same line.

A tender call in the newspapers

MR. CALLAN: calls for five kilometers of pavement between Queen's Cove and Long Beach. - Five hundred thousand dollars, a half a million dollars has been allocated for that particular stretch of road. Would the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) advise how much does it cost to pave, in general, how much does it cost to pave one kilometer of highway. Is it \$100,000, therefore five kilometers a half a million dollars? Would that be fair?

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, it depends really on which part of the Province you are in, what the condition of the roadbed is, how much reconstruction has to occur. It will vary from place to place.

MR. CALLAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary, the hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, getting back to the point made by the Premier-and also again this question is to the Minister of Transportation - last year on that same section of road between the TCH and Queen's Cove there were \$250,000 allocated but the tender called was let for \$180,000. In other words, there were \$70,000 that the people expected to be spent on that twenty-one miles of road but it was not.

MR. BARRETT: (Inaudible).

MR. CALLAN: If the member for St. John's West (Mr. Barrett) would like to be quiet, Mr. Speaker, I will continue. I would like to ask the Minister of Transportation -

MR. SPEAKER: Order! Order, please!

MR. CALLAN: - I would like to ask the Minister of Transportation, last year the people in the district of Bellevue lost \$70,000. This year they could end up losing

MR. CALLAN: perhaps \$100,000 or \$150,000.
What happens to that money? Does it go to other districts
or where does it go?

MR. HISCOCK: Mount Scio house. Mount Scio
house.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please!
The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, if I remember the
situation correctly, when a bid comes in on a particular
paving project it is based on the amount of money to the
contractor. In addition to that particular amount of
money has to be added into the total price of the project,
the engineering fees plus the cost of the liquid asphalt
which is supplied through the department.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Barbe.

MR. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier
just how obligated is the government to commitments made
by ministers?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: That is pretty vague, Mr.
Speaker, can we get more -

MR. BENNETT: No, it is not, it is specific.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well, can we get specific on it
then? Why waste Question Period, get specific.

MR. BENNETT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon.
member for St. Barbe.

PREMIER PECKFORD: What government?
What are you talking about?

MR. CALLAN: Listen, boy, listen.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Are you talking about this
government, the previous government?

MR. CALLAN: Listen! Listen!

MR. BENNETT: I cannot ask, Mr. Speaker,
I do not think I can ask the hon. the Premier -

July 6, 1981

Tape No. 3054

IB-3

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS):
member for St. Barbe.

A supplementary, the hon.

MR. BENNETT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I do not choose to ask the hon. the Premier questions
related to any other government than his own. Mr.
Speaker,

MR. BENNETT: when ministers make commitments, I am led to believe or at least I understand that those commitments, those obligations of the Ministers of the Crown and of this government, Mr. Speaker, I am of the opinion that those commitments should be honoured. And I am wondering if the Premier sees it that way. Would the hon. the Premier tell this hon. House if indeed commitments that are made by minister are indeed to be honoured by this government, by his government?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: As much as is humanly possible, Mr. Speaker, We do everything we can to live up to commitments that are made by respective ministers from time to time. Sure, we do what we can. You know, we are not perfect but we are getting there, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BENNETT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for St. Barbe.

MR. BENNETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Probably I should ask the hon. the Minister of Transportation (R. Dawe), during our study of the estimates the hon. Minister of Transportation suggested then that he would most certainly indeed try to live up to commitments made by his predecessor and, Mr. Speaker, his predecessor made a commitment to the people of Bonne Bay to have a road upgraded and paved and I have a letter addressed to Alfred Sheppard of Woody Point, who is the chairman of that area, of that community, in which the minister said, and if you would, for the record, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read one paragraph, "If an agreement is not reached"-

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Hon. members when asking questions are not allowed to preface their questions by reading of letters, telegrams, etc.; Standing Order 31 C.

MR. BENNETT: Well, Mr. Speaker, the minister, in this letter to the people of Bonne Bay, said that if an agreement could not be reached between the Federal and Provincial Governments in the year of 1979-80, then in the following year the Provincial Government would take up the responsibility of building and paying that road in their estimates for this past last year. And, Mr. Speaker, this year, I am wondering why, Mr. Minister, it seems that there are no funds this year and indeed if nothing is available this year, would the minister give us some indication when indeed funds could be made available to do the job that a commitment was made for three years ago?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, we are continuing to honour all commitments that are made, perhaps not as quickly as everyone would like but they are being honoured. As a matter of fact, on that particular road some quarter of a million dollars has been estimated to continue on with the upgrading and improvement to that road.

MR. BENNETT: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary, the hon. member for St. Barbe.

MR. BENNETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Would the hon. minister suggest approximately again what the cost of reconstruction and paving of that section - I understand to be something like in the order of six or seven - surely goodness there must be something in documentation to suggest what kind of money would need to be forthcoming in order to do that job.

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

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, I do not have the actual figures on what it will cost to do the complete section of road up there right now. I can certainly find out for the hon. member and get it for him later today or tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, My question is to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan). Could the minister advise the hon. House how much money his department has spent in the past two seasons in the construction of lobster pots throughout the Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I usually have the information to the questions, but today I -

MR. HANCOCK: Is that the best Minister of Fisheries we ever had?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: I think last year we spent approximately \$10,000. And the construction of these pots, of course, was on the basis of using people who were on social assistance, thereby creating jobs for these people who could not find jobs and were receiving social assistance because of no fault of theirs at the time. And that programme commenced about three years ago and as a result of a number of lobster pots were constructed and stored around the Province. The programme was substantially reduced last year and again this year because of these pots being already constructed and available to fishermen.

MR. WARREN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Could the minister advise how many lobster pots his department now has scattered throughout the Province that his department cannot sell?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, of course, the hon. gentleman is apparently misunderstanding the whole programme. The programme was for the purpose of supplying fishermen with lobster pots in case of storm damage, in case of unforeseen circumstances beyond the control of this government, an act of God sort of thing, that we would have lobster pots available to them. If the same kind of programme would now be applied by the federal government as it pertains to the whale destruction programme, whale destruction around the Province where the cod traps are destroyed by whales, and if the federal government honoured their responsibilities and put in place a similar kind of programme, the fishermen would not now be losing their fishing season.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: So we did put that programme in place for that very purpose of having pots available, not trying to sell them, but having them available in case of emergency when fishermen lost their lobster pots from ice, for example, or storm damage, heavy seas these kinds of things.

MR. WARREN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary, the hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister why an ad appeared in last week's paper from the minister's department asking for a tender for selling one hundred lobster pots at a time at \$3.50 each? Why would his department decide now all of a sudden we have lobster pots for sale, which, by the way cost \$7.00 to construct and now he is selling them for \$3.50 each but a fishermen can only buy a minimum of 100 at a time? Why?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, apart from the hon. gentleman, the Opposition do not seem to agree with us being fair to the fishermen, because that is actually what we are doing, being fair to the fishermen. The policy is that we have X number of lobster pots that were constructed three years ago and anybody with common sense would realize that lobster pots made of wood - and we do use lobster pots made of wood in our Province; they are not fibreglass, they are not steel, they are not wire netting, they are wooden traps - and these wooden traps obviously stored would somewhat deteriorate over a period of three or four years. And, therefore, Mr. Speaker, rather than let them deteriorate to the point of being unusable, we decided to give the fishermen a fair chance of purchasing these pots and we are selling them at a reduced price. And right now, by the way, Mr. Speaker, they are going pretty fast at a fair price to these fishermen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: One final supplementary.

MR. WARREN: I am sure, Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. WARREN: that the Premier -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary. The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I am sure the Premier will not be thumping his hand on the table after this question. Mr. Speaker, if the minister is concerned about the fishermen in the Province, why is he saying, look, you must buy 100 pots at a time instead of buying five or six pots? There are some fishermen in this Province who want to buy those pots but they cannot

MR. WARREN: afford to buy 100 pots. So can he not be fair to all the fishermen and the fishermen can come and buy the pots, one, two, three, four or ten, whichever he wants to buy instead of 100?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is obviously not reading the ads, he has not gotten the information. I pity the fishermen along the Labrador coast who are depending on the hon. gentleman for information, I pity them down there, because obviously he twists the information around to his own satisfaction and gives them wrong information, Mr. Speaker. Because if we depend on the hon gentleman to pass along or relay information from this House and from government tender ads such as the one now in the paper, the fact is that we are saying to fishermen, and to be fair to all the fishermen, that if they are going to sell these lobster pots at a reduced cost, below the actual cost to government, approximately half the cost, we do not want one or two fishermen coming in and buying up all the pots, so we are saying the maximum number of 100 pots is available to each fishermen concerned.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Mary's-the Capes.

MR. HANCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Recreation, Youth and Culture concerning the Norma and Gladys. I am wondering if an investigation has been carried out to see if the Norma and Gladys had struck a submerged object or did she just fall apart? Has your department received a report from the shipyard in Clarenville as yet?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. ANDREWS: The work is progressing on the Norma and Gladys, Mr. Speaker, I do not have an up-to-date report right now. The information is that she did hit either a submerged or floating object that was trailing a length of rope, it was the rope that entangled the propeller and wrapped around the propeller and eventually broke the stuffing block.

MR. HANCOCK: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, the hon. member for St. Mary's - The Capes.

MR. HANCOCK: There are some conflicting reports coming in, Mr. Speaker, some people say, and I have been talking to some people in Clarendville who say she just fell apart, some of the plank fell off the boat. And I am wondering how much money is his department willing to spend on this Norma and Gladys or how much money you are willing to waste, it seems like every cent that goes into it is just wasted. Would the minister care to elaborate on how much they are willing to spend on the Norma and Gladys to make here seaworthy?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, whatever the repair bill is to the Norma and Gladys, the vessel was insured for \$1 million with a \$6,000 deductible.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bellevue.
We have time for one final question.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) a question a week ago, he said that he would get the answer. I would like to ask the question now to the Minister of Public Works. Could he indicate if and when tenders will be called for an extension

MR. CALLAN: to the Boys' Home at Whitborne
as announced in the Bellevue by-election?

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

MR. YOUNG: I do not know, we only do it at the
request of another department, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Time for Oral Questions has expired.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, in accordance with
this government's policy of supplying information promptly
and openly and fully at all times.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. BARRY: - I wish to table the answer
from Order Paper 25/81, asked by the hon. member for LaPoile
(Mr. Neary), of course.

MR. SPEAKER: Further answers to questions.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Motion, second reading of a bill,
"An Act Respecting Denturists" (Bill No. 49).

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased at this
time to introduce this bill, "An Act Respecting Denturists".

The bill, of course, signifies
the intention of this department to come to grips with the
fact this denture technology in the Province and, of
course, in doing this we believe there is a role to be played
and we believe that it should be defined. On the one hand we
firmly believe the denturists should not be premitted to

July 6, 1981

Tape No. 3058

SD - 3

MR. HOUSE: practice without some kind of an act,
and, of course, they should be given the legislation to allow
them to fulfill their

MR. HOUSE:

proper role. The bill, as it is printed today, reflects the basic recommendations of a select committee of the House of Assembly some years ago which reported on the matter, and the committee recommended that they be regulated by a separate act of the legislature and not part of the Dental Act and that they be only allowed to provide full dentures. That was the recommendation of the select committee that travelled across this Province.

Now, I fully recognize, Mr. Speaker, that the bill is not the total answer and it is not the answer for the denturists. And it is definitely not the answer that the dentists themselves want.

MR. STIRLING:

Why put it through?

MR. HOUSE:

Mr. Speaker, we are putting it through

because any piece of legislation, and I do not want the - I was getting to that. I do not want to be prompted about it- any piece of legislation, the first and the most important part of it is for the consumer, and it is not necessarily in this case for the denturists or for the dentists either. So, it is fair to say that I would be aware of this situation long before the bill was made public. So I have to say that this government in introducing the bill was not motivated, and we could not be motivated by any desire to please any particular group. Our prime motivation was to provide legislation which we felt was fair and in the public interest.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is not a simple - the reason I am going to go into a little detail on this is because it is not a really simple matter. It is a complex issue which few of us totally understand, but most members of the House have, of course, been hearing about it for some time. It provides that denturists only provide full dentures because of the fact that providing partial dentures, denturists would be dealing with healthy teeth, would be dealing with live tissue, would be dealing

MR. HOUSE: with a medical problem to all intents and purposes. And it is our opinion that the partial denture would require a denturist to become more qualified than they currently are. So, as I said, the reason for us providing only full dentures is that dealing with live tissue, is dealing with healthy teeth and we think that that should require more qualified people, such as dentists. That is one of the major issues with the bill and that is one that we cannot be too strong on, I personally believe.

