

PRELIMINARY

UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT

House of Assembly

For the period:

3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.

February 22, 1977

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I should like to welcome to the Legislature this afternoon a delegation from the Town Council of Harbour Breton, and the delegation is composed of the Mayor, Mayor Abraham Godwin, Deputy Mayor Claude Fiander and Councillors James Snook, Raymond Noseworthy and Aiden Mahoney, and they are accompanied by the Town Manager, Mr. Simeon Fiander. On behalf of all hon. members I welcome the delegation from Harbour Breton to the House of Assembly.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

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

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, with Your Honour's permission I would like to acquaint the House with the state of the fishery in 1976 and maybe give a few statistics as to the increase in landings, earnings, value and so on. 1976, Mr. Speaker, was an exceptionally good year in the Newfoundland fishing industry.

The total landings were up by 22 per cent giving a total of 658.4 million pounds which was a 22 per cent increase over 1975. The value of the landings rose by 29.5 per cent for a total of \$56.8 million while export value jumped by 32.2 per cent for a record \$160 million. The previous record for export value, Mr. Speaker, was set in 1973 when the Province exported \$144 million worth of fish products.

The landings of several species showed increases in 1976 far in excess of that of the previous year. For example: codfish landings increased by 38 per cent for a total of 236 million pounds; flounder and sole increased by 25 per cent to 176 million pounds, and lobster landings totalled 4.9 million pounds for an increase of 31 per cent over the 1975 catch.

MR. W. CARTER: Maybe, Mr. Speaker, a more meaningful statistic is reflected in the increased value of the various species in 1976. For example: the landed value of cod was up by 47 per cent over 1975; flounder and sole increased by 36 per cent and the lobster value was up by 33 per cent over 1975.

I am pleased to report as well, Mr. Speaker, that the approximately 18,000 fishermen who were involved in the inshore fishery last year had a most successful season and on an average increased their income by 18 per cent over 1975. It was an outstanding year for these fishermen. I am not suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that things could not be better—indeed, that must be our objective, to make things better—but despite that 1976 was a good year and the landed value of their catch was up by 18 per cent for a total of \$35.5 million.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to suggest that the Department of Fisheries is totally responsible for all of these increases. However I do feel that a substantial portion of the increases results from the programmes and projects that the department has carried out during the past couple of years. One area in which the department can take credit is in the increased landings of herring and mackerel. Officials of my department have been actively pursuing the development of the purse seining fishery and during the past year a number of longliners, especially along the Northeast coast, equipped themselves with the necessary gear in order to prosecute that fishery.

As I told the House a few days ago, this year has been a record year with respect to the granting of loans through the Fisheries Loan Board. Indeed, I believe the amount of money loaned in 1976 pretty well accounts for in excess of 30 per cent of all the money that has been given out by that board by way of loans since its inception back in 1951.

MR. W. CARTER:

Other areas in which the department I think can rightfully accept some credit is in the projects undertaken in the St. Anthony area where surveys were carried out on the Tooker Bank, a few miles Northeast of St. Anthony, and located what is believed to be one of the largest stocks of turbot near our shores. As a result of that survey, at least eight other longliner crews took part in that fishery and in a very short period last Fall landed three quarters of a million pounds of turbot. This resulted in significant increases in income for the fishermen and provided hundreds of man-hours of work for the fish plant workers in that area.

So, Mr. Speaker, again I repeat, 1976 was an extremely good year for the fishing industry,

MR. W. CARTER:

and I am very happy to inform the House that the three ships that are being operated by the Department of Fisheries, the three sculpin class prototype sixty-five foot draggers have been operating on the Southwest corner of the Province since the beginning of February. And in a period of about seventeen days these ships have landed almost a million pounds of fish -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER: - with a landed value of \$101,742. This fish was landed in the fish plants, the Hardy operation in Port aux Basques, 151,584 pounds; Rose Blanche, 319,000 and Burnt Island, 343,000.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER: So certainly in that area of the Province it is looking up, catches are good. As a matter of fact, the catches are record catches. And I only hope, Mr. Speaker, that this will be, maybe, the beginning of another good year in the fishing industry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Fogo.

CAPT. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that we are all very pleased to hear the minister's announcement that the productivity in the fishing industry has increased. And what he has said now confirms, I think, what most of us saw the federal representative here state on television a few nights ago. It is almost the exact figures as the minister quoted. This increase in the cod fishery makes one wonder, Mr. Speaker, when we were all clamouring for the 200 mile limit, the industry was going down, the catch was going down, but all of a sudden it appears that catches along the inshore have increased. You know, it makes one wonder if the 200 mile limit is going to produce the results that we all expected.

MR. CARTER: It should have been better.

CAPT. WINSOR: Yes, with due course. In due time I am sure - and I am sure it is the hope that it will increase providing we do not go too much on joint ventures. That is one thing we have to be cautious of. And there is another area, Mr. Speaker, and I am going to give the minister some credit here for the developing the herring and mackerel industry. I do not think we have nearly reached the potential in that area, and it can certainly augment the earnings of a great many fishermen if the provincial government were to put more impetus in that industry. Because, Sir, there is an industry that has been more or less dormant for the past few years. But last year, and here I am giving the minister full marks, and I would sincerely hope that he would increase his activity in that area, because it certainly meant a great deal to a great number of fishermen. However, there are problems, and the problems are that they cannot seem to find a market. And I wonder if the minister would try to promote the sale of herring and mackerel, because there are an awful lot more fishermen anxious to get into that industry who just either cannot get a licence or otherwise they cannot get a market for their product.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are very pleased that the minister is convinced now that he, perhaps, for the first time in five years, as Minister of Fisheries is having an input in the industry, and perhaps with his industry the industry will grow, and I am sure he will get the credit for it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform the House that farmers of this Province will for the first time in 1977 have the option to buy livestock insurance. The Livestock Insurance Act which was passed during the last session of the legislature has been proclaimed to come into effect on April 1, 1977. Under this legislation a new board has been appointed known as the Livestock Owners Compensation Board and it will be responsible for administering livestock insurance plans. The government has established a special fund from which livestock owners insured under the plan will receive compensation for their livestock which are killed or injured by dogs or other predators under the terms and conditions of the insurance plan.

All livestock owners are required to register their livestock with the Livestock Owners Compensation Board before March, 1977. All applications for insurance must be received before April 1, 1977. The insurance programme is entirely voluntary and any farm may, if he so desires, insure his cattle or sheep. There is one stipulation and that is the entire herd or flock must be insured. We will not accept insurance for part of the flock or the herd.

The cost of insuring livestock for the first year of operation will be as follows: Purebred and registered cattle, \$7.50 per head; Unregistered cattle, \$5.00 per head; Purebred and registered sheep, \$1.00 per head; Unregistered sheep, \$0.50 per head. The fee for insuring calves and lambs will be much lower. Compensation to be paid the owners of insured livestock for losses caused to livestock by dogs or predators during the fiscal year 1977-1978 will be as follows: Purebred and registered cattle, \$750; Unregistered cattle, \$500; Purebred and registered sheep, \$60; Unregistered sheep, \$40. Again the compensation for insured calves and lambs will be at a somewhat reduced rate.

The Livestock Owners Compensation Fund replaces the Sheep Owners Compensation Account which will terminate on March 31. In the past and for the past three years only sheep owners could receive compensation. There was only an insurance programme for sheep only. The new insurance

MR. MAYNARD:

programme of course includes both sheep and cattle. Additional information is available to livestock owners by contacting any member of the Board, and I have the names listed out here. It is hoped, Mr. Speaker, that this programme will enable the livestock farmers in Newfoundland to become much more viable and as well to be able to expand their operations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

*MRS. MACISAAC: Mr. Speaker, I am quite happy to hear the announcement that there will be a Livestock Insurance Plan for the farmers. Over the years farmers have suffered considerably due to loss of cattle through different causes, and I am sure that they will be quite happy to know that there is going to be a livestock insurance plan. However I am not sure that the rates are going to be of too much benefit to the farmer. I can see instances where the insurance is going to cost the farmer a lot more possibly than the loss of his livestock would. I had hoped that the rates would be a little less than they are. But be that as it may, I will have to discuss that with the farmer and probably they may have some input into it. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to present a petition on behalf of 529 voters in the district of the Straits of Belle Isle in the communities between Anchor Point and Big Brook. Mr. Speaker, the prayer of the petition

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the prayer of the petition is as follows. I tried to contact the leader, Sir, to make him aware of the fact that I was presenting a petition on behalf of 529 of his constituents but obviously he seems to be more interested in Upper Canada these days. Vive la Canada!

MR. MORGAN: ~~Vive~~ Leveque making a fool of himself up there today.

MR. NEARY: The prayer of the petition, Sir, is: "Because of the many problems we have been faced with in the highways and the Straits of Bell Island due to lack of snow clearing equipment, we the undersigned people hereby petition the Newfoundland government for more snow clearing equipment for this highway."

MR. MORGAN: Near Mary's Harbour?

MR. NEARY: No, it is between Anchor Point and Main Brook.

MR. DOODY: They have not had a member there for years.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am told that over this approximately forty miles of road, which is exposed to the Straits is wide open to the Straits of Bell Island there are only two graders. They do not have a snow-blower and perhaps the minister might make a note of this-

MR. MORGAN: Yes, they do.

MR. NEARY: There is a snow-blower there now? Yes, because I remember we talked about the matter here a couple of weeks ago and I supported- I am not sure if the leader had a petition or made some reference to it anyway. But anyway, Sir, these people are very concerned about this situation. At one point over the last three or four weeks there were twenty-seven cars jammed in snow banks in this area, and one ambulance, Sir, one ambulance that was carrying a sick person, was also stogged in the snow. And so, Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to present this petition on behalf of these 529 people.

I might say, Sir, that one of the gentlemen that circulated the petition has made a suggestion here. He said, "I am a sick man and I get very little help. Therefore I would like for the P.C.

MR. NEARY: government to send me \$10 a day for going from door to door to circulate this petition . "And he said,"if the government cannot afford this"-

MR. SMALLWOOD: They will, they will, they will not hesitate.

MR. NEARY: No, I know .And I will be glad to deliver it personally and the hon, the Premier, might make a note of this; he said , "If the government cannot afford to send me this amount, then send me a few pens because I have mine all worn out." So Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to lay this petition upon the table of the House and asked that it be referred to the department to which it relates and I trust, Mr. Speaker , that there will be other members that will support this petition on both sides of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the prayer of the petition as presented by the hon. member for LaPoile on behalf of the over 500 residents in the area, If fact we all, obviously, support it, and I hope that when the petition is tabled to the department to which it relates, obviously the Minister of Transportation and Communication, I hope will rise and support it and whether he is in a position to send \$10 or whatever the amount required is that is involved in the tail end of the petition -or is it pens or pens you said ?

MR. NEARY: Pens I said.

MR. NOLAN: -That he will also endeavour to answer that request as well. But we certainly support the prayer of the petition by the residents , not only who signed it, but for all who may not have signed it or had an opportunity to do so, in this area which is so far removed -

MR. NEARY: Which is the majority of people.