Now, you are going to get some argument, Mr. Speaker, from the denturists themselves, from the people speaking in the debate, that this particular mechanism, partial dentures, is applied -

MR. STIRLING: It is a waste of time. Nobody wants the bill. The dentists do not want it, the denturists do not want it -

MR. HOUSE: The public wants it. I brought it to protect the public. As the Minister of Health, we want public protection.

There are two provinces, I believe, that do have partial dentures and they have a very complicated mechanism where they deal under the supervision of a dentist or other medical person. I think those are Saskatchewan and Ontario.

MR. HOUSE: This was not possible in this Province because I do not think there was a desire for the denturists and the dentists to work together in that regard. So, the Province of Ontario, for instance, provides for what they refer to as practice of supervised denture therapy. And my interpretation of that legislation in that province is that a person who holds a licence to provide supervised denture therapy, that is taking impressions, fitting and the supply of partial dentures, may only carry out the procedures in the office of a dental surgeon and under direct supervision. So that is not saying that a denturist or a dental therapist in that particular province can give partial dentures.

So, Mr. Speaker, the practice in Canada says that we only do full dentures except under supervision. Now, of course, I am of the opinion that once the act gets in place and certain standards of education are required, that things may change. But at the present time we should keep it this way.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the other contentious part of it is the makeup of the board, the composition of the board. And what we have got to bear in mind is that this board is prescribing or this particular technology, denturism, is prescribing, taking impressions, prescribing, and it is dispensing, it is filling the prescription, as it were. In other words, it is doing a complete job on complete dentures. In that case we have a makeup of a board that is a little bit irregular and uncommon. We are saying there should be three denturists, three lay people and one dentist. And the reason for having the dentist is because, of course, he is the expert in the provision of any kind of dentistry and, of course, any fabrication of dentures.

MR. HOUSE: That is the other thing, they are saying there that they should have - and I get correspondence from the denturists themselves - that they should have four at least. And we are saying at least at this point in time, because of the contentious issue and because of the fact that it is a complete service that they will be offering, that we should have the board not with a majority of denturists on it. There is going to be an interim examining committee. And that is put in the act simply because of the fact that the board cannot be put in place until after the denturists themselves are registered. And what we have in mind there is the selection of people from dental schools and from the Canadian Denturist Association to be the first examining board. After that is over, the examining board will be the board that we put in place known as the Denturist Board.

These are the two contentious parts, Mr. Speaker, the partial dentures only and the composition of the board. As I said, we are doing this basically because we believe that it is in the best interests of the public.

In conclusion, it is my view that this act is a fair act and it seeks to address the issues in a responsible manner. As I said, it is something that was recommended

MR. HOUSE: by the Select Committee on Denturism that was passed here some seven or eight years ago. It is not a complicated piece of legislation nor is it intended to be, but it is hoped that the act, once implemented, will, of course, allow denturists who are competent to serve the public to be better able under a legal framework to ply their trade. Those people who cannot, after reasonable attempts, meet the requirements of the act will not be permitted to continue to practice. One of the things is you have to be in practice two years before this act comes into effect before, of course, you can get an interim certificate. Within six months they have to write the examination and apply for full licence.

I look forward to comments from all hon. members on the bill and I will seek to obtain as much information as I can in response to any questions that are directed to me.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, if ever there was a bill in which there can be unanimous agreement that nobody wants it, it is this bill. Members on the other side of the House do not want it, the Dental Association does not want it, the denturists themselves do not want it and the members of the Opposition do not want it. It is one thing on which there is unanimous agreement. And why do we have the bill, Mr. Speaker? We have the bill because it is in keeping with the government's policy that it is better to do something, to give the appearance of progress no matter if it sets you back a hundred years, 'let us go ahead and do something'.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health (Mr. House) has been very well advised that

MR. STIRLING: since we first started to look at this problem in Newfoundland there has been a considerable amount of experience gathered in other provinces. And the Premier has stood up here from time to time and said, 'Give us an example of another province in any area that is as good as this Province. Give us an example anywhere, anytime, of any other province that is as forward in its legislation.' Now, Mr. Speaker, in this case, our Province is in the Dark Ages with this piece of legislation.

Now, what are we really dealing with? We are dealing with a situation in which neither the public nor the denturists want to do anything which is going to cause a problem with the health of any of the citizens in Newfoundland and Labrador. On that there is complete and unanimous agreement between the public and the denturists. Now, what are we really dealing with? Well, we are dealing with a situation, Mr. Speaker, in which once a dentist completes an examination, and dealing with live tissue, as was mentioned by the Minister of Health (Mr. House), once that decision has been made by a dentist in examining the health of the patient, a prescription has to be made

MR. STIRLING:

for either a partial denture or a complete set of dentures. And that is the end of the game for the dentist. He has then done his work. The person either has to go and get the work done by a dental technician or a factory of dental technicians, because you are not then into a health situation, you are into a situation in which you are manufacturing a product. And it has more to do with the skill of taking a correct impression and making something to fit. It has to do with making an appliance, an appliance that happens to be a partial or a full denture. So it is the manufacture of an appliance. Mr. Speaker, that can be done in a number of ways. It can be done by a dental factory or a dental technician's factory or it can be done by almost like an expert technician working on it as a custom made job who specializes in that particular manufacture. He has to be manufacturing teeth and making teeth fit properly.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the picture has been painted of the denturist as being not qualified and certainly not qualified at this time to get into making partial dentures. Now they have found a cure for that problem in other provinces and let me throw out the names of a couple of other provinces. Ontario is a province where they said, 'Yes, it makes sense that you not have somebody who is not a qualified dentist or a doctor, it makes sense for that person not to be involved in partial dentures without a prescription from a dentist.' So that you have the Ontario situation in which the prescription of a dentist or a doctor has to be given before a denturist or a dental technician can make a partial set of dentures.

Mr. Speaker, this would be acceptable to the denturists in this Province. It would not go anywhere near as far as Saskatchewan. And when we talk

MR. STIRLING: in terms of models, I am told that Saskatchewan after examining the legislation and after examining the problem, have developed for the last three years an acceptable set of legislation, an acceptable licencing system whereby there is a provision in a two-tiered system in which you qualify for one and then with additional training, additional education, additional experience you go on to get a second level of licence. The first level would handle complete dentures and the second level for complete and partial dentures.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if the government does not want to be ahead of the other provinces or equal to the other provinces like Saskatchewan, then Ontario should be one that they should look at, prescriptions given by a dentist. So let us look, Mr. Speaker, at the effect on the public because after all that is our main concern, both sides of the House, the protection of the public. It seems to me that it makes a lot of sense that somebody should have an examination to make sure that they are in good health and that is whether it is as an optometrist. For example, we just passed an optometrist bill. And I think that the relationship between an and an optometrist and a dentist and a denturist are very similiar. And since that had the unanimous support on the other side of the House presumably the same relationship would be acceptable to the other side of the House.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, the real danger that I see in this act, which is not acceptable to anyone, is that instead of curing a problem we are going to create a problem. We are going to create a problem, Mr. Speaker, in that you are going to have a situation in which denturists are going to feel frustrated, badly dealt with and are going to have a situation in which they can never qualify to be able to handle partial dentures. And if you never, ever, put it in the act, if you do not start it off with it in the act - now, Mr. Speaker, it would be quite acceptable to this side if you put in an amendment now that said for the next one year period they will only be allowed to do complete full dentures, and then at the end of a year or two years, when they pass a test or pass a license or pass an exam, they will be able to go to partial, it would seem to me to be very progressive legislation whereby you gave the full dentures as a start and put in the legislation your intention to go to the Saskatchewan type legislation in twelve months or two years or some such thing, so that the denturists, who are very professional, Mr. Speaker, the denturists and the Association of Denturists are as professional as any other group in this Province. They want to upgrade, they want to train their people to be able to have the skills, they want to make sure that the public is protected because by and large, Mr. Spaker, they are independent, technical people, they are business people and technical people and it is a custom shop so that they have, Mr. Speaker, a vested interest if you like in making sure that everybody who is a denturists provides good service. And so I think, Mr. Spaker, it is most unfair to bring in a bill now which recognizes a situation only part way but does not cure the problem. It does not cure the problem of giving the denturists a target, give

MR. STIRLING: them something so that they know that their businesses, their professions, their practices can be protected if they go through the training and the upgrading and give them something to aim for a year or two years down the road. Mr. Speaker, the time to do it is now. It would be quite acceptable to us if you would put into this an amendment now that talked in terms of putting in a partial denture situation a year or two years down the road. Let them qualify, let them convince you that they are qualified to do the job.

Mr. Speaker, there are people on both sides of this House who are not satisfied with the bill for different reasons. Mr. Speaker, to deal with a couple of the other problems: You have a situation where the lawyers have a closed shop. They control the lawyers. The teachers control the teachers,

MR. STIRLING: the doctors control the doctors, the dentists control the dentists, and we are setting up a situation here where on the Denturist Board a majority will be people who are not denturists, and who, in fact, can meet and deal with subjects without a single denturist being present.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am led to believe that that was the situation in the last committee that took a look at this, a Ministerial Committee in which they had, the denturists' representatives, to a person, submitted minority reports and the majority submitted the majority report which is now being referred to.

DR. COLLINS: (Inaudible) a select committee (inaudible).

MR. STIRLING: No, not the select committee, it was appointed later by a minister to look into it.

The composition of the Board is a major problem for the denturists at this time. Either we are going to recognize them as a professional organization and we encourage them and give them the guidelines that they have to follow in order to be able to qualify as they qualify in Saskatchewan, certainly the minimum that they qualify, as they qualify in Ontario, so that we would have the situation in which the very least that we should put into this act, Mr. Speaker - and I would like to have the attention of the Minister of Health (Mr. House) - is that the Board cannot meet without representation from the denturists. But if we treat them with the professional status that they are due, we should certainly put the majority of the people on the Board as denturists.

Mr. Speaker, I agree that consumers should be on that Board, as I agree the consumers should be on the Board of the Legal Society, the Medical

MR. STIRLING: Society and everybody else who has an effect on the consumer or the general public. Whatever the standard is for the denturists, whatever the good reasoning is for putting representatives of the general public on that Board, we should put representatives of the general public on these Boards.

And maybe, Mr. Speaker, this is one of the areas in which this government should insist that women be given equal representation. On all boards similar to this board, let us make sure that the lawyers have a woman on representing the consumer, at least a woman, and the doctors and the engineers and all of the other closed groups that we have here, if it makes sense, Mr. Speaker, for anybody who has control of the licencing of doctors, or denturists. If we are saying that denturists cannot be trusted to control their own professional association, then we should at least bring in amendments during this sitting - let us do it during this sitting - to add to the Dentists Society, the Dentists Board, the Medical Board; whatever reasoning you use for putting on representatives from the general public on the Denturist Board, then do the same thing for all other professional boards.

But you get the impression from this, Mr. Speaker, that what this legislation is doing is just going far enough to get rid of public agitation, public pressure, but not far enough to recognize the denturists as a professional body. Here, Mr. Speaker, is another problem, that the Board seems to appear to be self-financing.

MR. STIRLING: This has been brought to the minister's attention and maybe he should address himself to that point. Because what I am really afraid of is that by making the board self-financing and not allowing the denturists to see a glimmer at the end of the tunnel, that you are going to do more harm with this legislation than the good that you are doing, because you are going to have to require fees to be so high from so few denturists that you will make it impossible for them to pay their way and make the board self-financing.

The other point that the denturists have made is that some of the members from the general public have no level of remuneration, so they are suggesting that not the denturists but that other members from outside to make sure that they have the same interests that people on other boards have, they should be paid the same level of an honorarium or expenses as is paid to other government boards.

Mr. Speaker, the denturists in this Province have acted in a responsible manner. I think it is time now for the government to show them and to encourage the denturists who are supporting their association that it has been worthwhile for them to meet and be patient and negotiate with the government. It is now time for the government to show them something in return, and the very least that they should do, Mr. Speaker, is to demonstrate their good faith by preparing these two or three things that the minister has said are the important issues: One, put into the legislation a provision whereby a year or two years down the road, when the government is satisfied that the qualifications have been reached, that they should be then able to go to the partial denture situation, either under prescription

MR. STIRLING: as is in Ontario, or in the two-tiered system as is in Saskatchewan. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, what you will do in this legislation is only make a matter worse than it is right now. Right now there is no legislation and the denturists are acting in a responsible manner, but it is not being enforced, Mr. Speaker. It is against the law right now for them to be carrying on the practice that they are carrying on. The Dentist Act will not permit them to do anything that they are now doing. We have closed our eyes to it; it is like selling fish down on Water Street or selling flippers, and going part way, you bring in legislation that only goes part way.

Mr. Speaker, the denturists have made a suggestion that denturists and dental technicians should not be capable of holding dual licences. They feel that it will protect the public if you cannot be a denturist and a dental technician, that essentially the denturist is a specialist, a custom handled type of situation, whereas the dental technician could very easily become a front for a dental factory and that the denturist will then get the criticism. They believe, Mr. Speaker, that the examining committee should be established by the Denturists' Association of Canada - the Interim Examining Committee - and that the examining committee be terminated after a specific number of licences are granted, in other words, while the new board is getting a feel for it.

One of the problems, Mr. Speaker, is that the legislation is unclear with respect to the power to prosecute.

MR. STIRLING: The denturists feel that the power to prosecute should be vested in The Denturist Licencing Board as is similarly vested now in all these other boards that I mentioned, the Dental Board, the Medical Board, and other similar boards.

Mr. Speaker, the draft provides for compulsory membership but subsection (2) of 26 states "That if a person has been denied membership or who has had his membership revoked shall not lose his permit, licence or renewal interim permit." It seems that this is completely contrary to the whole purpose of having a Denturist Association that can control themselves. That if you are saying that you have to be automatically a member, and that if you are suspended the only power that the denturist have to make sure that their membership is adhering to the standard of training and the standard of ethics and the standards of practice is to have the control of membership and that revoking or suspending a member should automatically terminate his licence. This is the same protection that is now given to the engineers, the lawyers, the doctors or anybody else of a similar professional body who has control over licencing.

Mr. Speaker, I think it would have been in everyone's best interest if this act had been postponed until the Fall sitting when the minister could have checked with his counterparts in Ontario and in Saskatchewan to find out how well that legislation is working. It does not seem to gain anything by bringing it in now. It is not acceptable to the denturists, it is not acceptable to the dentists, it is not acceptable to the general public, and it is not acceptable to the members of the House.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is only going to make for frustration because you will have an act that goes part way and something which is totally illegal now, presumably the

MR. STIRLING: government will start to crack down when they bring in this legislation, and since it is not going to cure the problem we are just going to create more problems and sooner or later we have to face up to bringing in the kind of legislation that exists in Ontario as the minimum or Saskatchewan as an ideal.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is not too late to do something about it. It is not too late to be too stubborn to take a look at what happened elsewhere. The challenge was thrown out by the Premier, show us anything anywhere else where anyone is further along. Well in this area, Mr. Speaker, as in many other areas, the Ontario legislation is ahead of this legislation, the Saskatchewan legislation is ahead of this legislation. Mr. Speaker, we are bringing in a piece of legislation that on the day that we bring it in is outdated, antiquated, and is twenty years behind the times. It does not do anything for any of the problems that now exist. It does not do anything for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. It does not do a thing for the many clients of denturists, Mr. Speaker. The ultimate test is the test of whether or not they are successful, and they have been successful, and that must mean, Mr. Speaker, that there are people who wished to use the service of a denturist rather than the service of a dentist.

Let me be perfectly clear, I think there is no question in anyone's mind that

MR. STIRLING:

a dentist should be spending his time on the prevention of tooth decay, on the promotion of good health, of dealing with natural teeth, of doing all the examinations and prescriptions, and that we are not suggesting for one minute that the denturists should get into competition with the dentists. They are two entirely different levels. It is like the other acts that we are dealing with; the right to make prescriptions for eyeglasses versus the actually manufacturing of the eyeglasses. Dentures fall into that category. No one is suggesting that denturists should be doing any fillings. No one is suggesting that denturists should be doing any extractions. No one is suggesting that denturists deal with natural teeth at all except to make the natural tooth a foundation on a partial denture after getting a prescription, in the case of the Ontario legislation, or after training, in the case of the Saskatchewan legislation.

Mr. Speaker, let there be no doubt and let me sum up our position. One, we are not suggesting in any way that denturists and dentists be in competition. There is no suggestion by the denturists that they should be in competition in the area in which a dentist is the only one who is qualified for that service. But in the area of the manufacture of dentures, either full or partial-and I agree with the minister in having concerns about going immediately to a partial denture. But the concern that I have which overrides that is that if you make no provision now in the Denturists Act- and I ask the minister very seriously of this for a minute- if you make no provision in the Denturists Act for him to move to a partial denture somewhere down the road with proper training, where will he ever get the experience or the exposure or the training to enable him to do it? So that you are confining him and damning him, it is almost going back to the field that the minister is expert in, in the teaching field.

MR. STIRLING: It is almost like saying we will license you for elementary school but we do not think that you are ever going to be qualified to teach high school, and never ever allow a person to do it. Or the other way around.

So, what we are saying, Mr. Speaker, what we are saying in this situation is that denturists should fill the majority of the positions on the Denturists Board. Either that, or change over all other professional boards to give the same representation to members of the general public. That in the area of licensing of denturists that we go in a two phase situation. If the government does not want to go all the way now, then at least put in the legislation. Put it in because you know how hard it is to reopen legislation. Put in the legislation that the two tier thing will be considered after an acceptable level of training, education and experience.

And then in all of the other minor points that have been brought up, minor but important, we suggest that the denturists be treated in the professional manner in which they should be treated, that we have received delegations from the denturists, Mr. Speaker, over the years and on this side of the House we have great respect for their concern about the general public, their concern about training, education and upgrading. And we have seen nothing, nothing but the most professional of attitudes and we have

MR. STIRLING: every confidence, Mr. Speaker, that if we take this legislation to the point where we can give that association the opportunity to do what they want to do to bring in the additional training, education and experience and to move towards the date when they will be able to deliver to the customer a level of service that is comparable with what they can get in Ontario or Saskatchewan.

I have intentionally stayed away from the question of price; I do not want to get into that question of price because it has more to do with the question of professionalism, Mr. Speaker, and I think that is what we should deal with in this act. And I would urge the minister rather than create a whole series of problems that he take a second look at this legislation and when we get to the committee stage to bring in some of these amendments which will accomplish what this legislation should be trying to accomplish and that is the regulation of what is an acceptable practice.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. gentleman for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I have a few points I would like to make on this act.

There is nothing in this world that man cannot make a little worse and sell a little cheaper, and I think this is the case with the denturists. I am very much opposed to this act and if it stays in its present form I intend to vote against it.

As far as I am concerned, if denturists are licenced to practice in Newfoundland then the general public are not protected. I cannot see this, you know, we have gone to the trouble to have dentists carefully trained, seven year course, it is the equivalent, certainly the equal of a training for a medical doctor, and to think that we would then turn over the general public

MR. CARTER: to untrained or very partially trained amateurs, who have very little training in the matter of physiology and anatomy, to make teeth for the general public, I think it is a grave, grave mistake.

Now I know that because of the pressure for more and more medical services that there is a tendency in parts of the world to go what I call the 'paramedical route.' In other words, there are now teams of first aid workers, we will say, who will respond to a call - if someone has had a heart attack - and they are very, very well trained in immediate resuscitative techniques for a person who has just had a heart attack. And apparently their record in the United States, particularly, where they are used is very good and they have managed to save a great many lives that would otherwise be lost, because the first few minutes or the first half an hour in a case of a heart attack can be critical. And by the time they get them to the hospital, their condition is beginning to be stabilized and the amount of damage that has been done has been minimized.

Now I realize that this is a useful procedure and a useful way to go, but I would point out that in this case this team are working under and with and for the medical staff. They are not sort of working on their own. It would be quite absurd if the resuscitative team were to say, 'We are going to call ourselves resuscitavists and we want to be licenced under a special board and people who are about to have a heart attack or having a heart attack can call on us and we will look after them'. It is quite absurd for the medical field to be sub-divided this way. Unless the medical field are prepared

MR. J. CARTER:

to work as a team then I think the general public are being sold short and I will be very interested to hear the comments from the medical men in this House of Assembly on this point. Now there are dental technicians, false teeth -

MR. NEARY: What about the optometrists? See what they will tell you about them.

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, this time I would like some protection from sub-humans opposite.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! The hon. member wishes to be heard in silence.

MR. J. CARTER: I only have half an hour and I wish to make certain points. Now false teeth are made by dental technicians and there is no doubt about it that this requires a great deal of skill, but the dental technicians who make false teeth at the present time, legally, make them under the supervision of a dentist. They do not go off and make them all by themselves. Just because our jaws seem to go up and down does not mean to say that it is a simple operation. The movement of the jaw is quite a complex thing and a dentist goes to a great deal of trouble to study it and study it very carefully, and the problem of aligning a bite is quite a complex one and not one that can be learned or can be trusted to just an amateur, however gifted. The other problem too, Mr. Speaker, is that there will be some people who have perhaps no teeth, say, at middle age and they might end up never seeing a proper dentist after that, merely seeing a denturist. Now what competence does a denturist have to spot all the other associated diseases of the mouth? Now I have personal knowledge of a very unfortunate case.

MR. NEARY: You have hoof and mouth disease.

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, if the missing link could only keep his mouth shut I would certainly appreciate it.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order!

MR. J. CARTER: This was a patient who went to see a dentist, had some soreness in her mouth, and even though she went to see a dentist she had gone too late and this was the beginnings of cancer of the mouth, and a number of operations followed but the poor woman died a very painful, a very prolonged, excruciating death and it is certainly not something that we should take a chance on. I think that if people for any reason stay away from dentists and just go to see the denturist or just a dental technician without checking with either a doctor or a dentist, I think it is a great mistake on their part.

Now, I cannot understand why the denturists are not willing to work with dentists. Why will they not sit down with the dental board and say, look we are able to make teeth but we will work under you as part of a team. They can surely make a good living. The dentists are not out to starve them. There are a lot of dentists -

AN HON. MEMBER: Have you spoken to any dentists?

MR. J. CARTER: Yes, I have spoken to a lot of dentists

MR. CARTER:

and I have had a long history of association with dentists. I have been very fortunate in my choice of dentists and I have managed to hang on to my teeth.

MR. NEARY: Are your teeth your own?

MR. CARTER: Most of them are, yes.

MR. NEARY: You have got your receipt in your pocket for them, have you?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CARTER: To digress for a moment, Mr. Speaker, I used to doubt Darwin's Theory of Evolution because they never were able to find the missing link, but if Darwin had a seat in this House of Assembly, he would have absolute confirmation of his theories because there sitting opposite us are a great nest of missing links and the only trouble is they are not missing, they are here harassing us, and I wish if they cannot keep quiet they would leave.

Now, Mr. Speaker, just to recapitulate and to go through a number of points that I have made in preparing for this talk.

The denturists have improper and inadequate training. They are not properly trained, there is no suggestion that they be properly trained. The proper training for a denturist is seven years in medical school. If they want to be denturists let them go to Dalhousie University or McGill University or some school of dentistry. Let them spend the seven years and then let them start fooling around with people's mouths. But anything less than that, I think, is wrong, In fact it is immoral.

In some cases these denturists have no training at all but only through illegal practice. I have already mentioned the danger to the public in the possibility of them failing to recognize disease; and, of course, their lack of respect for the law - well, I do not

MR. CARTER: wish to comment too much on that. They are operating outside the law at the present time. I think this government and the past government, well, past governments, have been very lax in dealing with them. I think they should have been a little bit more strict and I think they should have refused them the right to practice at all except under dentists. There is no question about it, their offices are improperly equipped and I wonder about their standard of sterilization and cleanliness. We know, for instance, that a dentist chair is a very expensive piece of equipment and for proper examination of a patient you need all that equipment. Now, obviously, if you are going to make dentures you do not need a drill, but you certainly need X-ray equipment; you certainly need to have a complete knowledge of the pathology of the mouth; you need to be able to work under sterile conditions.