MR. NOLAN: Which is the majority of people, as the hon. member suggests. So we wholeheartly endorse the prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any other petitions.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman from Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. J. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of some thirteen settlements in my district. These settlements are the Town of Gaultois, the Town of Hermitage, the Town of Seal Cove, the Town of Harbour Breton, The Local Improvement District of St. Jacques -Coombs Cove, the Town of Pools Cove, the Town of Belleoram and English Harbour East, there is also a town council there. These petitions are signed by 2634 persons and the prayer of the petition is the same for all of them. "We the Town Council of So-and-So supported by X number of persons do hereby petition Her Majesty's government to institute an ongoing programme of upgrading and paving of all access roads to the communities

Mr. J. Winsor:

of the Conniagre Peninsula and the Fortune Bay area to be completed over the next two years. It is becoming increasingly evident that the development and economy of these areas have been seriously impeded due to the inferior quality of all access-roads. It is further evident that the economical operation of several fish processing operations has been and continues to be seriously impeded. This has reflected on the income of workers in these plants, and we appeal to the Minister of Transportation and Communications for full and understanding consideration of the prayer of this petition."

In supporting this petition I should point out, and I do not think it is all that necessary for me to point it out, because the number of signatures on these petitions indicates a great deal of dissatisfaction by the people in my district, coupled with a petition I presented previously of 940 names, there is a total of 3,574 names on these petitions which represents more than one-third of the total population of my district, 3,574. It is clearly evident that the economy of the whole area has suffered by the lack of a well organized programme of building roads, and upgrading, paving and so on. I do believe that there was a programme designed by the engineers in Transportation and Communications, but that programme has never been fully and completely carried out.

I therefore have much pleasure in supporting this petition, and I ask that it be placed upon the table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

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

MR. J. HODDER: I would like to support the petition which was just delivered by my colleague from Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. J. Winsor). I think this petition certainly shows the need for improved services in the Fortune Bay area, I believe my colleague said that there are some 2,600 signatures, and I understand that there was an earlier petition for 940, and I believe that this must certainly show the Minister of Transportation and Communications that something is

Mr. Hodder:

amiss in this area. It is also remarkable that so many towns in this particular area have gotten together, there is a certain unity there which, I think, is a unity because of need. I feel that if Newfoundland is to benefit commercially and through Tourism, we must have an adequate transportation system. And this is not to mention, of course, the hardship which is caused to the people and the expense to the residents of this area. And I believe that the roads of this Province are fast deteriorating, and I think it is time that we took steps in order to have both preventive maintenance and that we have an organized and orderly road building programme in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

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

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to present the annual report of Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation for the year ended March 31, 1975.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I have an answer to a question asked by the hon. member from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) last Thursday or Friday, I am not sure which, it was late last week.

MR. NEARY: Thursday.

MR. H. COLLINS: Thursday, concerning the number of cases of meningitis in the Province. For the year 1975 there were twenty-two cases reported, and in the year 1976, seven cases were reported.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. A. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the answer to Question No. 89 on the Order Paper of Tuesday, February 10, 1977, asked by the hon. member from LaPoile, I have referred that question to my hon. colleague, the Minister of Transportation and Communications as it is his department to which it relates.

ORAL QUESTIONS:

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

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Finance, and I ask it due to the absence of the Minister of Manpower who might also have been involved, and that is regarding the strike at the Waterford Hospital; have any new meetings been held to attempt to resolve the situation there? Has any approach been made by the union leaders to the minister or the Treasury Board?

Has anyone from the Department of Manpower or Finance attempted to contact them to renew negotiations? What I am seeking to find out, Mr. Speaker, is what is new, if anything, regarding the situation at the Waterford Hospital to help to resolve the problem?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: No, Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge there have been no advances put forward by the unit at Waterford. We have made it quite clear, and it is still quite clear, that Treasury Board and the Hospital Board are quite willing to sit down at any time to discuss anything that may be beneficial. Our obvious and ultimate objective is to settle this strike in the shortest possible time. It would be at the best possible advantage to everybody concerned. The services of the Department of Manpower and Industrial Relations are certainly available. I am quite sure that all the unit has to do is call on them and they will make themselves available.

The Treasury Board people and the Hospital Board people are willing, as I have said, to sit down and discuss the thing and to go into any detail to try to rationalize and try to organize and try to settle all the differences that there appear to be. As of this date, unfortunately, I cannot say that this has happened.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NOLAN: I just would like to emphasize for the benefit of the minister that the reason I asked the questions obviously is we were approached by a number of people involved in the strike and they left us with the impression, rightly or wrongly, that they were given the impression, in a letter I believe, possibly from an official in Manpower, that there are certain items that are non-negotiable, and I believe this may be the stumbling block.

What I am trying to endeavour to find out right now is how long can this go on before the government in fact will have to move in, if that is the good word to use in labour negotiations, and take some action on this matter one way or the other?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: I will have to try, Sir, despite the House rules which says that one question could be asked at a time, I will try to keep in mind the number of questions. If I miss one the hon. member can correct me.

The hon. member suggests that the stumbling block has been in the last letter from Treasury Board. The last letter from Treasury Board to the unit, addressed to the General Manager of the Newfoundland Association of Public Employees, replies to their reply to our suggestion which suggested that certain members of the unit be eligible for extraordinary pensions in terms of the public service pension plan.

The unit replied and said that this was not acceptable and outlined what they thought would be acceptable. The Acting Director of the Collective Bargaining Division replied on February 8th. to the unit, I have the letter in front of me, I can quote from the last two paragraphs and I table this, although it is simply a copy and I do not know if that is acceptable or not to the table of the House. And

MR. DOODY: it says, Sir, quite candidly,

"We are still prepared to look at any anomalies that there may be, However, the benefits and accumulation rate as outlined in the letter, January 21, 1977, must remain the same.

"I am available for further discussion if necessary."

Signed A. Andrews, Director (Acting) Collective Bargaining Division, and there is a carbon copy to the Administrator of the Hospital.

Now that says there quite candidly that Treasury Board is available for further discussion if the unit finds it necessary, and we are available, whether it is at two o'clock in the morning or four o'clock in the morning or six o'clock on Sunday morning, or any time. Our main concern is to try to get this thing settled. Our major concern has got to be our responsibility to these patients who are in at the Hospital. We have got to do what we can do to try to

Mr. Doody.

make sure that their safety and well-being is looked after.

We have also got a responsibility to the people at large in terms of what we can do with the public treasury. And to that extent, Sir, you know, we are just waiting and anxious and available to do whatever we can do to settle the thing in terms of what is reasonable and sensible.

MR. WHITE: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. When a couple of hon. members say supplementary it is difficult. Did the hon. member for Lewisporte ask for a supplementary?

MR. WHITE: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: And did the hon. member for LaPoile ask for a supplementary?

MR. NEARY: Yes.

MR. WHITE: A supplementary, yes.

MR. SPEAKER: I recognize the hon. member for Lewisporte and then I will go on to the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Minister of Finance. The police have gone into the Waterford Hospital and so on. Can the minister tell us what conditions are within the hospital now? You know, certainly if all those people are on strike that the patients must be doing without some kind of care. Could he inform us exactly what is going on, because I know there must be concerned people out there?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: I think, Sir, that one of the few bright spots in this whole situation - if there could be considered any bright spots in the situation - is that there are some people who are concerned. And I think that, you know, once again I have to draw to the attention of the House and to the public the fact that there are people who are genuinely concerned, and people who are genuinely responsible. The total management and employee staff at the unit, as I

Mr. Doody.

recall it off the top of my head, is about 680 people. I think there are about 500 of that group who are now on strike. There are 180 supervisory people, together with a nursing unit - which can be deducted probably from the 500 of the people who are on strike -The nursing unit are working in there. The supervisory people are working in there. There are some volunteers who are working in there, and we have thirteen policemen doing security work on each of three shifts which makes a total, I guess, of thirty-nine policemen plus whatever backup.

So there are quite a few concerned people who are doing everything that they possibly can do to make conditions livable and decent and reasonable for those people in there who cannot look after themselves. Unfortunately, none of the unit involved have seen fit to stay on the job and that, of course, is their right under the agreement, and under the present lack of agreement. But I do find it extremely encouraging and satisfying in terms of the relatives and friends of the people who have their patients in at the Waterford, that there is a group of people who are dedicated enough to extend their shifts, to pass over their days off and their hours off, to work long and hard in jobs that they are not usually expected to do. And I can honestly say to the House that as of this moment the reports that we get from our people in at the Waterford, that the level of attention the patients are getting, while certainly not what it should be if the full group were employed, is certainly adequate to meet the necessities of the day. And although the necessities of the day are not all that we would like them to have under the circumstances we are faced with, I think that the people who are doing the job are doing an absolutely remarkable job, and we are very, very proud of them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile, a supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, as this is an urgent matter I am sure Your Honour will allow some leeway in the supplementary questions to the minister, because there are a lot of things which have to be asked about this strike.

Would the minister first of all tell the House if the minister himself made a commitment to the employees at the Waterford Hospital in writing, either before or after the signing of their last collective agreement, that before the new agreement is signed, the one which is being negotiated now, before that was signed, that the minister would undertake to give pension benefits the equivalent of those received by the police and firemen to those who receive contact pay at the Waterford Hospital? Did the minister undertake that commitment in writing?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, during the last contract discussions with the Waterford unit, there was, you know, a very serious and very real series of meetings between the unit

MR. DOODY:

and Treasury Board and myself. And government did send a letter to the unit signed by me on behalf of the government. And I think the clause that the hon. member is referring to I think in this case could be referred to as the operative clause. It says, "In particular, government recognizes that justification for revised pension benefits exists for those employees of Waterford Hospital with a record of lengthy service comprised of constant involvement in the supervising and care of patients." That commitment was made by this government last year.

That commitment, Mr. Speaker, has been carried out and has been offered despite the fact that we had the -

MR. NEARY: Well you might.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, will you please ask the animated larynx to control itself for a few seconds? This is a very serious problem Sir, and there are very, very many people involved. I have a great deal of sympathy for those people at the Waterford who are patients. I have a great deal of sympathy for those people who are on strike. But I do not think that the cause of the House or of the people involved is going to be served by having the animated larynx lose control of itself at this particular point.

MR. NEARY: You are only a hired gun anyway.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

All hon. members have the right to be heard in silence.

The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: I will try to speak in silence, Mr. Speaker. Do you want me to try to answer this question or do you not, because it is important?

MR. NEARY: Do not be so arrogant.

MR. DOODY: There may be some benefit, Sir, in getting the television cameras in here to see what actually does go on.

We made a proposal to the unit in there because of that commitment. We also undertook at that time to instigate a fact finding commission into working conditions at the Waterford Hospital. We appointed a commissioner in consultation with NAFPE, with the unit, and a report was duly submitted to government on November 28, 1975 by Mr. Howard Dyer.

MR. DOODY:

And unfortunately the findings of Mr. Dyer did not really substantiate all the allegations and all the recommendations that the unit had made to us. On the other hand it did not, in all fairness, throw out the fact that there had been in the past a lot of people working at the Waterford who had to work under very adverse and very difficult conditions. And I must say - and I do not mean to try to criticize the Dyer Report - but I can say that I do not think it was completely satisfactory to either side. I do not think it was very satisfactory to the government side, to the hospital side or to the union side.

MR. NEAPY: That was because of the terms of reference.

MR. DOODY: The terms of reference -

MR. SPEAKER: I must point out to the hon. gentleman, to restate what was stated before, and that is that the hon. minister in answering the question has the right to insist that he be able to make it without interruption, and that is a right which the Chair must enforce when requested.