MR. STIRLING: (Inaudible).

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition is interrupting and sometimes it is fun to banter back and forth but when one only has thirty minutes and is trying to make serious points, I would appreciate some co-operation.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. CARTER: Also, of course, the whole approach of denturists is a technical one rather than a biological and scientific one. It is not like getting a part made for a car. Here you have something that is, you know, going to be used as part of one's body. It is rather like trying to get a pacemaker put in by an electrician, it amounts to the same thing.

MR. CARTER:

Another point that should be made is that our facilities for the training of dentists is now adequate without duplicating an inferior service. Now there are a good supply of dentists coming out of the dental schools and there is no need for there to be a shortage of dentists. There is no need for a person to have to wait to see a dentist certainly in this city, and I would suggest in most of Newfoundland, provided the dentists are not harried out of these various practices by denturists. Now that is one of the problems, that a dentist, for instance, might not want to go to a smaller area because the denturist is taking up a lot of the patients that he would otherwise get.

Now, I feel that the public are somewhat ignorant. They see a name written up, denturist, they do not think too carefully about it. They say, 'Well, he must be trained. He is a qualified person. He can look after my teeth', and so they go in and they get in the hands, without realizing what is happening, they get in the hands of someone -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. CARTER:

I think it might be worthwhile considering just calling them dental technicians but they are not willing to go by those names. They want to have the more sophisticated word 'denturist'. So the practice of denturism kills the incentive of the dentist to go to outlying areas in this Province to practice. I think it is also clear that if the denturists are a licenced body working to make false teeth there is certainly going to be tremendous pressure brought upon patients who go to see them to have excess teeth removed so that they can then be looked at and handled by them. Certainly there is a great lack of total dental care. They are only willing to look at a part of one's dental needs.

MR. CARTER: Of course, the making and insertion of dentures is only the beginning of dental care. I have referred to earlier in my remarks that the adjustment of the bite is most important. A very curious fact too is that unions apparently support illegal denturists without training, but would not support untrained people in their unions. I cannot see the electricians allowing an untrained electrician to practice or the carpenters union allowing an untrained carpenter to practice. And yet the same union in some cases apparently have been promoting the permission of untrained denturists to practice on people. Now I think there is a possibility to set things right. And although I do not particularly like this act - in its present form I serve notice that I will be voting against it - with some very minor changes I could support this act and support it wholeheartedly. And the changes are in the composition of the board. At the present time it says the minister may appoint to the board three denturists from a list of not fewer than five denturists, one dentist and three other persons who represent the public at large. Now if those three other persons were to have a medical background and to be medically qualified in

MR. CARTER: some area of medicine, or even to have just some background in medicine, say a nurse or an X-ray technician or someone with some medical knowledge, I could then, perhaps, vote for this act knowing the public would be protected and that we would not be having untrained people let loose upon us. I still would not like it but I would then be in the position of saying, well, half a loaf is better than no bread. So, I would urge the minister, and I urge him with all my heart, to consider this change.

Now, I happen to trust this particular minister. Fortunately the act says the minister may appoint to the board, and it is outlined who he may appoint. This minister, I think, is sensible enough to appoint a sensible board. But, he may not always be the Minister of Health (W. House) and I would like to see it enshrined in legislation that this board be composed of at least one dentist and three medically oriented persons. And then, well, you could have your three denturists, I suppose. But they would be outnumbered by medically oriented people and I think the general public would be protected.

Now, I intend to read into the record a communication from the Newfoundland Dental Association which I think is relevant. I will make a few comments on it as I go through - I will be tabling it - and I think it is a helpful part of this whole exercise. This is the Newfoundland Dental Association's statement on the proposed Denturists Act, and it says in part, 'Dentistry, as one of the respected health professions, is proud of its progress in our Province in the raising of the level of dental health awareness and in the advances of scientific knowledge which have improved the dentist's skill. It is, therefore, concerned with any move which could jeopardize this progress, for we feel that our people have the right to the best dental care we can provide. The profession has long accepted the position that auxiliary

MR. CARTER: workers, adequately trained and supervised, can be valuable members of the dental team to provide quality health care. We maintain that the provision of dentures is a vital part of this overall dental health service and should not be relegated to untrained or inadequately trained personnel; nor should it be divorced from the overall team approach to a dental health service. We repeat the self-evident axiom that the retention of natural teeth in the mouth in a healthy state throughout life is the obvious aim and result of a successful dental programme. Any move to jeopardize this aim, such as permitting people, untrained in the proper diagnosis and treatment of disease in the mouth and supporting tissues, to construct partial dentures, for example, using natural teeth as abutments of support, should be rejected with determination.

'When we consider the 'Denturist' Bill as a vehicle by which our people may be legally provided with a full denture service of good quality from an alternative source outside the dental profession, we observe several serious inadequacies, some of which we feel should be noted. The use of the word 'denturist', we submit is misleading. This word, to a lay person, indicates a level of training comparable with that of a dentist, who has spent up to eight years in university'. I said seven earlier, eight years. 'It indicates a professionally trained person specializing in the fabrication of dentures, whereas, in fact, those seeking legalization are less adequately trained in every aspect of dentistry, including denture construction, than are dentists.

'In actual fact, those seeking recognition are, at best, technically trained workers in the therapist or technologist category, and their designation should reflect this to the public honestly. In nearly all provinces, the word 'denturist' is not used in legislation. We suggest for consideration the term 'denture therapist', which is used successfully in Ontario, for example.'

MR. CARTER: 'Because of the importance of the matter to the health of our people, and because those seeking recognition as denture therapists have been reluctant or unable to show evidence of formally acquired skills in their craft, we submit that the bill should be far more specific in its requirements for licensure than it is, and this could be done without making the act unworkable. We submit that our people have the right to expect any person designated to be qualified to have at least the following qualifications: be of legal age, be of good character, hold a minimum educational standard of Grade XI, have completed a recognized course of formal training and/ or a recognized period of apprenticeship, pass the qualifying examinations prescribed by the Board.

'We recognize the difficulty of implementing a formal training requirement for those already active in the field. Those seeking registration as 'grandfathers' could be accepted on the basis of a period of apprenticeship only to fulfil the requirement of section (d) above.

'However, those seeking registration after proclamation of the act should fulfil both the training and the apprenticeship requirements in the qualifications as outlined above.

'The matter of enforcement of the act is of serious concern to the dental profession, both because of its lack of specificity and because of experience in other provinces. We would point out the great responsibility entrusted to the minister in enforcement, for, both in the appointment of the Board and in the approval of regulations concerning registration and in the examinations, he is supreme.

'We are confident that he is aware of his obligation and will discharge it honourably. However,

MR. CARTER: ministers and their philosophies change, as do boards, and here, again, the inclusion of more specific directives in the bill would enable more consistent and reasonable enforcement. This is particularly true respecting the examination of candidates. The bill even fails to state, for example, that the examination need concern itself with the applicant's ability to make dentures.

We submit that the bill should specify that candidates shall be required to prove their skill by successfully completing a comprehensive written, technical laboratory, clinical and oral examination. There should as well be the assurance in the bill that those entrusted with task of examination be the most qualified and impartial people available. There is no other way that the public interest can be safeguarded in this important matter. This is especially significant at the outset when many of the applicants apparently have no formal technical training.

We are confident that our elected representatives will deal with this matter responsibly considering all the facts before them. We would submit, however, that they not be swayed by misleading statements concerning cost differentials between the fees of dentists and those of only technical training. These differentials, where they exist, are marginal, and the experience in other jurisdictions is that they fade into insignificance when legislation requires the raising of minimum standards. Nor should one be influenced, we submit, by the argument of personnel shortages in dentistry, for it has been recently recognized that there are very few areas in our Province where a complete dental service is not available from a highly skilled and dedicated professional. Now, I will table this, Mr. Speaker, because I have read from it. I have read most of it in fact. And I would just like to sit down, having made this one final point, in

MR. CARTER: what sense would we be any the worse off, what way would be any the worse off if denturists were not to exist at all? I say, why have this bill at all? Why even bother?

MR. STIRLING: The same test for the same (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, if I cannot be heard in silence.

MR. STIRLING: (Inaudible).

MR. CARTER: When I am trying to be serious, I think it is a pity.

So I say what difference would it make if there were no denturists at all? I would be very, very happy to

MR. CARTER: be able to report such a fact. I would like to see the denturists disappear because I do not think they are providing an adequate service. I think they are downgrading the medical profession, downgrading the dental profession, and it is a great mistake to give them anything.

But if this administration in its wisdom is deciding to give them an act, then I think that act should be changed in the way that I have outlined and I very, very strongly urge the minister to make those necessary changes. So with those few words I hope that some changes will be made.

MR. SPEAKER(Baird): The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, in talking on this bill it seems that basically nobody wants a bill; the denturists themselves do not want it, the dentists do not want it and, as well, as number of people in this House.

I would like to assess the problem in the same way as the member for St. John's North(Mr. Carter) and ask the question why do we need denturists? I would also ask the question why do we need dentists, but, obviously, we need to have preventative medicine. And I am very pleased that the Liberal government, years ago, brought in free dental care in our schools, up to the age of thirteen. And in the estimates that have been brought down I impress upon the Minister of Education(Ms. Verge), as well as the Minister of Health (Mr. House), to make sure that this programme is now extended to all students in schools, not only because they are thirteen years of age. Years ago in our Province, because of our economy and our diet etc., a lot of our people, if they had a toothache, of course, the thing to

MR. HISCOCK: do was pull the tooth out.
The main reason, of course, was there were no dentists.

We still have a shortage of dentists in this Province and that is an actual reality as to why we need the denturists. There is a shortage of dentists. We have to send our students away; sometimes we only have as high as one student per year at Dalhousie Medical School of Dentistry, and we do have a shortage. I feel that if we are going to get at the root of the problem it is desirable in this Province of ours - they say the level of civilization can be told by skeletons, if they have their teeth.

The Egyptians, for example, had their teeth, whereas other ones never had them -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HISCOCK: - other civilizations.

And if we are going to maintain our standards, I would like to see the Minister of Health (Mr. House), and the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge), and the Premier of this Province make sure that dental programmes are extended to our schools, number one. Number two, I would like to see, also, with the Minister of Education, if I could have her attention - but, obviously, where I am not talking on Women's lib rights, then obviously I will not get the attention of the Minister of Education.

MR. NEARY: She has her own
(inaudible).

MR. HISCOCK: I am talking, particularly, about our younger people. Our older people never had the opportunity to have good teeth, it was the reality of our economic conditions. Now we do, and I would like for the Minister of Education to make sure that dental programme is extended to all grades in the schools and also to

MR. HISCOCK: bring in free milk.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is the Minister of Health's job.

MR. HISCOCK: I know it is the Minister of Health, I have said it to the Minister of Health(Mr. House) also. But unless the Minister of Education(Ms. Verge) sets her own priorities on what should be done in the education field, and unless she puts pressure on the Minister of Health, then the Minister of Health has a lot of things to do.

So with regard to it I would like for the Minister of Education to put pressure upon him. But with regard to something that is under her -

MR. HISCOCK:

maybe it is under the Department of Agriculture now - and that is to have free milk in the schools. Because I am rather concerned, Mr. Speaker, being a former teacher in schools in Forteau and Bonavista and Musgrave Town and in Englee, and I am rather concerned from the point of view that when you go into our schools many of the students are sent to school without any breakfast whatsoever. Many of them are sent without any breakfast and then they come on to school over twenty or thirty miles of gravel road, or sometimes over paved road, come to school, have two or three hours in the morning and after that what happens, Mr. Speaker? Are there any hot meals? Are there any nutritious diets in the schools? No, the only thing available is a bottle of coke, a bag of chips and a bar, or maybe go on to the corner store and get a plate of chips. Then, Mr. Speaker, when they come home, because if they are on social assistance or low income, with regard to the high cost of food, what do they get? Kraft dinner. And we expect our children to function in the schools and to be able to get the rate of return from their studies. Obviously not. I think it is one of the most pressing problems in our school today, that it has been proven children from low economic income families do not get the rate of return from their learning, they do not have the attention, they are not alert, they are not physically well-sounded in the sense of their nutrition, diet. And I feel that we, as a Province, if we talk about all the boom that we are going to have in this Province, that we will bring in a free dental programme for all the students in the schools and we will also bring in a free milk programme.