The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The terms of reference were drawn up, as I understand it and remember it, jointly by union and management in this particular case. And I do not think the terms of reference were really a point in question. The point in question were the findings which were really not that conclusive. It points out that certain things happened at the General Hospital which were not inconsistent with things that happened at the Waterford Hospital and things that happened and so on, which is really not what we were trying to get at.

So in order to try to achieve a reasonable compromise under the circumstances we presented to the group at Waterford a proposal which suggested to those people who were employed there from 1960 on - and there was a formula worked in there with years of service,

Mr. Doody:

plus age, who would be given special consideration in terms of pension benefits. We know that conditions have changed at the Waterford for the better, thank God. During the past fifteen years or more, things have improved considerably. We recognize the fact that people who have worked in there prior to ten or fifteen years ago were very likely working under conditions which were much different than those in other institutions. And so we offer this as a compromise because we had made the commitment which the hon. member from LaPolie mentioned, and a commitment which government has no intention of backing down from, and which we have honoured by sending this offer to the unit. The unit has rejected this, and feel that they want a much broader and much larger application of the pension benefits at the hospital.

Well that leaves us in a very difficult position, Your Honour, because I cannot honestly say that the conditions right now on certain areas of the psychiatric unit at the Grace or St. Clare's or all the other general hospitals, are all that different from that at Waterford. I cannot honestly say that the amount of stress or strain that is going on in the out-patients department on Saturday night at some of the general hospitals is more difficult than there is at the Waterford. I cannot honestly say that the psychiatric division at the Janeway, where all these children are, is more difficult or more onerous than the Waterford. I cannot honestly say that the difficulties and stresses and strains that go on at all the other hospitals, and all the other institutions - Fxon House, the Children's Home - is more difficult. And I mean that quite sincerely. I cannot honestly say that this is so, and it has not been demonstrated to us that it is so despite the fact that we commissioned in all honesty, in unity with the union, an inquiry into just that question, and the Waterford Hospital has not been demonstrated in this commission to be all that different. And so I say that to pass along the benefits that are now being asked for at the Waterford to them to the exclusion of the people who are working in these special care units in other hospitals, at this point in time

MR. DOODY:

is not demonstrated to us to be reasonable or equitable, and so we are forced to the position that we are, and that is to say that there are some people in there who we feel deserve special attention, and these people are willing to recognize, But we deplore the fact that the strike is in place, and as I say, we are willing to sit down, and if there are anomalies, if there are areas that we can get together to try to work things out, Treasury Board and the management in there are willing and able to sit down at any time to try and resolve it.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the minister on television last night mentioned the fact that the people over in Hoyles Home, the workers in Hoyles Home were getting a contact allowance, and that thirteen members of the Newfoundland Constabulary that were doing the work of 500 in the Waterford Hospital, and that the new wing of the hospital had been open. Could the minister confirm if these statements are correct or if the minister just slipped up and was just talking without having the facts in front of him?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: Once again there were three different questions, one of them was - what was the first one?

MR. NEARY: The Hoyles Home.

MR. DOODY: The Hoyles Home. I said, I remember that one, I said, possibly the Hoyles Home.

MR. NEARY: That is not true.

MR. DOODY: Well then it was not probably or even factually, it was possibly that some of the Hoyles Home people may be - I know that it is factually true that some of the people at the Hoyles Home feel that they do deserve special pay and special accommodation and special consideration.

On the policemen thing, on the thirteen -

MR. NEARY: Doing the work of 500.

MR. DOODY: - doing the work of 500. That is obviously, and once again, you know, it is so easy to take something out of context, I said this is obviously an oversimplification, and do not misinterpret it, but they very quickly leaped on it. There are thirteen

Mr. Doody.

people per shift, so you make it thirty-nine. There are thirteen people per shift who are doing the security work which is only part of the job of the people who work at the Waterford. But one must not forget at the same time that that 180 other people who are employed at the Waterford are doing the rest of that work. So if you take that thirty-nine, or thirteen times three, policemen and add them to the 180 management and nursing people who are doing the work, doing the nursing care and the hospital care work, you have got the thirteen policemen per shift doing the security work, and you got the hospital people, thank God, doing the necessary attendants' care work, and because of this the standard of service to those poor people, who are incapable of looking after themselves, had not deteriorated to an extent where it is right now a major emergency.

On the new wing of the hospital, you know, it is in progress. It is there. It is a matter of fact.

MR. NEARY: The minister said it was open last night.

MR. DOODY: I said working conditions have improved there considerably. I said that there are all sorts of things happening in there. There are extra staff. There are new doctors. There is a new wing. The new wing is there. I did not say that it was opened or not opened or whatnot. It is there. But every time that, you know, that obviously I say anything or will say anything on this thing, it just adds fuel to the fire of those people who want to keep the thing going as long as they can keep it going, because it embarrasses government. I do not care how much you embarrass government in this particular case. I do not care if you run me out of town on a brass rail with feathers hanging out of me. My concern is with these 500 patients in there who are desperately in need of help, and that is what I want.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I recognize the hon. gentleman but I would ask him to take his seat for a moment. Now with respect to a supplementary, as hon. gentlemen know Standing Order 31 (b) covers that, "In the discretion of the Speaker a reasonable number of supplementary questions arising out of a minister's reply to an oral question may be asked by any members ." In using the discretion which the House gives me I have to bear in mind, number one, the importance of the subject matter, and number two, whether there are other hon. members who wish and have made known their wishes by continuing to stand, who wish to question on other subjects. And since a little over two-thirds or approximately two-thirds - I do not have it to the minute - of the Question Period is over, I think it is the proper use of the discretion to now recognize other hon. members. That does not mean that if there are not other subjects that this could not be returned to.

The hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage.

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

My question is directed to the Minister of Fisheries.

In view of the rather guarded statement on the CBC last night regarding the status of B.C. Packers plant at Harbour Breton, can the minister tell the House what stage negotiations are in at present?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, negotiations, I understand, have been going on between Fishery Products Limited and B. C. Packers with a view to having the former assuming ownership of the plants now owned and operated by B. C. Packers in Harbour Breton, Change Islands and Herring Neck. I am told as well that a proposal will be presented to me later today from Fishery Products outlining the entire matter. I might tell the House as well, Mr. Speaker, that after the Question Period I will be meeting with a delegation of people from

MR. W. CARTER:

Harbour Breton who have expressed the similar concern, and I will be telling them pretty well the same as I am telling the hon. House now that negotiations are ongoing, and that a proposal will be made to us shortly, and there is every likelihood, at least there is a good chance, maybe, that ownership of that plant will change.

MR. J. WINSOR: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. J. WINSOR: Will this mean an upgrading of the trawler fleet operating out of Harbour Breton?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, there will be certain benefits, I suppose, accrue to the operation with, maybe, Fishery Products taking the plant over. Fishery Products have a large catching capability, I think around thirty-seven ships. And I recall last year that they arranged to have two of their side trawlers placed under charter to B.C. Packers Limited which did, I think, to some extent alleviate the serious problem of the lack of continuity of resources in these raw materials. But maybe if Fishery Products does in fact succeed in their endeavours to acquire ownership of that plant, with the added catching effort of that company, I think

MR. W. CARTER: it will mean maybe a greater source of raw material for the plant; of course at the same time a greater continuity of employment on the part of the workers who work there.

MR. J. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: One further supplementary.

MR. J. WINSOR: Thank you. Will this mean the same type trawlers that they have now from Fishery Products or are you thinking about a better type, mid-water or something like that?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure what type trawlers will be used or in fact am I sure just exactly how many. But I suspect that if Fishery Products does, as I say, succeed in taking over the plant there will be much more catching effort available to them. And as to what type I am not able to say at the moment.

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

MR. HODDER: A question to the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications. Has the minister given consideration to placing a half load limit on the Trans-Canada Highway and some of the secondary roads in the Province?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, no consideration has been given to date, but in the Spring breakup or the Spring thaw every year a number of roads around the Province are placed on half load limits. so I am quite sure this year, with the substantial frost we have had this past Winter, this past number of weeks, that there will be again a number of secondary roads placed on half load limit.

With regard to the Trans-Canada Highway, to date no consideration has been given to placing any limits with regards to weight restrictions, but if the situation deteriorates and no action is taken on upgrading the Trans-Canada, we will reconsider.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. HODDER: Is the minister aware that an early announcement of half load limits in the Province will allow shippers and carriers in this Province to plan their schedules early in the year for the half load schedule?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman apparently is assuming that I can foretell in the future what the weather conditions will be, what the environmental conditions will be in months ahead, I cannot say at this time, for example, what the conditions will be of our roads two months time. It is impossible. However, when the situation arises, when we have bad roads by means of the thaw, the Spring thaw, then the considerations will be given to placing half load limits.

MR. HODDER: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: One additional supplementary.

MR. HODDER: Is the minister aware that the Department of Transportation and Communications in New Brunswick from past experience in placing half load limits have already announced their half load limits in two stages so that shippers and carriers can plan for it? And I think in New Brunswick it is announced in one part for early March and then later in March.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Justice. Would the minister advise the House as to the present status of EMO, emergency services organization of this Province, EMO, Emergency Measures Organization.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman will recall that last year there was an announcement in this House that there would be some

MR. HICKMAN: cutting back on the staff at EMO and this has been done very satisfactorily. At the same time to use them as they were designed to be used as the focal of organization for other departments that have emergency divisions situate therein. For instance, the Department of Social Assistance has a very strong, well trained group of men and women who are ready to respond wherever the call goes out to an emergency

But we found for instance that in EMO there was a highly qualified doctor, full time, and obviously his talents and training could be much better spent working in the Department of Health but available for any emergency that might arise. And again in the Department of Health we have that emergency unit, as I understand - if I am wrong my colleague, the hon. Minister of Health can correct - this is the concept that I understand is being used to develop EMO.

And the concept of EMO has changed a great deal since it was first brought to this Province, as the hon. gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) will recall. I think it was designed was to protect the lives of the Premier and the Cabinet. It was under the able direction - I see the first Director of EMO in the gallery in the person of Mr. Wickford Collins. I think he was the first director.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: Was he the first?

MR. HICKMAN: No, the second. Major Peter Cashin, Mr. Speaker, I must correct the record was first. Mr. Collins second and now Mr. Guy.
Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I hope hon. gentlemen will realize that I must cut the minister off because our thirty minutes are up. Perhaps there will be another opportunity.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

* Motion first reading of a bill, "An Act Respecting The Registration And Regulation Of Consumer Reporting Agencies." (Bill No. 18)

On motion a bill, "An Act Respecting The Registration And Regulation Of Consumer Reporting Agencies," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow. (Bill No. 18)

Motion first reading of a bill, "An Act To Establish The Bay St. George Community College." (Bill No. 19)

On motion a bill, "An Act To Establish The Bay St. George Community College," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow. (Bill No. 19)

On motion a bill, "An Act To Amend The Collection Agencies Act, 1973," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 1)

On motion a bill, "An Act To Amend The Direct Sellers Act," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 2)

On motion a bill, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland Consumer Protection Act," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 3)

On motion a bill, "An Act To Amend The Attachment Of Wages Act," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 5)

On motion a bill, "An Act To Amend The Statutes Act," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 8)

On motion a bill, "An Act To Amend The Maintenance Orders (Enforcement) Act," read a third time, ordered passed and title to be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 10)

On motion a bill, "An Act To Change The Corporate Name Of The Society Of Industrial Accountants Of Newfoundland," read a third time, ordered passed and title to be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 11)

On motion a bill, "An Act To Amend The Evidence (Mechanical Recording) Act," read a third time, ordered passed and title to be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 15)

* On motion a bill, "An Act To Amend The Landlord And Tenant (Residential Tenancies) Act," read a third time, ordered passed and title to be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 16)

On motion a bill, "An Act To Amend The Chairman Of The Board Of Commissioners Of Public Utilities (Pension) Act, 1974," read a third time, ordered passed and title to be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 17)

MR. HICKMAN: Order 12 - Bill No. 4.

Motion second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Petty Trespass Act."

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this amendment is to add to the provisions of the Act the premises of schools, colleges throughout the province under its provision. A few years ago - I think right now as it reads that the Act takes care of the premises of shopping malls, and these are sort of semi-private properties, and we feel that the schools and colleges in the provinces should have the same protection. Right now we find that the University, for instance, has a very limited way of protecting its property from people who are trespassing as well as do school-boards, its schools and its lands around it. So it is a very simple addition to the Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: The minister says, Sir, that it is a very simple amendment to the Act. Well, Sir, it is a very major amendment to the Act. It is not a simple matter. The minister should not try to - because there are not a lot of words in the bill, Sir, the minister should not try to just pawn it off as a very trivial matter, because it is a very major matter. Now we are going to have, Sir, in addition to the university and shopping malls and so forth, we are going to have schools, colleges, and I presume that includes vocational schools, included in the Act.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what I want to ask the minister is, what are the grounds for extending the jurisdiction of the Act? Have we been having trouble? Has there been any pressure brought to bear on the minister? Is it a result of the trouble we have been having, or at least we are alleged to be having, in the College of Trades and Technology? No, The minister shakes his head and says, "No" Well then, what is the justification for this major amendment that the minister tries to give the appearance is so simple?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a few years ago, a couple of years ago, we brought in a piece of legislation, into this hon. House, to give the security people over at Memorial University I believe equal status, to give them the same power, the same authority as the Newfoundland Constabulary, Well, practically the same. I beg your pardon?

AN. HON. MEMBER: It was not approved.

MR. NEARY: It was not approved. Well, I thought we passed that act, we amended the act and then passed it through, because I remember the original act that was brought in would almost allow the security people over at Memorial University to be armed, and that is what we objected to. But they were given a great deal of authority and they have more authority right now, I presume, than the security over at the College of Trades and Technology and in the vocational schools. Mr. Speaker, I am not objecting to the bill, but I would like to know what is behind it, Sir. All I am asking the minister is to give the House some information, What is behind it?

The last time we had a liquor strike in this province we saw a picture on the front page of the Daily News, where the security people, the head of the Gestapo, over at Memorial University was seeing unloading beer and lugging it into the back door and got caught in the act by a photographer, a very alert photographer. Is that the reason for doing it? Is that the kind of trespassing we are talking about? I would like to know, I would like to have some information on this.

MR. J. CARTER: You will get the information.

MR. NEARY: Well, if I do not put the questions to the minister, he is not going to volunteer the information, the hon. big galoot would just please restrain himself.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. gentleman knows that he has been called to task a couple of occasions and he is asked now to withdraw the term.

MR. NEARY: Withdraw the term 'hon. big galoot' I thought it was just big galoot, Sir . Well, if hon. big galoot is not parliamentary I withdraw it , Sir.

MP. NEARY:

But, Mr. Speaker, you know, I would like to know. I mean, here we have this bill that seems to be sort of a - well in the title it says Petty Trespass Act - but there must be some reason for it. And the minister certainly did not give us any justification. If the minister had to rise or fall, if the minister had to stake his reputation on the presentation of this bill, and if we had the television cameras in here and the people of Newfoundland had to judge whether or not this was a good piece of legislation, whether this is going to put bread and butter on the table of the ordinary people of this Province, if the minister had to justify that in the eyes of the people of this Province in furthering the cause of education in this Province, I am afraid that the minister made a very weak case. And I call upon him now to tell us what is behind it, and I will take my seat and I will bow to the minister. But when ministers are introducing legislation, Sir, let them not just pawn it off by saying it is a very trivial matter. Some of the trivial matters that have gone through this House have our people tied up in knots, have a stranglehold on our people, and they sometimes are slipped through.

Well there is going to be no legislation slipped through while I am in the House. It may be sneaked through and slipped through and ran through when I am out, but not while I am here. I call upon the minister now to tell us what is behind this bill, "An Act To Amend The Petty Trespass Act." (Bill No. 4)

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

MP. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I am aware - I am not attempting to deprive the hon. minister from responding to the questions raised, because I realize if he speaks that means he closes and that will be it. But I am always somewhat concerned when we have a bill such as this - and this is not a criticism of the minister, incidentally - But it means that some, you could say, freedoms are possibly being interfered with.

But what it brings to my attention, Mr. Speaker, is the fact of the situation that we are faced with. Not too long ago schools,

MR. NOLAN:

shopping areas and so on did not need enforcement guards, police, security guards, call them what you like. Everywhere you look now, whether it is an airport - there might be some real justification there because of the security problems and threats on planes and so on. But I actually had reason to see one security guard - I use that term, it may not be exactly correct - being beaten severely in a shopping center a couple of years ago here in the city. You cannot help but wonder what kind of a situation the teachers of the Province must find themselves in. I mean, have we lost control in this Province? I mean, have the teachers? Many of them will tell you personally that they have. They do not have the control they had when, for example, the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) was going to school because if he stepped out of line, I suggest, he would be severely reprimanded. And if he went home and complained, he would get the rounds of the kitchen, the same as we all would.

But now the control seems to be gone. The discipline, so-called, seems to be gone. We are now trying with public money to protect public property that we have paid for in the first place, apparently. And, you know, it is a matter of concern to me as a citizen - apart altogether from my presence in the House, that this thing I see growing all the time. We are continually bringing in new measures, new laws that have to restrict certain, I am afraid, freedoms. And this is the thing we have to watch out for.

This is not an attack on the minister from me, believe me it is not. It is a matter of concern that I feel he shares with me. Surely as a former educator he must. But I am just wondering what we have done. We were all priding ourselves throughout the 1960's on freedom of this, and the freedom of that.

MR. MURPHY: The enlightened age.

MR. NOLAN: The enlightened age, possibly. But what we have done, what we have created - I mean, some of the young people that came through the 1960's with the so-called freedoms are now young married men and women. And many of them are telling their children, "No way are you going to have it the way I had it." They do not

MR. NOLAN:

believe in it. They may have fought for it and marched for it and all the rest.

But I am concerned about this particular bill, and I would be concerned about others of the same vogue or nature if they were brought before me in this House of Assembly, to buildings used for educational purposes. Well it seems to me if we are going to move in - we are really policing it, that is what we are doing. We are not calling them policemen, perhaps, but that is what they are. And they have to be

MR. NOLAN: given authority, I would assume. And by the way, while you are at it the Minister of Justice might give some authority to the gentlemen, the commissionaires in this building, who have often had some things to deal with. They have very little authority in many instances, too.

But I am always very, very hesitant to approve a bill like this, and yet I know that in certain instances certain measures are necessary. I mean, we fight like dogs for freedom of speech, freedom of this and freedom of that and then we immediately, or some of us at least, abuse it and we have to bring in other laws, other personnel, more public money to help defend ourselves. And it scares the devil out of me some of the things that I see that are happening in this particular instance. To think that the people of this Province have spent good money, and as a former broadcaster how often did I have to go on the air in the morning and report of instances where 500 school windows were broken out.

I mean it drives me mad just to think about what is going on. What I am scared of, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that the hon. minister will understand, is that every time we set up another law enforcement agency, I refer to this as a law enforcement agency for the matter of debate, but to what extent are we going in repressing freedoms that are now being enjoyed by well ordered, responsible, disciplined students and so on. I mean, what am I doing? And I am just as responsible here in this House as anyone else. I did not introduce the bill, did not bring it in, but I am responsible. What am I doing? Am I setting up some kind of an agency that is going to repress in any way the activities of students in the various educational institutions? I mean, they go to school to look for truth, facts, and so on, and by golly I mean if this goes through, and I suggest it will, the minister has a terrible responsibility on his shoulders,

MR. NOLAN: I suggest, to see, one, that it is set up properly, that the areas of authority are very clearly set out.

The minister also has a very grave responsibility the first time he gets words that any one is misusing the powers that we are allegedly or going to give through this bill, that he will move in quickly through the school boards, or whatever it takes, to snap it back into order. It is costing the people of this Province a lot of money.

Not too long ago our normal law enforcement agencies could apparently handle the problems, whether they were in school - they did not have to move into the school necessarily unless invited. They did not have to move in there because control was there within the school. It was there. They did not have to move into the London, New York and Paris down on Water Street, or J. M. Devine's when it was open, or anywhere else. It was there. And now we have a situation where more and more we have to pay good money to set up additional agencies, call them what you like, who are going into law enforcement, to enforce regulations and so on, because something has broken down.

Now the easy thing, I suppose, would be to fire away or blast at the government or the Minister of Education. Well I think I would be irresponsible if I did that, because I think it is broken down in more than one area, and add the result is coming home to haunt us.

I think we have to look at the whole educational system to see what is happening. I think we have to look to see to what extent we have disarmed those who are involved in education. Right now I do not think you can punish anyone, for example, unless you bring another teacher or principal in to witness any discipline that might be enforced.

MR. MURPHY: Spare the rod and spoil the child.

MR. NOLAN: Pardon?

MR. MURPHY: Spare the rod and spoil the child.

MR. NOLAN: Well I am not suggesting that they go swinging the rod around either. But I am suggesting that - you see freedom is a wonderful thing. We are all shouting and bawling about it all the time. But freedom brings with it responsibility. I mean, you do not give a child a knife to play with. And I am very sorry, I have to tell the minister, I am very, very personally sorry to see this bill going through. I am, as I am others. And yet unless we start changing other things perhaps in the home, in the school and so on, we are going to see more of this. We are going to have more and more of it coming all the time, more and more of it. And I do not like it, Mr. Speaker. I do not like it.

This is a matter of real concern and it should be to all of us. It is not just a little bill. It is not. The explanatory note gives it two and a half lines. That is all. But it is worth more than that. Because I am saying to you we have seen other bills go through for the university, and we will see more for other public institutions in the future.

I would like to be able to stand up here and advance all the answers to the questions that are necessary. I am sorry that I cannot do that. But I have enough sense to know that something is wrong.

I think it is a failure on our part. Are we afraid to say that things are somewhat out of control

Mr. Nolan:

in some areas, because the passing of this bill surely admits that there is something wrong. There is something wrong. I believe - I was going to say I hope the minister realizes what he is going, I believe he does. I only hope that he will realize that the follow-up to this has got to be very strict policing by the minister and by his officials, of how this power is going to be used; because if we surely have this backfire in any way so that it is going to affect the students occupying the buildings concerned, the premises concerned adversely, then we have created a grave act here in this House. So we have to watch it. We have to watch it. We spend our time fighting for freedoms, so much time in this House, and God knows a lot of people before I ever came on the scene, and now we are rapidly bringing in bills to try to protect what we have tried to build up. So I only hope that, I am not attempting to - I do not believe I should criticize the minister unless I have something better to offer, that is what I am saying. And at the moment I am really stumped on this one, other than the fact that the discipline in many areas seems to be gone. There seems to be a genuine lack of respect for other people's property, private or public. And the more and more of this I see, the more I see us moving into a society that I do not particularly like. I do not like it. So that is all I have to say on it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. member from Lewisporte.