And as for the Minister of Health (Mr. House) saying there are a lot of schools getting rid of

MR. HISCOCK: junk food in the schools, it is quite true. But a lot of other schools are keeping junk food in because they need to pay for other equipment. When I was in - and I will not mention the schools - but when I was in some of these schools one of the main sources of income for buying projectors or buying lab equipment or buying books for the library-because they had to take the other money that was given by the Department of Education, the board kept it and spent it on its heating bill or maintenance bill, and in regard to that this money at the canteen was a major source of revenue.

So I would like to in commenting on this bill with regard to denturists, I think we should be more into the preventative medicine. Our older people obviously need dentures and they need them repaired. There is no question about it that the dentists are charging extremely high rates. But with regard to legalizing the denturists and bringing them up to a greater standard than they have now who knows, once they obtain the board, then their standards will come on up to the dental rate of our dentists now.

So I, myself, believe very strongly that we have to have more dentists in the Province. I would like to see the Minister of Health (Mr. House) look at the possibility of maybe having some dental school here at the university. Because we are not getting enough dentists in this Province. And if we have to export them after they graduate, after we have our own, and export them to other parts of the world, then at least we can have the credit of saying, 'We educated another Newfoundlander and Labradorian and sent them to some other part of the world'. So, I, myself, am against the bill as it reads now, and I am also against the principle of having denturists. And I find it a little bit upsetting that the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge)

July 6, 1981

Tape No. 3075

IB-3

MR. HISCOCK: referred to this with a very quick slap of the wrist and said, 'This is not my department, it is the Minister of Health (Mr. House)'. As I said, it is a wonder she did not say milk belongs to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Goudie).

So I would say that the minister has to take a stronger, more aggressive role in the Education Department. We have seen now the mess that we are going to have with Grade XII. Hopefully, Mr. Speaker, we will see

MR. HISCOCK:

a greater strengthening of our educational and social programmes in the schools.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird):

Is it the pleasure of the House that the said bill be now read a second time?

MR. NEARY:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. NEARY:

He closes the debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

If the Minister of Health speaks he closes the debate.

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

It is back and forth, would the hon. gentleman care to - I will wait until the hon. gentleman is finished, Mr. Speaker.

MR. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Kilbride.

MR. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to have a few words, a couple of minutes on this matter, a couple of short comments on what the hon. the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) said. He did not think these denturists were trained or should be in existence at all.

I have a note here of the number of patients that one denturist saw in one year, which comes out to 1,411 people and if you multiply that by the number of denturists and the number of years they have been in operation, I am sure that anyone could see that these are not untrained, unskilled quacks, as some people try to make them out to be. They are offering a service. They have been in existence quite some time. They have been trying to be legalized since the time of

MR. AYLWARD: former, former administrations and they have come this far to date.

The bill that we are proposing certainly is not the ultimate for denturists across Canada. The Leader of the Opposition made some reference to a position in Ontario where the denturists would have to fill prescriptions made out by the dentists and this situation does not work. Right now there are thousands of records being made that the dentists will not co-operate. That is the same thing that would happen here, so I do not believe that that situation would be useful for Newfoundland. If the dentists here do not want to work with the denturists, there certainly is not much sense in putting that into the legislation. The Saskatchewan legislation would be better. I would prefer to see here a situation something like that. In British Columbia right now there is free dental care for senior citizens, introduced lately, as far as I know. The fact that people use the argument that people only go to denturists because they are not as expensive as dentists seems to be washed out in B.C. where there is free dental care for anyone. They can go to a denturist or a dentist, it does not make any difference for the senior citizen, and 80 per cent of the dentures are being done by the denturists, so it is not a cost factor.

MR. STIRLING: Would you repeat that again?

MR. AYLWARD: In B.C. where there is free dental care for senior citizens, the cost does not matter to an individual so there is no argument that just because they are cheaper people are going to them. In B.C. where there is free senior citizen dental care, 80 per cent of the dentures are done by the denturists rather than the dentists. So it is not a price -

MR. STIRLING: (Inaudible).

MR. AYLWARD: Well, this is only a recent statistic

MR. AYLWARD: that I do not know if the minister is aware of.

MR. STIRLING: (Inaudible).

MR. AYLWARD: Well, he is in shouting distance, he is hearing what I am saying.

MR. STIRLING: There is a lack of respect over there, he should be in his seat.

MR. AYLWARD: I do not consider it a lack of respect. He is on government business right now.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please! Address the Chair.

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about this legislation. I am concerned about the board as it is set up. I believe that there should be a majority of denturists on this board.

The fact that the denturists cannot. in this act, do partial dentures also worries me. Quite a bit of denturists' business, 30 per cent or 40 per cent of it at least, would be partial dentures. And they have been doing it for quite some time. There is not enough roar. The only thing that I can base my information on is that denturists have been around a long time. In recent years they have been operating openly. They have served hundreds and hundreds of patients and there is not a general outcry. There are no more - I do not know if there are any less, but there are no more complaints about denturists than there are sometimes with dentists or any professionals. Each professional will have some complaints against him.

One problem I see right now with the way the denturists are operating is that there are people operating as denturists who

MR. AYLWARD: are not members of the Denturists Society and they are giving a bad name to these people who are acting as denturists. I expressed my two concerns about this bill. I will not be voting against the bill, because I believe firmly that this is a start. We have to start somewhere. Although I am not completely satisfied with this start, I will be working very hard once this is law to see that the board -

MR. THOMS: (inaudible) House, now the backbenchers are speaking.

MR. AYLWARD: Come in more often and you will see more of us speak. Mr. Speaker, I will be working very hard, when this legislation is law to keep a very close eye on the board that the minister will be appointing. This board will make or break the future of the denturists and it will make this legislation either work or not work in this Province. If the board is appointed where the denturists and the members of the board can work in co-operation with each other, we can have a good Denturist society in Newfoundland which will eventually be trained to do not only full dentures, as recommended in this act, but, I am sure, will be trained and registered to do full dentures and partial dentures in the not too distant future. But it all depends on the board that is going to be established. I will be keeping an eye on this board and making sure that it is a board that can work with the Denturists Association in Newfoundland right now.

There is one small part of the act that I will bring up in committee, Section (3) subsection 4, which is a minor point, but there are not very many denturists and they have to be rotated within three years. No one can serve more than three years so this could be a concern in the composition of the board. But I would just like to restate again that I am concerned

MR. AYLWARD: about the board in this legislation and I would like to see a majority of denturists on this board, as it is set up, immediately.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I think that the Justice Minister in PEI a while ago made a comment at a conference that I attended and he would be well-advised, the Minister of Health (Mr. House), to listen, to what that Justice Minister said concerning a bill. If a bill is brought into the House that cannot meet the needs of a particular department or cannot meet the needs to satisfy a particular group of people, then the bill should not be brought in in the first place. The bill should come into the House without any amendment. The minister should be sure of himself when he gets his department to draft up a bill, that this bill will not require any further amendments. Now, Mr. Speaker, this bill is not a sufficient bill, this bill is lacking. This bill, in my estimation, is out to protect the dentists but not to help the denturists. Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what that bill is doing. It is out to protect the dentists but not to help the denturists.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the minister said earlier, 'to protect

MR. WARREN:

the public! Yes, Mr. Speaker, to protect the public.

Now, Mr. Speaker, how is the minister intending to protect the public when he is bringing in a bill that only goes half way to protect the denturists who will be servicing the public? Mr. Speaker, I think it is a bit much for the minister to expect this bill to protect the public when the bill is not satisfactory to the group of people called denturists who will be servicing the public. So how can he protect the public when the bill is not satisfactory for the denturists?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think the problem in Newfoundland at the present time is not whether the denturists should carry on a legalized operation or whether the dentists should be protected. I believe that the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) said that if he had his way he would do away with the denturists altogether. Mr. Speaker, he said the same thing about Joey Smallwood, if he had his way he would get rid of Joey Smallwood forever. Mr. Speaker, that comes from a man who has no respect for anyone or any society. He is just - Mr. Speaker, he must be going through a period in his lifetime where he does not realize that -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. WARREN: - the denturists in this Province, Mr. Speaker, are the public. Now, I believe that we should have a bill in this House and the bill should be, "An Act Respecting the Denturists", but, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health (Mr. House) has brought in this bill and he is very vague. He is very vague on this bill, Mr. Speaker, This bill should not go through under its present terms and references. This bill, Mr. Speaker, is not giving any protection at all to the public, it is not giving any protection at all

MR. WARREN: to the denturists. Why should the denturists in this Province not have the same opportunity of serving the public in the formation and in the making of partial dentures and dentures? Why should they, if they are qualified to do so, have a bill that says, 'You can only do it halfway, you cannot make the partial dentures'.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this bill is telling the dentists, 'Look, denturists will not be affecting your profession, we will make sure that those denturists will be legalized under Bill No. 49, that they will not be given the opportunity and the privilege if they qualify, regardless if they qualify or not, to go ahead and make partial dentures. Now, Mr. Speaker,

MR. WARREN: this bill is against principle. It is against the principle that we all try to attain. Whatever profession one could go into, whether he be a dentist, whether he be a savoury farmer, Mr. Speaker, that he should have, whatever profession -

MR. NEARY: No, that is a hobby (inaudible).

MR. WARREN: That is a hobby, is it? - Mr. Speaker, he should have whatever protection a bill can give that individual. This bill is not giving the denturists the protection that they deem and is necessary for them under legislation.

Mr. Speaker, another reason that I am not going to vote for this bill, as it now stands, is at the present time there are people along the Labrador coast who are waiting as high as sixteen months in order to see a dentist. Waiting as much as sixteen months in order to see a dentist. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is even after that individual has his first teeth, we call it, extracted. He is waiting as high as six and seven months, Mr. Speaker, to have his dentures made by the dentist. And, Mr. Speaker, is the minister saying that look, let so-and-so, he is living down in Spotted Islands, let him - he is way off there on the island or way off there on the coastline of Labrador, I do not care how long he has to wait for his partial denture.

Mr. Speaker, this is another indication that if this bill becomes law that that individual person, or those individual people will still have to wait because the denturists are not permitted to make partial dentures.

So, the minister, number one, does not have a sufficient number of dentists in the Province practising, where the people in the Province can receive the best dental care, and, number two, Mr. Speaker, if there is an opportunity that those people in the remote areas of the Province can be serviced medically and in the best health ways possible

MR. WARREN:
by denturists?

why should they not be serviced

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about miles and miles, hundreds of miles of coastline where the people only see a dentist, only see a dentist once every year, or sometimes it is much less than that. And the cost factor, if that individual person has to travel outside of their own town, Mr. Speaker, the cost is enormous.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have to vote against this bill at the present time, until I can see clearly that this bill will give the denturists the opportunity, the privilege that would be justly due them in their profession, to make partial as well as complete dentures.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) said, the denturists are downgrading the medical profession. Mr. Speaker, what a bunch of crap coming from the member for St. John's North. He has to be full of it, Mr. Speaker, to say such a thing. Mr. Speaker, how could the hon. member - why did he not give us some indication? As soon as he said this he just sat down. Why did he not give us some indication and let the denturists, tell the denturists - maybe he has some information that I do not know - and tell them that they are downgrading the medical profession. If they are, Mr. Speaker, if the denturists are downgrading the medical profession in this Province, why has this government, which has been in power for the last two years or the Progressive Conservative administration that has been in power for the last ten years, why have they not gotten up and brought a bill into this House condemning denturists in the Province and saying, 'Look, boys, we are going to have to ship you out of the Province'? Why did they not do that, if it is downgrading the medical profession? And the Minister of Health (Mr. House) surely to goodness does not agree with those comments from the hon. member for St. John's North, that they are downgrading the medical profession. If they are, I am surprised that the minister has not taken more drastic steps to make sure that nobody in this Province will avail of their practice, Mr. Speaker.