MR. F. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to say very much on this particular bill. I had not given much attention to the bill until now that other members have started to talk about it, and I have become interested in it myself to the point that I want to bring up something that we discussed there a little while ago, and the Minister of Education confirmed at that particular time. What we are doing presumably is trying to put more legislation on the books so that we will have more control over maintaining discipline and whatever at schools, and vocational schools, and the University, trade schools, the College of Fisheries, just about any places that are being used

Mr. White:

for educational purposes.

The thing that occurs to me, Mr. Speaker, is that a few weeks ago the Minister of Education confirmed that twenty-eight school attendance officers throughout the Province were being let go by his department, not necessarily let go, but those particular jobs were being phased out and some of the workers, or some of the employees, some of the officers were going into other vocations. It seemed to me that those school attendance officers were there to assist parents, to assist teachers, to assist school boards in helping out when students were staying away from school, and missing school and that kind of thing, and those would be, you know, in general terms, some of the students who this Act might apply to. So I am wondering if we are doing away with something good on the one hand, and bringing in something bad on the other.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. member from Baie Verte-
White Bay.

MR. R. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I certainly share the concerns expressed so well by other hon. members on this side of the House with regards to this particular bill. It is not a minor amendment, I do not believe, as the minister indicated in his opening remarks. In that regard I am going to be mildly critical of the minister. I believe that not only this particular minister, but when any minister—some bills have a fairly lengthy list of explanatory notes to them, this one unfortunately has a couple of sentences— but I believe when any minister stands before this House to introduce a bill of the magnitude and implications of this one, then the least that can be done is to give an adequate explanation before the minister takes his place and we are expected to reply.

How can we intelligently debate the implications of this bill? I mean The Petty Trespasses Act do not mean very much to me, I do not know if I heard

Mr. Rideout.

tell of it before I saw the amendment to this bill. How can we intelligently, Sir, debate the implications of this amendment if the minister gets up and says, very casually, it is a minor amendment, sits down, and when he stands again he closes the debate. The implications of the bill, the reasoning behind the bill, what the bill is all about, should be told before the minister takes his place the first time. Then when he takes his place we can debate the merits of it, we can intelligently debate the merits of it, and the minister can reply before he closes. That is what I would like to see happen. Unfortunately, it is not going to happen now. When the minister sits down, when he next rises, the debate will be over. We will not have a chance to reply to whatever his particular arguments are. But like other members here have expressed, I would like to know the real reason behind this bill. What is it? What is the reason for the bill? If the minister had told us that in his opening remarks, then I would think, I would have assumed that an intelligent debate could have gone on back and forth across the House. That cannot be done now, because of the way the bill was introduced.

I will throw out a couple of particular points. Is the purpose of the bill to regulate the use of school parking lots by private cars, for example? I have heard that type of thing being thrown around. And in small communities, particularly communities in rural parts of this Province, people have been used to, when they cannot get their car anywhere else, off the side of the road, parking them in school parking lots. Is it to regulate the use of school parking lots with regards to snow machines later on in the evening when school is closed? I do not know what the reasons are. I cannot intelligently debate the bill until I know, and I would like for the minister, if he ever introduces another bill in the House, or any other minister, to take that into consideration. Let us know what is behind it before you sit down and say, "Oh, it is only a minor amendment," and then expect us to intelligently take part in the debate.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. member for St. John's East.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, as I read this bill all that is being done - and I know the hon. minister will correct me if I am wrong - all that is really being done in this particular case is to afford and give to properties occupied by schools, vocational schools, Memorial University, College of Trades and Technology the same type of protection as the owner of a premises of a shopping mall or shopping plaza would have or the owner of a factory or a warehouse or a storage area, that if somebody is trespassing on it and doing damage, then that person may be apprehended in accordance with the act, and he is dealt with according to law, nothing more or nothing less. The only thing I would observe with respect to it is that I have a great deal of hesitation sometimes in extending any authority whatsoever to Memorial University, until Memorial University is willing to submit itself to the authorities of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: But be that as it may, Mr. Speaker, we still have to remember that this is public properties, schools' public property, vocational schools, Memorial University and what have you. It is a fact of life that vandalism in this city, certainly, and throughout this Province has run wild and is out of hand, and we have to, unfortunately, take and give to the custodians of public property, certainly, the same rights as would be given to the owners of stores and shops, in other words, private owners.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): If the hon. minister speaks now he closes the debate.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, the purpose was just outlined by my colleague behind, the purpose for the bill, but one of the things I want to point out in relation to this is that the schools themselves, all schools, colleges and the universities have the power to discipline or to take action against the students of the schools. So this particular bill does not necessarily pertain to students who are registered with the various schools. It is for people who are in these areas for no good reason.

Mr. House.

So that is the first thing, you know, for instance, in reference to the College of Trades, there was an action taken over there because that is within the rules and regulations of the school. So the first thing is that it does not have any effect on the school pupils in relation to their school duties. The thing that I want to bear in mind is that we have had a lot of complaints from a number of

MR. W. HOUSE: schools and I was very familiar with this when I was a school superintendent. The member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) has put his finger on it when he asked is it going to prevent private cars from parking and so on. One of things we have in a lot of schools in Newfoundland, a lot of young people who happen to be idle, unemployed, perhaps, during the Winter, is day after day you get people going around and round the schools on snow tobaggans, just interrupting the classes totally all the time. That is one of the problems now.

If you could have a person in these institutions who can take some action against these people, of course, that is one of the purposes of it.

The other thing is, Mr. Speaker, a lot of reference was made to Memorial University. I think we did make a proposition a few years ago where they would be able to set up a special police force. I think that was turned down. I am pretty certain that never got passed. One of the problems Memorial University has is not with their students. Again, like everybody else, they can handle their students. They have mechanisms to suspend students. But the one problem that they cannot resolve is after a student is suspended or expelled from the university, they have no way of keeping them off the property and he or she is normally there for things that are not connected with education and perhaps doing the very antithesis of education and, I think, I do not have to spell out what can happen.

They have no means whereby they can get rid of this kind of trespassers, so it is only just giving, as was stated, the provisions of the act that allows a shopping mall, for instance, to protect its property. I think we have a responsibility to this Province. We have public schools, they are public denominational schools and there are public colleges and so on, but they are operated by private boards. The boards are private. It seems ludicrous to me when I go around to schools,

MR. HOUSE: and I have had this case myself, where the board had to deem the area private property, "Private Property, Trespassers will be Prosecuted" because they could not come under this act apparently. So that seemed ludicrous because people have to go in there and there is nobody going to try to keep people off these properties when they are there on legitimate business.

I am saying that the schools are set up for a specific purpose and set up by this Legislature for the purpose of educating and when people are there for reasons other than that and perhaps causing problems and trouble, I think the board should have a right to get these people taken off it, and this is what this act will do.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why do they not call in the police?

MR. HOUSE: They call in the police, Mr. Speaker, and by the time the police are in they are gone and there is nobody to apprehend. This certainly happens in the case of snowmobiles. So, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this bill.

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

MR. HICKMAN: Order 17, Bill No. 13.

Motion, second reading of a bill,
"An Act To Amend The Department Of Education Act."

MR. SPEAKER (Collins): The hon. the Minister of Education.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is twofold. First of all it is a name change. Previously we had two assistant deputy ministers; one was the Assistant Deputy Minister Academic and the other was the Assistant Deputy Minister Vocational and Technical.

With a little bit of reorganization at the department, to try to make it more functional, we have changed that to an assistant deputy minister, programme development, and an assistant deputy minister of finance and administration. The

MR. HOUSF:

purposes there of course is because both ADM's were connected with finance and administration and both were connected with a programme development previously. Now we think it is a lot better to have the person who is finance and administration to look after the whole thing. So that is the purpose of that particular change.

The other change is that the General Advisory Committee make-up consists of the three denominational education secretaries and the Deputy Minister and the Minister of Education. We asked the people on the Committee, that is presently the three DEC secretaries, if we could place on that Committee the ADM programme development and they concurred. And that is the other part of this bill, it is to allow the ADM programme development a place on the General Advisory Committee.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure either where I stand on this particular bill at this moment. There are many questions that I would like to point out to hon. members about this particular bill, particularly as they relate to the two Assistant Deputy Ministers. Hon. members will recall that the Assistant Deputy Minister in Administration and Finance is replacing what was the Assistant Deputy Minister of Vocational and Technical Training. There are many people who fear that by eliminating this position we have indeed minimized the importance of vocational and technical training.

The point is, Sir, that who now has the responsibility to co-ordinate vocational education in this Province. Who is it that sees to it that we have got different type programmes in our vocational schools to cater to the various needs? Who will see that there is no duplication of programmes in the various institutions and that we are indeed offering the programmes that meet the needs of students today? So there is some concern among educators that by eliminating this position that we are doing something to minimize the importance of this tremendously important aspect of education, vocational and technical training.

MR. LUSH:

The other thing relates to the position itself of an Assistant Deputy Minister of Administration and Finance. Sir, I am the first to realize that there are a lot of monies allocated in education and that we do have to have some responsibility, somebody looking after the expenditures. But Treasury Board normally is the group of people who look after what monies are allocated to education. Now we are wondering whether there are not two stumbling blocks to get monies allocated for education. Just what is the authority of the Assistant Deputy Minister? Is it just a matter of saying how much monies are going to be allocated to education in a particular year? Then do we still have to go to Treasury Board? So this looks like two stumbling blocks really, two things to delay the process by which monies will be granted to education.

There is no other designated position within government. This is the only one, I think, that will have an Assistant Deputy Minister of Administration and Finance. There is another concern too in addition to the problem of how this is going to slow down the process of making decisions in education with respect to finance. Another important one is what are the further implications? There is some concern among educators that this position is going to put more attention on financing education than on looking into the needs of education. In other words, we are going to not be so much concerned about what the actual needs of education are so much as to what dollars we can put into education. Sir, I think that there has got to be a balance between the two. But we certainly have to design programmes that are geared to look after the needs of the students of this Province.

Another point here as well is that it is unfortunate to see somebody in finance who has no background with respect to education. This is another point for concern.