So I am really disgusted.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I am sure hon. members on the government side are disgusted by hearing the hon. member for St. John's North saying that the denturists are downgrading the medical profession. Now, Mr. Speaker, that, in itself, is not called for. And the minister can see that this bill is not the answer, this bill is only part of the answer. And, Mr. Speaker, why should we spend three or four months with a select committee going around the

MR. WARREN: Province and trying to find a flag that the government thinks is suitable for the Province, when here we have a denturists bill that the minister hopes will be a start? Mr. Speaker, it is not satisfactory to the people of this Province, it is not satisfactory to the denturists, that we will have a half-made bill, as probably you would say. Because, Mr. Speaker, this bill is not in total. There have to be changes made in this bill. And until I can see some major changes - and, in fact, the biggest change I want to see is that the denturists will be given the same opportunity, under regulations, of course, to make partial dentures. And, Mr. Speaker, if they follow the right and proper procedure, there is no reason why the minister could not bring in major amendments to this bill. If not, I would strongly suggest to the minister that he should just take the bill off the Order Paper altogether and we should not discuss it any further because, Mr. Speaker,

MR. WARREN: I think, it is like the Minister of Justice in PEI said, why bring a bill into the Legislature, if the bill is not a satisfactory one, why bring it in at all? Why does not the minister and his officials make sure that when they are going to bring a bill into this House, whether it is a denturist bill or whether it is on hydro or anything else, that the bill will be brought in where very little - minimum amendments will be necessary, and where the bill will be satisfactory to the group that the bill is intended for.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): The hon. member for St. Barbe.

MR. BENNETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I certainly would like to have a few words on this because I, myself, feel most certainly, it is all to the people of Newfoundland, especially, Mr. Speaker, to rural Newfoundland. And I think I have echoed many times in the House of Assembly my sympathy and my desire to see service provided for rural Newfoundland. I feel that in urban Newfoundland, basically and generally, services such as denturists or dentists or whatever other medical services people need in urban Newfoundland, such as St. John's, Corner Brook, Grand Falls, the larger centres seem to have these services readily available while, at the same time rural Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, does not have these services readily available at any cost.

In my opinion, we certainly need the services of any and all who are prepared to provide those services, most certainly in the field of medicine. It costs a lot for persons from rural Newfoundland to come into the cities, to urban areas, it costs a lot in transportation and in accommodation to come and visit a dentist. Just to have one tooth extracted, it might cost hundreds of dollars.

MR. BENNETT: While I know we are speaking about denturists and the making of dentures, I certainly, myself, would like to see a service provided and expanded to provide the services to the people of rural Newfoundland, especially. There is no reason, Mr. Speaker, that we should have a downgrading of quality. I understand denturists are skilled persons, professionals, I understand, Mr. Speaker, that they have worked and they do work in the field of making dentures and work being supervised by dentists who do spend years studying to accommodate this need.

The hon. gentleman for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) suggested earlier we do not need denturists. Probably we do not, Mr. Speaker, but we certainly need a service provided to Newfoundlanders, to people who find it very difficult - if you try today to get an appointment with a dentist for a filling, an extraction, or for a denture, it is practically impossible, you have a long wait.

MR. CARTER: : You have it now.

MR. BENNETT: You have a long wait -

AN HON. MEMBER: What about (inaudible).

MR. BENNETT: I have a long wait for myself and my family. It is not readily available and I live in urban Newfoundland. I have a dentist there who takes care of my family's needs, but we cannot always pick up the telephone and say, I want to come down and have this done. He will say, I will put you on the waiting list and in a few months time, unless it is an emergency, in a few months time we might be able to fit you in. You certainly have to make those appointments. And it is more difficult for people who live in rural Newfoundland to get these services provided than it is for people who live in urban. Naturally, the people who provide these services, Mr. Speaker, need to set up where they have sufficient business to do and primarily this, naturally,

July 6, 1981

Tape 3081

PK - 3

MR. BENNETT: would be in urban Newfoundland where there is a ready population. But where our population is more sparsely spread, we do not have a thickly populated area in rural Newfoundland, it is becoming more and more difficult to have the service of a dentist or a denturist provided.

Regardless of whether this bill, Mr. Speaker, goes through or not, if we are all in agreement or if we are all not in agreement, it is about time the government did something to accommodate the needs of Newfoundlanders

MR. BENNETT: in this particular field, we need it desperately. I do not know if the hon. gentlemen across from me realize how desperately we need these services, the services of dentists, generally plus denturists, for rural Newfoundland. We need it in the district that I represent, the district of St. Barbe, Mr. Speaker, we need it most certainly, and we certainly need it at a cost that is not prohibitive. We need it at a cost the people can afford. It costs a lot of money to visit a dentist. It costs a lot more money to have to continually go back to a dentist. It costs a lot of money for dentures, it can cost hundreds of dollars. I saw a young man that I am very close to, a few days ago, who spent in excess of \$600 on a couple of teeth, in excess of \$600 just on two teeth. Now, Mr. Speaker, for those people who do not experience such expense, and for those who can have it done for less, have this service provided for less money, I suspect they are not completely aware of the total scope of the ramifications of dental work. And when it comes to large families especially, and low income people, it is really painful to see the dilemma and the lack of services provided in the field of dental work in rural Newfoundland. Children go to a dentist and have their teeth extracted indiscriminately. Regardless if they can have them filled and saved, they just have them extracted, and it is not fair to these children. And I speak of which I know. I am not speaking out of the back of my head, I know this, I experienced it, I see it all the time. In years gone by, when we did not have the expertise of dentists and denturists, when we did not have this particular expertise available, so readily available to us as we do today - today we have roads where denturists can travel, we have roads where people can travel in to visit the dentist or the denturist. We have this availability, these roads have been linked up around the Province. It is all the more

MR. BENNETT: reason now why the service should be made available so people can avail of it. I would like to see something done to accommodate the denturists, Mr. Speaker, so that if they are going to operate they are not operating against the law of the country, make it legal. We have a government in place that can make regulations and do inspections on any field of endeavour, so make it legal, if it is something that is needed by the people of this Province and it is something that can be accommodated in the framework of government. Then, Mr. Speaker, I think the least the government can do is recognize the needs of the people and have something put in place to accommodate the needs of the people. Just because you pay \$500 for a set of dentures does not necessarily mean that they are better than the ones that you paid \$300 for. We have a real dire need for the service of dentists and denturists, a real dire need, especially, like I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, in rural Newfoundland. If people in my district wish to get to a dentist, they have to get in to Corner Brook or Deer Lake, a hundred miles away.

MR. HOUSE: Wrong. Wrong.

MR. BENNETT: It is not wrong, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HOUSE: What about Nurse White who travels your coastline?

MR. BENNETT: Why do people go to a retired old lady still who spent a lifetime - why do they still have to go to have extractions done? And the hon. minister knows of whom I speak, without mentioning any names. This elderly lady is retired for years and she has been doing these emergency calls or emergency cases for a good number of years, and she is still doing it. And why should she have to do it? Simply because we have not got the availability, we have not got provided

MR. BENNETT: to rural Newfoundland the services of dentists let alone denturists who, I understand, do excellent work for less money. I stand to be corrected, Mr. Speaker, if they do inferior work - which I am led to believe - I understand they do good work. So when the minister closes this bill, hopefully he will, indeed, relate to the district that he knows so well, the district that I represent, and tell me so I can tell the people in the district of St. Barbe that, indeed, they have sufficient dental service in River of Ponds, that they have sufficient dental service in Plum Point, that they have sufficient dental service in Trout River. If the hon. gentleman thinks these services are already available, and they are not, then I would hope that the government would do something to accommodate the people who have to travel 100 miles to get these services.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) it is going to take a lot of money.

MR. BENNETT: It costs a lot of money with the escalating costs of gasoline and now with the escalating tax structure put in place by the government. And they are continually taxing people in order to provide these services. So I would most certainly like to see the government provide more services to the people who need them.

I think it is about time that the government took a real hard look at the cost of some of these services to the people of Newfoundland, to the consumer. Government has given authority to collect tax dollars from people for these services to be provided. And I would hope the minister when he stands up can relate to some of the needs and most certainly explain to the hon. House where the dollars come from to provide

MR. BENNETT: the service, just how much service is being provided by the government in the field of dentistry, just how much service is being provided in rural Newfoundland especially. Like I said earlier, in urban Newfoundland dentists are more readily available; they have the population to draw from where most people have a cash flow. They have a guaranteed income in most urban areas, that is why the towns and cities grow. But that is not the case with rural Newfoundland, and rural Newfoundland have to come to the urban centres to get these services. And when they come here they should have these services available, and if denturists can provide this job, do the job for these people for less money than the regular dentists can do it, and if the quality is there, which I understand it is, I have been told all the time that the quality is there, the expertise is there. These people who are denturists apparently work for dentists, they get some kind of training.

If they are not able to provide the service, if they are not capable of doing it, I can understand then the legality of denying them the right to work, but, Mr. Speaker, if these denturists can provide the service, and if indeed the quality is there, and if the price structure is such that our people can afford it, I think the government should do something about it and have them recognized.

When the hon. the minister speaks he might be able to tell us exactly the system that is in place for rural Newfoundland and naturally his comments would be of a general nature because we seem to have a real problem in the district of St. Barbe having this service provided, this service of dental treatment generally.

In my opinion, it is about time we got away from this glorified tooth whipping where you

MR. BENNETT: saunter in just to have a tooth extracted when you should have the dental treatment applied in rural like you have it applied in urban. If families can afford to provide hundreds or even thousands of dollars to have proper dental work done, if they can afford to have it done in urban Newfoundland, I do not see why our young people should be victims just because they live in rural Newfoundland and are not able to afford to have proper dental work done.

It is a broad field, a broad area, and it is a very important area. I do not know what statistics suggest today, if we have more tooth loss, more tooth decay because of our lifestyle than we had some years back, but most certainly, Mr. Speaker,

MR. BENNETT: there is certainly need for the government to take a real hard look at this field specifically. And I will certainly appreciate the remarks of the minister and I will certainly appreciate anything that can be done to accommodate rural Newfoundland, and especially the district of St. Barbe, where I know, myself, the service is not provided. And if it is provided in other parts of Newfoundland well, then, I would hope that the Northern part of Newfoundland gets the same service as other parts of rural Newfoundland. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (BAIRD): The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do not wish to prolong the debate, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to have a few words on this particular topic. In view of the fact that it has been on the agenda of this House for so long, I cannot say that I blame hon. members for getting involved today in the debate. Hon. members will recall that ten years ago, I believe it was, I think it was ten years ago, maybe a little longer, right about the time the government changed back in 1972 and prior to 1972 - the denturists have been fighting for recognition in this Province for at least ten years and probably longer. So I do not blame hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House for taking part in the debate today on this bill, bill no. 49, 'An Act Respecting Denturists'. I must say that I am disappointed with some of the remarks that have been made.

The member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter), in keeping with past tradition, of course, brought us back to the Victorian Age. The hon. gentleman who agrees with nothing or anybody in this House, did not spoil his reputation today. He got up and viciously attacked the denturists, hon. gentlemen who are not in this House to defend themselves. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to dwell on what the hon. gentleman said. But then, shortly after that,

MR. NEARY: one of his own colleagues stood and contradicted what the hon. gentleman had said.

MR. MORGAN: A real open party.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, they say an open party. Well, I say to that, Mr. Speaker, when a government measure, when a government bill is brought before this House, unless it is a matter of conscience - listen to this, now the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) should listen to this - unless it is a matter of conscience then usually -

MR. CARTER: What do you think this is?

MR. NEARY: It is not a matter of conscience. This is not a matter of conscience, Mr. Speaker. Unless it is a matter of conscience usually you would expect the government ministers and the government members, the supporters of the government, private members, that if they wish to speak at all they speak in support of the bill and not against it. And if they are against it, well, then, Mr. Speaker, they have two recourses open to them: Number one, they can bolt the party, move their seat, sit as an independent or an independent Tory, move their seat away from the government that they cannot support - they have to hold their noses when they bring in legislation like this - move their seat or have the Premier discipline the member for not toeing the party line, for not supporting a government measure.