The last point I want to mention is that - and this is related to another point that I made with the fact that finance will become now a very important matter as opposed to the needs and the kinds of programmes that we should be

Mr. T. Lush:

putting into our schools, and that is, Sir, that there is some great fear that finance is going to become so important that, as a matter of fact, what is going to happen is that in the hiring of teachers in the future that we will not be looking at qualifications as such. In other words what we are going to be saying, is that if we can hire, if we have got, let us say, half a dozen applications for a certain position, and we have got a couple of people with Grade VI, and a couple of people with Grade VII, maybe this financial expert will say, look let us take the person with Grade II, let us take the person with Grade III rather than spending this money on the person with Grade VII, because he is going to cost us twice as much money. so therefore we will take the person with the lower qualifications. And this could be very serious, having the result really of lowering the quality of education in this Province, Sir. And these are some of the concerns that I have, and would want more clarification on this particular thing before I would give consent to the bill, before I would agree to the passing of this particular bill. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS) The hon. member from LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the first thing that I asked myself when I looked over this bill, looked over the explanatory notes of the bill, "An Act To Amend The Department Of Education Act," Sir, is what this is going to do for education in this Province? I read the explanatory notes very carefully, Sir, and I have come to the conclusion that it is going to do absolutely nothing. Nil! Zero! Absolutely nothing, Sir. It is not going to cure, it is not going to do anything. It is not even going to put the minister or his department in a position to cure the ills of education in this Province. Now I am not going to swing into a wide-ranging debate. I could at this moment, Sir, and I realize his Honour is coming in at 5:00 o'clock to sign some of these bills, but this opens up the door, Mr. Speaker, this bill could open up the door for a major debate on education in this Province. I am not going to get into it now, I hope to get into it some time before the session ends, because I think it is about time we stopped our foolish

Mr. Neary:

nonsense of fooling around and putting grand titles on people and got down to brass tacks, took off our coats and took a look at our whole education system in this Province, and see where we are going, if we are headed in the right direction, if we are getting the right value for our educational dollar that is being spent.

Somehow or other every time somebody talks about education and it is verified in this bill, they say, "Oh put more money in education. You are not putting enough money in." I hear that argument every day of my life; give education more money, give the school boards more money, give this one more money, give that one a few more dollars, and we do not know at this moment if the money is being spent.

MR. MORGAN: I was not aware it was coming from the government side.

MR. NEARY: No I do not hear it from the government side.

We do not know, at least I do not know, and I have been asking enough questions over the last two or three years trying to get a fact-finding committee or a commission of enquiry or something to look at our whole educational system. I am not so sure, Sir, that we are getting the value for our educational dollar that we should be getting in this Province. And before we start harassing the Minister of Finance and Treasury Board, and the gentleman that has been appointed here, the Assistant Deputy Minister in charge of administration in Finance, before we start harassing these people, and tearing the hide off them for more money for education in this Province, let us find out now before it is too late, if we are getting the value now that we should be getting for our educational dollar, and if we are headed in the right direction. If not, what should we do to remedy the situation? Education is the kind of a thing, Sir, if you do not face it now it will be too late in a few years. The damage will be done. It will be impossible to rectify it.

As I said I am not going to swing into a debate now on it, I will, I hope before the session ends. This bill, Sir, is going to stick a couple of handles, a couple of titles on a couple of people down in the minister's office. but it is going to do nothing, Sir, to improve the standard of education in this Province. It is going to do

Mr. Neary:

nothing to improve the performance of teachers in the classroom.

I remember recently, Mr. Speaker,

Mr. Neary.

I got into a hassle with one of the officials down in the minister's department, when I talked about a teacher being paid on his effectiveness in the classroom, not on the piece of paper he got from Memorial University, because that, as it happened, turned out to be a bit of a racket, a certification racket. And this official said to me, "Oh, yes, if you do that, the teachers will be passing all the students so they can have a good record. The official could not even see what I was talking about. The only thing they could see was to try and put a roadblock in the way of what I was talking about, obstruct what I was talking about, obstruct my idea. The immediate reaction was negative that, oh, yes, if you do that, all the teachers then will be passing their students so they can show that they are really effective in the classroom, and it will all be just a big hoax, and a big farce. They could not even work out a formula in their own little narrow minds, the officials in the minister's department, of how you could judge a teacher on his effectiveness in the classroom.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Justice's blood pressure is going up, Sir. I wish we had more time to talk about this bill. Look, it really, I suppose, in one sense, does not make any difference if we pass it, if we turn it down, if we stand on our heads as far as this bill is concerned. It is not that important to our educational system, and some time later on during this session I think we should have an all-out, no-holds barred debate on our educational system in this Province at the present time.

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

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Minister of Justice's blood pressure will not bust for another minute, although I will only be a couple of seconds. I think most of the questions relative to this bill have been raised by the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) and the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). I just have a couple of brief questions for the minister. I notice that the amendment in Clause (3), relative to the Denominational Policy Commission, the second assistant

Mr. Rideout.

deputy minister that he mentions, the Assistant Deputy Minister of Administration in Finance is not included or not listed, at least, in the clause that has been part of this Denominational Policy Commission. My question would be, will he be on that policy commission? And I would like for the minister in closing the debate to attempt to, at least, enlarge a little bit more on what is to be the actual authority of this second assistant deputy minister, the gentleman in charge of that administration in Finance? As my colleague from Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) pointed out very adequately a few minutes ago, we already have to go to Treasury Board. We already have the mechanisms. And what is the purpose of this second stumbling block, this assistant deputy minister in charge of administration in Finance? So I would like for the minister to deal with those two particular points in his remarks, please.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: Just a word, Mr. Speaker. I do not want to prolong the debate on this, but since the Finance issue has become such a prominent one in this particular bill, I think it incumbent on me to say just a few words. The vote in the last budget for the Department of Education was almost \$245 million. To suggest that there should not be some senior person with financial expertise and financial experience sitting in one of the senior seats in that department, would be, I think, most irresponsible. I think the minister is making a very sensible and a very reasonable move forward in getting a senior officer to take responsibility in the financial area. The budget for the Department of Education, as most people of this House are well aware, exceeds by far the entire budget of this Province just a few short years ago. Proper financial controls in distribution of that money is absolutely essential. Somebody has to be sitting down on a day to day basis discussing the salary problems, discussing the pension problems, discussing the

Mr. Doody.

school bus transportation problems, discussing the grants to school boards problems, discussing the grants for capital constructions for the school boards and so on. And there has to be obviously in any responsible organization a senior finance man. To suggest that the level of education will

MR. DOODY: will deteriorate because some financial or expertise in management is being inserted is just not sensible. Certainly we need a high standard of education in this province and certainly this province is struggling to attain and to keep up the high standard that we now have, and perhaps to get a higher standard in the future. To suggest that this should be done completely without regard to the cost to the treasury and to the people of the province, I think, is just not sensible.

And so I congratulate the minister on getting a senior finance man in a position of authority in his department and I think it is a very, very, worth-while move and one I think that is going to be of estimable value in the future in keeping the expenses of the department under reasonable control.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister speaks now, he closes the debate. The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Terra Nova has some questions about some concerns that he had and, of course, I was going to mention the importance of putting it in the way that we are. I do not think it is going to change education per se. Right now these people are in place, they are the same two deputies, there is no more cost. The people are in place and what I tried to point out at the beginning was that under the previous organization both ADM's were concerned with finance, both were concerned with programme development but both were academic people, and it was felt that when the time came to make a change that we should have a high-powered finance person. Because, Mr. Speaker, the ADM Vocational was concerned very much with manpower training grants, a lot of his time was taken in Ottawa for instance, dealing with Ottawa manpower training programmes and so on, basically on finance.

So now what we have done is put the ADM that was in academic, generally in programme development, and he is overseeing totally the programmes in vocational schools as well as the day schools.

MR. HOUSE: And the ADM is involved with the same programmes but from the finance angle and they work together at that very well. Now you say who is looking after- well I just mentioned the ADM at a top level programme development. But for technical purposes the person who is responsible for curriculum in vocational schools and vocational education is the director of vocational education. That is the technical man who oversees curriculum and that sort of thing. Also in addition to that we have a Manpower Needs Committee which takes people from the Department of Manpower. These people are involved with curriculum also, so I see it as a very wise move. And you cannot underestimate the fact that we do have a very heavy budget, a large budget, and we do need a high-powered person there.

The question from the hon. minister for Baie Verte-White Bay "Will the second ADM be under demoninational policy commission?" No, the demoninational policy commission deals basically with school programming and in that case we would just have the one ADM on that particular committee. I move the second reading of this bill.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Department Of Education Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave. (Bill No.13).

MR. HICKMAN: Order 14 - Bill No. 7.

Motion second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Memorial University Act."

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is twofold. It is necessary to bring the Board of Regents and the Senate of Memorial University, their boards, in line with other universities and colleges throughout the province, throughout the dominion and also it is necessary for insurance purposes, liability insurance purposes, as well as good common sense practice. At the present time the legislation, as the legislation reads, it is not clear as to whether

Section 46

MR. HOUSE: and 68 personally exempt members of the Board of Regents or members of the Senate from liability for actions and decision taken by them in their official capacity. That is now clear. These are individual members so this amendment would have the effect of exempting them from liability in this case.

It says there, I think, "Without affecting the interpretation Act," and the Interpretation Act states that corporations can sue and be sued. So the board of Regents is a corporation in the sense it can sue and be sued.

Of course the other thing, "A majority of members voting for a particular action binds all other members." And the other thing that is important to bear in mind there in that act is that, "They are exempt from personal liability when they do not contravene the provisions of the act incorporating them." So that provides, of course, a measure there that protects the university but this new act here is just a clarification to exempt people from personal liability when they take an action in their official capacity. It does not exempt the board itself, the board may be liable but the individual shall not be under this act.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I notice in his remarks there the hon. the Minister of Education, Sir, committed the mortal sin, as far as the university is concerned, of referring to it as a corporation. Well if the President of that corporation could only hear that, Sir, he would have a stroke. He would not last out another year before he passed in his resignation or retired.

MR. HOUSE: It is a corporation in the sense of being -

MR. NEARY: Yes, well they do not call it a corporation. I had a row recently with the academics over at Memorial about whether it was a corporation or not. They say it is not a corporation. They do not look upon it -

AN HON. MEMBER: How did you get in? I thought it was petty trespassing.

MR. NEARY: I was invited in, Sir. I was invited in and I will tell the Minister of Finance about my meeting one of these days. It was a very interesting affair.

AN. HON. MEMBER: Tell us now.

MR. NEARY: No, I do not have time now, Sir, the Minister of Justice is trying to ram through a few pieces of legislation in a hurry and we are trying to do the best we can to accommodate him. The Minister of Education is not being very helpful. The minister could have picked some other department because the Minister of Education is not giving us proper explanations and that is why we have to stand up and ask a few questions and try to pry a little bit of information out of the minister.

Well, Sir, again this bill opens up the door for a very wide-ranging discussion, a very wide-ranging debate but because three or four minutes from now His Honour is going to arrive, I have to cut it short.

MR. WOODROW: Fifteen minutes left.

MR. NEARY: Fifteen minutes?

MR. WOODROW: Yes.

MR. NEARY: Well, maybe I can go on for ten of the fifteen minutes anyway. I thank the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) for that little piece of information.

But, Sir, in one sense, I suppose, you cannot blame the members of the Board of Regents of the university for trying to get out from under the responsibility of being personally liable for anything that goes on over at that university. You cannot blame them at all, Sir. If I were on the Board of Regents I might try to do the same thing myself with the irresponsible manner in which that crowd is acting over there, refusing, for instance, to comply with the Province's own public tendering procedures. They refused to do it. They will not do it, they will only call tenders for anything over \$10,000, and

MR. NEARY: this House passed a Public Tendering Act making it compulsory for the government itself to call tenders for everything over \$1,000. Yes, Sir, I checked recently with the officials and I am told they will go down to a stick of pencil if they can. But usually they have the escape hatch there, everything over \$1,000 they should call tenders for.

Over at Memorial University it is everything over \$10,000. They will not even comply with the Public Tendering procedure of the Province. I think that is wrong and if I were on that Board of Regents I would be -

AN HON. MEMBER: Can you quote examples?

MR. NEARY: Quote examples? Yes, I can quote examples but I am not going to.

MR. MORGAN: Sure you can?

MR. NEARY: Maintenance of the buildings over there,

MR. NEARY: lighting, electrical, mechanical -

AN HON. MEMBER: Heating maintenance.

MR. NEARY: - heating maintenance. They do not call public tenders, Sir. When, Mr. Speaker, when was the last time Your Honour saw a public tender in the newspaper from Memorial University. Your Honour would be misleading the House if Your Honour said, "Oh, I have seen all kinds of them in recent years." They just are not there. They are doing what they like with the money over there. No wonder the Board of Regents are getting upset about being personally responsible for what goes on over in that institution, that institution of higher learning. And they would be very offended, they would give the minister a little slap on the knuckles if they heard him referring to it as a corporation.

And, Sir, with all the crowd that are running around like roosters with their heads cut off to all parts of the world, with unlimited expense accounts, certainly the Board of Regents -

MR. MORGAN: - Travelling first class.

MR. NEARY: And travelling first class. You cannot get aboard of a plane, the poor old members of the House of Assembly, Sir, have to travel second class economy, and lucky to do that. And ministers, I understand, recently got instructions from the Premier when they are travelling to go economy.

AN HON. MEMBER: Except overseas.

MR. NEARY: Except overseas.

MR. MORGAN: Anywhere in Canada we travel second class.

MR. NEARY: Well not so with the crowd over at Memorial University, not so with that crowd, Sir. They have got to sit up front, They would be up with the captain if they could get there I suppose. They have got to get their couple of little extra drinks of spirits, and they have got to get the preferred treatment by the cute little airline stewardesses, and here are members of the House of Assembly back aft, lucky to get on the aircraft at all.

MR. LUSH: Steerage.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. LUSH: Steerage.

MR. NEARY: No, not steerage, that went out with the Fort Townshend or Fort Amherst I think.

And, Sir, I would make no wonder men of the Board of Regents over there at Memorial University do not want to have anything to do with being responsible or liable for any of the actions, even their own actions, I suppose, to a certain degree.

Mr. Speaker, the Board of Regents-look it has to be about the biggest joke on the face of the earth, the Board of Regents of that university, and I know my friend, the member for Kilbride (Mr. R. Wells) will get up and say, "Oh well they are outstanding Newfoundlanders, great honourable crowd of people." And the Minister of Justice will verify it saying, "Oh my, look what you are saying about all these fellows on the Board of Regents over at Memorial University. They are performing such a service for Newfoundland, wonderful people, putting in their time over there. My God, volunteers, they do not get anything out of it and there you are running them down." They are just merely rubber stamps, Sir, they are merely rubber stamps for the President and his cronies, his little clique over at that university. And I have very good reason for saying that. Maybe before this House is over I will tell about my meeting that I had recently in connection with the re-appointments to the Board of Regents at this university, when two gentlemen got kicked off because they dared go against the wishes of the President of the University who came in to the hon. the Premier and said, "Mr. Premier, if you re-appoint Peter Gardiner to the Board of Regents of that university you will get my resignation a year earlier than you thought you were going to get it."

How is that, Mr. Minister of Finance? How is that for having the Neary plumbers at work, getting me the information.

AN HON. MEMBER: Neary plumbers.

MR. DOODY: I am used to listening to the sewerage problem for a for a long while now. It is hogwash. Carry on.

MR. NEARY: The hon. member had better be careful about his public statements. If the hon. gentleman is going to appear on television he had better be factual, especially if I am watching him.

MR. DOODY: Straighten out your boiler plugs.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is another story and we will deal with that when we come to the Education estimates, about the re-appointments and how Aiden Maloney and Peter Gardiner got shafted, got put off the Board of Regents because the President did not want either one of them there.

MR. MURPHY: What has that got to do with the minister's reaction of last April or last Spring?

MR. NEARY: That is what? The reaction of what?

MR. MURPHY: Last April or last Spring.

MR. NEARY: I have not said it in the House.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, you did.

MR. NEARY: No, I certainly did not, because the appointments were made, Sir - the people were reappointed since the House closed, after the House closed.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, as I say, I do not blame certain members of the Senate and of the Board of Regents for not wanting to accept the responsibility for some of the things that go on in that university and before we are finished with this session of the House hon. members may learn of a few more things that are going on over there that these gentlemen do not want to accept the responsibility for.

So, Sir, I do not know whether I am for the bill or against it, To be honest with you, I really do not know. I probably will not even bother to vote on it. I wish I could have a full-fledged debate with the minister on this whole matter of the Board of Regents and the Senate over at that university. We do not have the time now but we will have it out before this session of the House is over.

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

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I would assume that we have to grant to the Board of Regents, members and Senate, the same as we have done for other similar boards and regents, or other groups rather, in similar positions, to remove them from personal liability in their functioning as allegedly the guardians of the people, because that is what they are, appointed to look after the affairs of the people at the university. Now whether they are doing it or not is the question that is asked by many people throughout this Province. I am sorry to say that I believe that Memorial University is under great suspicion by many people in this Province who, perhaps, have never darkened the doors of the university but nevertheless their children have and they have paid for it.

As long as this official cloud of secrecy that prevails continues to prevail, as far as Memorial University is concerned, as long as it continues to be a great academic sacred cow, we are all in trouble and we are all looked upon with some suspicion.

MR. NOLAN: It is particularly offensive to me, Mr. Speaker, to know that there are members who are now involved with the university in responsible positions, perhaps on the Board of Regents or on the Senate, who have actually spoken in this House about the very things many of us criticize, and have stated their position, if you will examine the Hansards of years gone by, demanding the same things so many of us have been trying to get.

Now if you talk to the higher echelon of the academic community at the university, especially the members of the government, they will rise up in revolt and say, "How dare you attempt to interfere with academic freedom?" What nonsense! What absolute and utter nonsense! All we are asking for is financial responsibility to the people, to this House and therefore to the people of this Province. We are not attempting to interfere with academic responsibility.

One of the problems I see sometimes in some of the outrageous statements about the university is that we must be careful that in attempting to control some of the things we disagree with, that we do not destroy the institution in the process. That is what we have to beware of.

MR. DOODY: Were you experimenting with the organ on television?

MR. NOLAN: No.

MR. WHITE: That is academic freedom.

MR. NOLAN: I happened to make a comment on the university recently and it was on television, or part of what I said, and I had a call from a certain gentleman engaged in teaching and so on at the university, very much alarmed and upset. Obviously he did not hear all that I said, and I mean, the proposition that he put to me was a very serious one. He has quite a number of students, he has been looking for a small piece of equipment for two years now and has not been able to get it. I told him, as I am sure all members here would, we are

MR. NOLAN: not against that type of individual getting what he needs to teach classes. Now here is something for ministers to consider, if they have not heard it already from the civil service you will, and that is - let me give you an example; supposing you send an official of your department or he goes down to buy, say a projector. - I just use that as an example - and he is told because of cost restrictions and this that and the other that they must not be footloose and fancy-free with public money, to get the best price. So here is your civil servant standing here at this counter and here is someone from the university at the same counter next to him; this chap from the government buys Volkswagen, if you know what I mean, and here is the other guy buying Cadillac. How do you justify that?

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. NOLAN: Exactly right. I mean, how do you appear to be reasonable about this? How do you appear to be reasonable about this?

Mr. Nolan:

It is absolutely terrible what is going on. And I suggest to you that one of those days someone is going to demand a real investigation of Memorial University. Now I know that people in responsible positions in this Province in the past, and again in the not too distant past who, if they even suggest what I am talking about or what perhaps the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) may have referred to from time to time, who are told in no uncertain terms if you proceed along this course we will quit. Now I say let them quit. Do not be blackmailed. Do not be blackmailed by people like that. If they have the best interest of the University at heart and the people of this Province at heart do not be blackmailed by threats of this nature. They are the servants of the people just as much as we are, and it is about time we faced up to that responsibility.

I suppose I have to vote for this bill. I would like to vote against it. I feel the Board of Regents should be speaking out if they truly represent the people in this Province. When is the last time one of them open their mouths to bring to the attention of anyone in this Province that there might be something wrong up there? When? And as long as they remain silent, as long as this continues I am sorry to say that we are going to be in for some trouble. I believe the University will continue to be looked upon with some suspicion. And if that University crew, in certain positions, can shut us up then we all should be flung out, it is as simple as that, and let them take over the whole Province. They will tell you they can run it anyway.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member from Twillingate.

MR. J. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, at the bottom of the printed bill, I have not got my copy, there is a Clause (4) "No action or proceedings may be brought against the University without first obtaining the written consent of the Attorney General to the bringing of the action." Now is that the case also with all the other Crown corporations? You have the Hydro Commission, you have the Liquor Commission, you have the various Housing Corporations, you

Mr. Smallwood:

have the Paper Mill Corporation at Stephenville, and there must be a good many other Crown corporations as apparently the University is. The University may not be sued under this, except with the permission of the Attorney General. Is that true of the other corporations? And then secondly, is the government now - may the government now be sued without the government's permission? Down through, almost from the beginning of time, governments could not be sued except with their consent, I think, that is gone is it not?

* AN HON MEMBER: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well what is the case - and the Attorney General might oblige us by setting us right on it. We are asked now to pass a law saying that without the Attorney General's consent the University may not be sued. Is that true of other Crown corporations?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member from St. John's East.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the observation that the hon. member from Twillingate made is one that I was also going to make, and had a note of it. Now this particular Section (4) is the same as the entire Section (46) in the principal Act, this is the way it was before. But I think the question we have to address ourselves to is whether it should remain? This government adopted as a matter of policy when it came into office - one of the Acts it took was to permit actions to be taken against the Crown itself for negligence and to permit them to widen the scope whereby a private citizen may take action against the government.

Now I do not think that Memorial University, subject to any explanation the hon. Attorney General may have to make, I do not think that the government would really intend that the University should be in any different and more privileged a position, certainly, than the government of this Province. And to provide that no person may take an action, or proceeding taken against the University without obtaining the written consent of the Attorney General to bringing of the action, I myself do not feel that it is an appropriate section even though it was in before. And I think that perhaps the government

Mr. Marshall:

might consider in Committee stage, when this passes, taking a look at it for the purpose of having it dropped. Because the way it now works is that if there is any action that can be taken

MR. MARSHALL: against the university by a third party as a result of any negligent act by one of the servants of the university, or as a result of there being some defect in the university's property or what have you, and somebody is injured, that the consent of the Attorney General has to be obtained.

Now we all know that actions from time to time can prove to be embarrassing, both to the university -

MR. SMALLWOOD: A student burning to death.

MR. MARSHALL: This type of thing, You know, there are many combinations of things which could prove to be embarrassing to the government or embarrassing to the university, and I do not say that the university should be in any different position than any other private concern when it comes to this aspect of the matter. As a matter of fact, I certainly do not think it should be in any different position than the government. But I very strongly would suggest to the government that it might consider - Now the hon. the Government House Leader, -

AN HON. MEMBER: The Governor is here.

MR. MARSHALL: I realize the Governor is here, and we do not want to keep the Governor, but also the hon. poor lowly member for St. John's East wishes to make a point and intends to make it.

So the point has been made and I would hope that as I say the government would consider in Committee to removing this from the section.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: What I was going to say, Mr. Speaker, that sub-section 46 (4) which was taken as the hon. gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) pointed out, from the old act: In my opinion, and it is a point made by the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), has no place there any more.