This is a government bill and I would suspect that unfortunately the publicity that will go out of this debate today will have nothing at all to do with the bill, it will be centered around the member for St. John's North who distracted from the bill by getting up again - and that is not the first time he has done it, Mr. Speaker, he is taking an example from the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), the member for St. John's East, who does it repeatedly in this House, a gentleman who wants to practice law and be a minister at the same time, who wants to

MR. NEARY: criticize the government and be in the Cabinet at the same time. Well, the member for St. John's North is following that example which is a bad example indeed. And so, Mr. Speaker, he either moves his seat or the Premier disciplines him, probably gives him the flick for voting against a bill. And obviously, Mr. Speaker, a bill of this magnitude has to be discussed and debated in caucus and once it is approved by the caucus, brought into the House, then, I would submit, that hon. gentlemen have no choice but to support that government measure unless it is a matter of conscience and this is not a matter of conscience. And I did not hear the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) or the Premier (Mr. Peckford) get up and say that members are free to vote as they please on this bill. I did not hear that said. That is usually said. When there is a matter brought before this House which is a matter of conscience, then the Government House Leader or the Premier will stand in his place and say, 'Members on my side of the House are free to vote according to the dictates of their conscience. I did not hear that said in this particular instance, so I would assume the hon. gentleman is bolting his own party. Then a few moments later, as I said, the member for

MR. NEARY: Kilbride (Mr. Aylward) contradicted the hon. gentleman and almost went to the extent of letting go a little bit of a broadsides at the hon. gentleman. Now, I can understand the hon. member for Kilbride, I can understand his feelings, because some of the denturists are operating in his district. And, of course, he would not want his colleague getting up and condemning them. He would not want to leave the impression with the denturists that this was the general feeling on the government side of the House, that they are merely bringing in a bill for show, they are merely bringing in a bill out of shame, they are merely bringing in a bill that has been on the Order Paper before. This is not the first time that the denturists have been on the hitch to get their own act in this Province. And the member for Kilbride would not want that impression to go out of this House, that the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) was speaking for the caucus, it might cost him a few votes. So he stands up and takes a little bit of a swipe at his colleague.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to repeat a phrase that I have heard uttered by the Premier in this House, and by the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) in this House and by other ministers, but I will just deal with the Premier and the President of the Council at this particular time. They have said time and time again in this House, why does the Opposition not get its act together? How often have we heard that, Mr. Speaker? Well, now, I say to the government, why does the government not get its act together? I would not be at all surprised but if you polled the government benches that you would find a number of other ministers and a number of other backbenchers who are opposed to this bill, not opposed to it because it is a bad bill, because it is not the one the denturists want, they are opposed to it in principle. I would not be at all surprised but the

MR. NEARY: member for St. John's Center
(Mr. McNicholas), and the reason he has not spoken in this debate, I would not be all surprised but the hon. gentleman is opposed to this bill. Why? Out of professional jealousy. That would be the reason. Just the same as the hon. gentleman is opposed to optometrists, the same reason, professional jealousy. I would not be a bit surprised but the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), if he were allowed, if they would release him to get up and speak, that he would speak against his colleague, the Minister of Finance, the physician not medical doctor, physician, if he were allowed to speak, that he would get up and speak against this bill. And I am sure the member for Exploits (Dr. Twomey), if he got up to speak he would speak against this bill. Because I have no doubt at all, Mr. Speaker, but these were the three hon. gentlemen plus the Dental Society, that these are the three members on the government side of the House who had more input into this bill than the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) or the Minister of Health (Mr. House) who is introducing the bill. And they were, I would say, given the bill and, I would say, over a cup of coffee or over lunch they took this bill, the original bill and dissected it and tore it apart and gave it back to the minister and said, 'Here is what you should bring in. If you have to bring a bill in, bring in this second-hand bill, watered-down version of the bill'. I would say that the medical people, the Ophthalmologist, a physician and a doctor, medical doctor from Exploits, took the bill -
AN HON. MEMBER: This one?
MR. NEARY: Yes, took this one, slipped to them under the table, took it, went over it and then made their recommendations to the Minister of Health. But I would say, apart from that, the people who had more input into this bill than anybody were not the denturists, the ones who should have had the input, the ones who should have been listened to, I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the dentists had

MR. NEARY: more say, had more input in this bill than any other group in this Province.

MR. HOUSE: You are wrong.

MR. NEARY: No, I am right, Mr. Speaker, I am right. I have ears to listen and sometimes I listen. And I have heard-the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) parroted the feelings of the dental profession today in this House, parroted and had it written down for him, had it written down, typed out by his secretary.

MR. CARTER: And why not? And why not?

MR. SPEAKER (BAIRD): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: I do not mind interruptions

from Sachmo, from Big Foot, Mr. Speaker -

MR. CALLAN: Sashquatch.

MR. NEARY: Sashquatch, rather, Big Foot.

I do not mind that. People with big feet have no brains. Mr. Speaker, I would say the dentists had a bigger impact and a bigger influence on the Minister of Health (Mr. House) on this bill than any other group in the Province. And that is why, Mr. Speaker, we have before us today a watered-down version of the bill. And, as I say, it is not the first time that notice has been given

MR. NEARY:

in this House for a bill to legalize the denturists. If there was ever a group in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, that should get the Order of the British Empire for lobbying and for fighting for their rights, the denturists are the ones who should get it. They have fought harder -

AN HON. MEMBER: I supported them five years ago.

MR. NEARY: Well, I supported them ten years ago. They have fought harder, Mr. Speaker, and lobbied harder for recognition, for their rights than any other group that at least I have seen since Confederation in this Province. And what do they get in return? Now, they get a slap in the teeth, a kick in the teeth by the hon. minister. The hon. minister now is sitting back. I can hear him when he gets up and says, 'Well, this is a start, this is a beginning, we can amend this as time goes on. This will do for the time being.'

MR. HOUSE: (Inaudible) them now?

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

MR. HOUSE: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: No, I can hear him now. Well, I say to the hon. gentleman, if he makes these kinds of statements that he is awfully naive, because that is not the way it works. Once the bill is put in place, Mr. Speaker, it will take an army -

MR. HISCOCK: Years.

MR. NEARY: - years to move the minister or to move the government to get an amendment to this bill. It is almost virtually impossible with the tug of war that is going on between the denturists and the dentists and the Minister of Health and the optometrists and the ophthalmologists and the opticians. Once a piece of legislation is put in place it is virtually impossible to get

MR. NEARY: an amendment brought into the House. And unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the denturists, as good as lobbyists as they are - and they are the best I have seen in Newfoundland, they are good lobbyists, they make common sense, they make good sense, they make a strong case - but as good as they are, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately they have not been able to convince the public of their value to our Newfoundland society, to Newfoundland and Labrador. Because if they were able to get their message out to the people of this Province and the government could see that there would be a backlash, that they would lose votes if they did not legalize the denturists, then you would have a better bill than you have today. But because the government are not convinced that this is a vote-getter, because they are not convinced that the people can see the value of this, because the government thinks this is just a handful of denturists fighting for recognition - because if that is what they think, then that is why, Mr. Speaker, we do not have a better bill before this House than we have today. The trouble is that the people cannot see the value of the denturist, I am talking about generally speaking now. People who have used the services of denturists of course recognize the value of the denturist, as far as the cost of dentures are concerned. Of course they know it, they realize it, but generally speaking it is not an issue that has sex appeal.

MR. MORGAN: : Have you ever worn any dentures?

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, thank God, all my teeth, so far, are my own. But there are people in this House, members of this House who are wearing partial dentures and dentures that have been made by denturists. Do hon. members realize that? The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) opened a second front,

MR. NEARY: The Minister of Fisheries has a second front partial denture made by a denturist. My colleague who sits next to me, the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hancock), Mr. Speaker, who used to be a boxer -

AN HON. MEMBER: A boxer?

MR. NEARY: Yes, he was, and he was a good one too, and he would have won the Canadian championship - and I would not advise the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) or anybody on the government side to tangle with my hon. colleague.

MR. STIRLING: 'Brian' he should be your bodyguard.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the member for

MR. NEARY: St. Mary's-The Capes would have won the Canadian Championship. But do you know why he did not win it? He was in the ring -

AN HON. MEMBER: He was wearing his (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: No. He was in the ring with a challenger who was a pretty tough guy. And I think it was in the early rounds that his challenger struck him in the side of the jaw. As a result of that blow the member for St. Mary's-The Capes (Hancock) felt something go down his windpipe. He could not breath, he could not breath and he thought he was after swallowing his mouthpiece. So he had to give up because he was suffocating, he could not breath, They kept rooting around his mouth to see what it was and they could not find anything. And finally when he had to give up -

MR. MORGAN: He sure did not lose his tonque, that is obvious.

MR. NEARY: - he could not -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: I am quite serious about it - he could no longer carry on, when they finally did take him off to the hospital they discovered that when this guy hit him, when his opponent hit him, he knocked one of his jaw teeth out, it went down in his windpipe and they had to fish it out or he would have smothered. That is why he did not win the Canadian Championship.

MR. CALLAN: But he did win St. Mary's-The Capes.

MR. NEARY: That is right. But he is a champ in another way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: He is the Tory killer in this Province.

MR. WARREN: He is a winner.

MR. NEARY: Yes, that is right he is a winner. And apart from that and playing --

MR. MORGAN: He is going to be a Liberal killer in the next few days.

MR. NEARY: - hockey and fighting, he had his teeth loosened up and he had to get a partial denture recently for his two bottom teeth. And he had it made by a denturist.

MR. STIRLING: It will not be allowed under the new act.

MR. NEARY: It will not be allowed under the new act - like the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and a number of other members of this hon. House who have used the services of denturists successfully.

MR. STIRLING: The best dressed man of the year.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague, the member for St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. Hancock), had his partial denture made for \$120. Whether the Leader of the Opposition likes it or not, we have to talk about costs, we have to talk about cost, we have to talk price. Because economics do come into this whole matter whether we like it or not, and that is where the sex appeal comes in for the Newfoundland public and for the ordinary Newfoundlander, if that message could only be gotten out. But my colleague paid \$120, I think it was, to a denturist to make this partial plate. That same partial plate made by a dentist would have cost \$240, or double - would have cost \$240, or double would it would cost to have it made by a denturist.

MR. HOUSE: How long ago did he have it made?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, -

MR. HOUSE: How long ago? The time frame is important.

MR. NEARY: Well, the hon. gentleman says, the time frame is important. Well, what would the hon. gentleman think is a good time frame?

MR. HOUSE: I would say if it was two years ago the price was not exactly cheap but that was (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Well, how about two weeks ago? Would the hon. gentleman be surprised?

MR. HOUSE: (Inaudible) about two or three dollars cheaper than (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman had these dentures made within the last month, this partial denture, within the last month or so for \$120 that would have cost \$240 at a dentist, if they were made in the dentist's office, \$240.

Now, the hon. gentleman can try to drag red herring in and try to confuse the issue and he can try to create all of the doubts that he wants, we have heard enough of that today. We have heard enough of doubt thrown on the denturists today for one session of this House.

And so, Mr. Speaker, if that word, if the denturists, if the supporters of the denturists had been able to get that message out to the Newfoundland people that they would pay less, substantially less, 100 per cent less for partial dentures or full plates, by using the services of a denturists and not having to have them done in a dentist's office, if that message had gotten out I have no doubt that we would see a better bill before this House today than the one we have. Because people would have been clamouring for it. People would have been writing their members, people all over this Province would have been lobbying the government, would be sending delegations to see the government. Unfortunately, that message has not gotten through to the people of this Province. Because, as I say, if it had, and the government could see that it

MR. NEARY: was a real vote catcher, a real vote getter, I guarantee you that we would have a bill, just as good as the one they have in Saskatchewan. And that is why we do not have a good bill before the House today.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) this bill.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: If the people were for it, it would have been a good bill.

MR. NEARY: That is right. It would be a good bill.

So, Mr. Speaker, here we are today in this House, on the 6th. of July, and no sign of the end of the session in sight yet, the Premier has the House on a time table the same as he used to have when he was in the classroom; forty minute session for this, forty minutes

MR. NEARY: for religion, forty minutes for history, forty minutes for a lecture by the Premier and a few hours on a debate on the denturists' bill, we are on a timetable. And, so, here we are in a bit of a dilemma. We do not know whether we should vote for the bill or vote against it. We really do not know what to do. We have heard this afternoon about the concerns and the complaints of the denturists, and we have heard government spokesmen tell us that they should be all taken out in the harbour and drowned. That is what they meant, the government spokesmen. Just the same as we heard a government spokesman the other day tell us that the former Premier of this Province, Mr. Smallwood, should burn in hell, that same government spokesman. We have three spokesmen, three government spokesmen in this session of the House. We have the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn), the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan). These are the spokesmen, the government spokesmen. None of it has been denied, Mr. Speaker, none of the things they said have been denied by these three government spokesmen in this session of the House, and so we can only assume that this is the feeling of the Newfoundland Government. Even though they are bringing in this bill, they are bringing it in half-heartedly. The Minister of Health will never make his mark in the history of Newfoundland by bringing a major reform into this House. This bill is watered down, it is weak and, in some aspects of it, it is unrealistic and will not work, and one cannot blame the denturists for being concerned about it. My colleague, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling), said the bill would have been better off if the government let it die on the Order Paper, let it die on the Order Paper.

MR. HISCOCK: Nothing dies on the Order Paper these days.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I guess there is an element of truth in that. The denturists, certainly, might be better off if it died on the Order Paper. The only thing I can say about that is that because of the delays, because of the procrastination on part of the administration, the denturists years ago, eight or nine or ten years ago, were driven underground for a while. Then, suddenly, they emerged and they hung out their shingles, they put their names in the windows in the store fronts, and they operated illegally. For years they have been doing that, and the government and the Minister of Health (Mr. House), of course, dare not challenge their right to do that because they are providing such an invaluable service to the people of this Province. The government were afraid that all those people who were using the services of the denturists, who were not forced to pay the dentists high prices for partial dentures and for full plates, that these people might rebel. The member for Kilbride (Mr. Aylward), for instance, might lose a few votes over it, and members who represent other districts might lose a few votes. So, Mr. Speaker, the delays in this bill, the price that we are paying for the delays and the procrastination on the part of the government is high indeed. The people will suffer as a result of these delays and the denturists, themselves, will suffer. The dentists will survive, Mr. Speaker, the dentists who - we had one in this House who sat on that side of the House, right, I believe, where the member for St. John's Centre (Dr. McNicholas) sits. He stood up and he, almost word for word, told us in this House what the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) told us today. He was being very selfish about the whole matter. Mr. Speaker, I tell you this, that I feel so strongly about this that I doubt very much if dentists should be allowed to make dentures in their offices. The hon. ophthalmologist

MR. NEARY: over there will no doubt tell us that an optometrist should not be allowed to dispense eye-glasses. Well, I do not think that a dentist -

DR. MCNICHOLAS: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: - no, the hon. gentleman is saying, 'Yes, he should be allowed to do it'?

DR. MCNICHOLAS: No, he should not.

MR. NEARY: No, that is right, he is saying he should not. Well, would the hon. gentleman not agree that a dentist is in the same boat?

DR. MCNICHOLAS: No. I have a few words to say.

MR. NEARY: Well, I am going to bait a few people. I will drag - the debate would have closed if I had not got up and now I am going to drag a few people to their feet.

A dentist should not be allowed to dispense dentures in his office. And all this foolish nonsense about training, Mr. Speaker, who said the denturists are not trained?

MR. CARTER: I said it.

MR. NEARY: You said and some of your colleagues over there. Are you speaking for the government?

MR. CARTER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Denturists, in a lot of cases

MR. NEARY: I would rather put myself in the hands of a denturist than in some of the dentists I have seen.

MR. CARTER: Then you are a fool.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, they are trained.

AN HON. MEMBER: They got their Grade XI from Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: They are trained, Mr. Speaker, and

not only are they trained but they have the practical experience. We were told at one time in this House by the Tories that they were going to establish a training programme at the College of Trades and Technology and that we were going to have a denturists school in the new polytech that we see up here up on the top of Mount Scio hill that was built by this government, the new polytech. They told there was going to be a denturist programme in that school or one at the university or all three we were told, Mr. Speaker. But this foolish nonsense, all this is designed to create doubt in the minds of members of the House and create doubt in the minds of the Newfoundland people, that the denturists are not competent to do the job when in actual fact they are. As a matter of fact, they are the people who make the dentures for the dentists. A lot of them, I would say 90 per cent of them, worked in dentists' offices, a lot of them did.

Mr. Speaker, they are qualified and let nobody in this House be swayed by the doubt that is created about, you should have to have a dentist look at your mouth. Do hon. gentlemen think for one moment that if a denturist who is trained, if he spots something that he does not like in a person's mouth, is he going to deal with it himself or he would he recommend to the individual that they go see a dentist or a dental surgeon? Mr. Speaker, these are responsible people. Their track record speaks for itself. In the last ten years they have looked after the needs of the Newfoundland people by giving them low priced, low cost partial dentures and full plates. And look

MR. NEARY: at their track record for the last ten years, Mr. Speaker. Have they had any complications? Can anybody fault it? Can anybody complain about it? Have there been any complaints to the Department of Health? We see the minister letting the Status of Women do pregnancy tests downtown in a clinic, that they have established without any supervision by the Department of Health - and the minister does not do anything about that - by non-professional people.

MR. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member has about five seconds to finish.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, let me wind up by saying that I do not know if I am going to vote for this bill or against it. It is a feeble effort, in my opinion, to appease the denturists and to try to give the people of this Province the impression that the government is doing something. And it is like all the other things that they do, Mr. Speaker, it is done in a half-hearted way.

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

MR. MCNICHOLAS: Mr. Speaker, I had not intended speaking at all but I was provoked by the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). I can say this, I do not honestly think I have ever met a denturist and I do not think I got any brief from the denturists. I know many of the dentists. I know their concern about this bill. I feel that we have a responsibility to the people, to the denturists and to the dentists. And I am going to vote for this bill because there are restrictions on the work that the denturists can do. They can only deal with full dentures. At the present time, at any rate, I would not like them dealing with partial dentures because there is often disease, infection and carcinomas lurking-

MR. STIRLING: What happened to the (inaudible)?
MR. MCNICHOLAS: And I know what I am talking about, because I have done a lot of personal surgical work in the mouth myself. So you do not try and tell me anything about it. Mr. Speaker, I have great pleasure in supporting the bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Thank you very much, Mr.

Speaker. I had an opportunity to have a look at the present legislation and it appears to me that, certainly in this day and age, one is very hard put to support the legislation. Mr. Speaker, either the denturists in this Province are qualified or they are not qualified, one or the other. This legislation to me suggests that this administration, those who are bringing in this particular bill, does not believe that the denturists are in fact qualified. I think I happen to disagree with the government. I believe that the denturists have shown, in this Province, that they are indeed qualified. Just the same as there should be in this Province, in my own profession, lay people

MR. THOMS: who are well qualified to act for people who are purchasing homes, mortgaging it does not take a qualified lawyer to complete the purchase or sale of a piece of property in this Province.

But one of the things I take strongest exception to - Mr. Speaker, no administration in this Province would dare do, for example, to the Law Society of this Province what this particular act is doing to the denturists.

MR. NEARY: Or the medical.

MR. THOMS: Or the medical profession or anybody else. How many lay persons do you have on the benches of the Law Society of Newfoundland? Was there one lay person on the benches of the Law Society of Newfoundland? Would the Law Society in this Province stand for having this administration or any administration appointing more lay people or people from other professions to govern the conduct of the legal profession in this Province?

MR. HOUSE: (Inaudible) not drawing a parallel.

MR. THOMS: Why is it not a parallel? Like I say, we have a bill and -

MR. HOUSE: (Inaudible) work schedule?

MR. THOMS: What is that? .

MR. HOUSE: (Inaudible).

MR. THOMS: I cannot hear you.

MR. HOUSE: Would you let other people do the work you are doing now as a lawyer?

MR. THOMS: Of course, I would. You can go to a Notary in Quebec and you will find that the Notary in Quebec can do a job as well as any lawyer in Quebec at one-third of the price.

MR. HOUSE: (Inaudible) apples and oranges.

MR. THOMS: I am not talking about apples and oranges, I am comparing here the denturist to the dentist.

MR. CARTER: We are talking about people's health.

MR. THOMS: You are talking about people's health. What is so all-fired - you know, that you need six or seven years of training? What you are trying to do is keep the situation where denturists are not allowed to practice in this Province.

MR. CARTER: That is right.

MR. THOMS: So I can assume you are going to vote against this bill.

MR. CARTER: Oh, yes.

MR. THOMS: Oh, very good. Okay. As a great matter of conscience you are going to vote against it.

MR. CARTER: Sure.

MR. THOMS: Well, I am glad to see you are going to vote against the bill. But we are probably voting against it for different reasons.

MR. CARTER: Oh, quite different reasons, yes.

MR. THOMS: Quite different reasons, because I do not accept that only dentists are qualified to make dentures -

MR. CARTER: They are making fools of themselves.

MR. THOMS: - it is that simple; any more than I am prepared to accept the fact that a lay person cannot be a clerk in a legal office and be able to do a real estate transaction as well as a lawyer. Mr. Speaker, there are law firms in this Province today who have them, who do it, have been doing it for a number of years.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who are they?

MR. THOMS: Clerks, as well qualified as the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) ever hopes to be when it

MR. THOMS: comes to acting for somebody who is going to be purchasing or selling a house in this Province.

But the point I am getting at is this, that if you are going to bring in a bill and you are going to set up a board to regulate the denturists in this Province, then why not give them the same courtesy as any other profession, recognizing them as a profession? What I am saying is that you would not dare, this House would not dare, the administration would not dare, this party would not dare suggest that the conduct of the Law Society would be governed by three lay persons -

MR. CARTER: You are bringing in great (inaudible).

MR. THOMS: - a chartered accountant and three lawyers. Would the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) for one minute support a suggestion that the Law Society should be governed like that? How about the Medical Association? Would my hon. friend, the Minister of Health (Mr. House), dare with any hopes and expectation of not creating a furore in this Province suggest that the Medical Association

MR. THOMS:

should be run by people, the majority of them, by people other than medical doctors, and this is what we are doing here. There are three - the Board will consist of three denturists, one dentist and three lay people. Now, all I am saying is this, either you are going to recognize the denturists as a valid, legal, existing organization, a profession in this Province, or you are not. This legislation does not accept that fact. You accept it as something less than - now, I have not had an opportunity to look at the bill regarding the dispensing opticians of this Province.

MR. STIRLING: Yes, four opticians.

MR. THOMS: There are four opticians.

MR. STIRLING: The majority are opticians.

MR. THOMS: The majority are opticians. The majority of people who are benchers in this Province are lawyers. The vast majority of them are lawyers. The majority who are on medical boards are doctors and you get your token lay representation. Believe you me, Mr. Speaker, the lay representation on the Benchers and Law Society of this Province is token representation, that is all it is. Let us call a spade a spade, let us be honest with ourselves. It was put there - it was done for show and nothing else, nothing else, because people started asking for some lay representation. It is done for show, and the same thing should be true here. Here we are setting up a board - it is a board consisting of seven members - to govern the conduct of the denturists in this Province; three denturists, one dentist and three lay people, four of whom are a quorum, so that the three lay people and the dentist can outvote the three denturists. Now, I ask you, is that fair? Is

July 6, 1981

Tape No. 3091

GS - 2

MR. THOMS: that reasonable? I would like the minister to justify, I would like for the minister to justify-

MR. MARSHALL: Would the hon. gentleman adjourn the debate?

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I will move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Grand Bank adjourns the debate. The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, at 3:00 P.M. and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, at 3:00 P.M.

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

JULY 6, 1981

The following information is supplied by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Energy in reply to a question put forward by Mr. Steve Neary (M.H.A. LaPoile) in Order Paper 25/81 dated April 7th, 1981.

Questions:

- (a) The cost to the Public Treasury of extending Newfoundland Light and Power Company's line across the Exploits River to junction of Bay d'Espoir Highway and Trans Canada Highway;
- (b) purpose for extending this power line;
- (c) number of hook-ups resulting from the extension of this power line in the years 1977, 1978, 1979, 1980 and 1981 to date;
- (d) all correspondence, purchase orders and requisitions in connection with this project.

Answers:

- (a) Before responding to this query it should first be noted that the area in question is within the jurisdiction of Newfoundland Light and Power and consequently involves neither Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro nor P.D.D.

Thus there has been no cost incurred on behalf of the people of this province by either Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro or P.D.D.

The cost to the Public Treasury was \$25,000 and this was incurred by the Department of Highway for highway lighting.

- (b) (c) and (d) These particular questions should be forwarded to Newfoundland Light and Power since it is their responsibility.

July 2, 1981