MR. HICKMAN: Three years ago this government brought before the House a bill which destroyed that old position, well established, that the Queen could not be sued except by petition, the Petition of Right Act, and gave the right of any person living in Newfoundland the right to sue the Crown if he or she feels they have a good cause of action.

I will, without any hesitancy, and I am sure my colleague, the hon. Minister of Education will concur, move in Committee to delete four and democracy will triumph.

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

The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, responding to the gentlemen who spoke particularly about the university. I would just like to remind them that I had a very difficult time at the university, a little while ago, saying some of the same things that you people were saying. So you are not alone in admitting some of the frustrations that we have with the university.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. HOUSE: But this particular part, 46 (1), (2), and (3) here I think principally what it is doing is what I stated at the beginning, is doing something to rectify something that is not clear. It was meant to put the Board of Regents and the Senate in the same light as the Technical College Board, the Fisheries College Board and school boards, where the individual does not have personal liability in any action he takes in his work. And that is something that they have been acting in that capacity all along, thinking they had it that way. I believe that was the intent of the original legislation, but now because the insurance people say that they are - it is not clear whether they are liable or not, we have to get it rectified. And this is just putting it in line with everything else, good common sense.

So I move the second reading of this bill.

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

On motion that the House go into Committee of the Whole; Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Petty Trespass Act." (Bill No. 4)

On motion Clause 1 carried.

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

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Department Of Education Act." (Bill No. 13)

On motion Clause 1 through to Clause 4 carried.

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

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Memorial University Act." (Bill No. 7)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall Clause 1 carry?

MR. HICKMAN: Clause 1, Mr. Chairman. I move the following amendment:
That sub-section (4) of section 46 as contained in Clause 1 of this bill be deleted.

On motion Clause 1 as amended carried.

On motion Clause 2 carried.

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

MR. HICKMAN: I move that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again. And I thank hon. gentlemen and lady for their co-operation this afternoon.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report Bill No. 7 with amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole reports that they have considered the matters to them referred and have directed him to report Bill No. 7 with some amendment.

On motion report received and adopted.

On motion amendment read a first and second time.

On motion bill ordered read a third time presently by leave.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report Bills Nos. 4 and 13 without amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole reports that they have considered the matters to them referred and have directed him to report Bills Nos. 4 and 13 without amendment.

On motion report received and adopted.

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

MR. HICKMAN: Order 12, Bill No. 4.

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

MR. HICKMAN: Order 14, Bill No. 7

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

MR. HICKMAN: Order 17, Bill No. 13.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Department Of Education Act", read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I understand his Honour is somewhere in the building. His car has arrived. Rather than get back on the Address in Reply for about two minutes, I guess His Honour has just arrived so we will wait for a minute.

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor has arrived.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Admit His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor.

May it please Your Honour, the General Assembly of the Province has at its present session passed certain bills to which, in the name of and on behalf of the General Assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Collection Agencies Act, 1973." (No.1)

A bill, " An Act To Amend The Direct Sellers Act." (No. 2)

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland Consumer Protection Act." (No. 3).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Petty Trespass Act." (No. 4).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Attachment Of Wages Act." (No. 5).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Memorial University Act." (No. 7).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Statutes Act." (No. 8).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Maintenance Orders (Enforcement) Act." (No. 10).

A bill, "An Act To Change The Corporate Name Of The Society Of Industrial Accountants Of Newfoundland." (No. 11).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Department Of Education Act." (No. 13).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Evidence (Mechanical Recording) Act." (No. 15).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Landlord And Tenant (Residential Tenancies) Act." (No. 16).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Chairman Of The Board Of Commissioners Of Public Utilities (Pension) Act, 1974." (No. 17).

HON. GORDON A. WINTER (Lieutenant Governor):

In Her Majesty's name I assent to these bills.

MR. SPEAKER: Order 1, the adjourned debate on the Address in Reply.

The hon. member for Kilbride.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I will wind up my remarks very quickly on this. The last day I outlined to the House an experiment, or the terms of an experiment, which I thought would be a good idea if we tried. The reason I suggested it is that I do not think there is anybody wise enough to know just what would work in a House without trying it. I think that if we compare other houses, and take the rules and regulations or the Standing Orders of other houses, and just try them here, without an experimental period, we could be locking ourselves into something which could cause us grief later on. I do not think that that is how we should go about it. If we have to have two or three experimental periods to decide whether a course of action is good or bad, then I think that that is fine, we should do that. At any rate, I circulated on the last day the three things which I thought we ought to do. I explained them, and I have a note following the explanation which I circulated, and I think they are crystal clear to all members. So I am not going to go over them again. But I do want just to point out one thing, And' if members will look at the Order Paper you will see now that insofar as Private Members' Day is concerned, we are on Motion No. 3, which is the Labrador motion.

The next motion is a joint venture motion, very important to discuss. The next motion concerns the Federal Fisheries Management Plan of the Government of Canada, again vitally important. Then there is another motion on joint ventures. Then there is this matter of the motion concerning private enterprise and pensions for employees. Then there is an extremely vital and important motion, industrial health safety, and so on down through the list, there are altogether about ten or twelve motions on it.

Mr. Wells.

Now what I have suggested, particularly vis-a-vis Private Members' Day, would enable us, I think, in this session to discuss most of these things, but if we do not do something and change the rules, vis-a-vis this, we are never going to get most of these. Do you remember last year, Mr. Speaker, we were fourteen weeks on the first private members' motion. Now there is so much worth-while here to be debated that it would be a crime and a shame if we do not do something to allow these debates to be held. And that is really what I am asking the House. Likewise in the discussion on the amendment, I am suggesting that the experiment there be limited to twenty minutes also just for that debate to see what happens. And if everybody chooses to speak, that is fine, they choose to speak. But at least we would know what happens. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the end result of this would tend to show us that what would happen is that you would get many more members speaking than that speak at present, and that in the course of the time while the Assembly is open, we would discuss many more matters, and that, I think, is what is needed.

Anyway there is no need for me to go on longer. Members have this in front of them. I am not going to make a motion. I do not know if the House is ready yet to do this. One thing I would say: if we are going to conduct this experiment, let us get on with it and do it before we get too far into the session. Otherwise, it will become increasingly difficult if not impossible to do it. So I would commend it to members and would ask them to consider it, as I am sure they have, to see perhaps by agreement between both sides of the House if it could not be tried. Any rule change involves, as I understand it, a two-thirds majority. So there has to be agreement on both sides of the House before this could be tried. So I would ask members on both sides to consider it, and perhaps, too, if both House Leaders or whomsoever wishes, could have a word on it before we meet tomorrow, it may be possible, Mr. Speaker, that this

Mr. Wells.

experiment could be conducted by the agreement of the House
and let us see how it works. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, it is rather unfortunate that a person with so little experience in the House as I myself should follow the hon. member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) after presenting his proposed changes. Suffice it to say that from my short stay here in the House I certainly agree with him that changes certainly are in order to streamline and refine debate in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I am all too humble and all too unpretentious and all too unassuming to begin my speech in the way that the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy did, when he started off by coming out with some process of evaluating the speech by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, as you will recall. I got somewhat worried as he went down through the criteria that he was going to use in evaluating speeches in this hon. House. If you will recall, he talked about style, he talked about content and he talked about grammar. I am not sure what he said about grammar, and indeed Hansard is not clear what he said about it, but there was some reference made to grammar. Anyway he failed the hon. Leader of the Opposition on all accounts, failed him miserably.

But I was a little bit wary, Mr. Speaker, and I was a bit concerned that he was going to use dialect as a criteria for evaluating speeches in this hon. House. Of course being that I have inherited only my oratorical skills from Bonavista Bay which according to many puritans in the English language, many grammarians, it contains a lot of the irregularities, a lot of idiosyncrasies, a lot of things that the puritans of the English language would not altogether regard as, shall we say, exemplifying the nuances and the niceties of the English language. But he did not consider dialect, and I thank God for small blessings. That means I can get here today and give my speech with a little more ease.

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this amendment to the Throne Speech - and I want to read it so that I myself can get familiar with what it says - it says, "This House condemns the failure of the ministry to prepare and to present to the House measures adequate to deal with the

MR. LUSH:

problems confronting Newfoundland and Labrador today, and demands that the ministry forthwith take all measures possible within their constitutional authority to alleviate these problems." Mr. Speaker, in order to measure what action and what measures and what steps the government will take as a result of the Speech from the Throne just recently delivered in this current session of the House of Assembly, the obvious step is to look back at previous such documents and examine and ascertain what philosophies and what strategies the government have adopted in the past, what things they said in previous documents and what action they took to carry out the particular philosophy or the particular strategy.

Such an examination, Mr. Speaker, will reveal that this government started with a policy. It started with some form of a philosophy for the economic development of this Province. It was a good policy. But, Mr. Speaker, the stark reality of the matter is, the stark truth is, that somewhere along the line that the policy never got off the drawing boards. The government never got on the tracks with its policies. The policy died an extremely quick death. And the present Speech from the Throne is a clear indication to me that rigor mortis has indeed set in and set in very quickly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: It

MR. LUSH: illustrates a government that is in despair, a government that has got no ideas, a government that has got no creativity for the economic development of this Province.

I said, Mr. Speaker, that the government started off with a policy. It started off with a philosophy. But why did the philosophy not materialize? Why was there no action to alleviate the economic problems which this Province faces today? Mr. Speaker, the government knows the answers to these questions more than I do. All that I can do is merely speculate and pass opinions on the basis of my observation since I have been here in this House for a year and a half, and what my constituents are saying to me about the performance of this present government.

Mr. Speaker, to look back at previous documents, the one I suppose that we should go to is the first Speech from the Throne by this government, which is the one I believe for March 1, 1972. That was the big manifesto. That was the public declaration of the policies that this present government had for the economic development of this Province.

MR. WHITE: The revolution.

MR. LUSH: That was the big document, Mr. Speaker, that was the document what was to cure all the economic ills in this Province. And in that particular document the government was tremendously concerned about the high rate of unemployment, and that speech at that particular time stated that Newfoundland need not have the highest unemployment record or the lowest per capita income of this great nation.

There was great concern, Mr. Speaker, for unemployment, the high rate of unemployment in this Province. To solve these problems the government said that it was going to introduce new social and economic policies to guide the effective development of this

MR. LUSH: Province. To bring about the development in an effective manner the government was going to pledge itself to the philosophy of inter-regional equity, government inter-departmental co-ordination and inter-governmental partnership.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this policy of economic development was to be centered around and developed around the base resources of this Province, forestry and land resources, our marine resources and fisheries and our offshore oil and gas and minerals. Great emphasis was placed on the development of the tourist potential of Newfoundland and Labrador, and great concern was expressed for education.

Mr. Speaker, in subsequent speeches from the throne you can see these themes going through all the time, emphasis on the resource based industries of the Province, tourism education. And the big concern was for the high rate of unemployment in this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what has been the result of this concern? What has been the result of this great philosophy, this good policy, if you will, for the economic development of this Province? What has been the result of all of this? Mr. Speaker, the statistics speak for themselves. In August of this year, for example, there were 200,000 people in the Province's labour force. Today, January, the latest statistics, say that there are 168,000 people in the labour force. Unemployment in this month, the actual figures are 17.1 per cent, that is double the rate of the national average which is 8.8 per cent. And if you were to add also the numbers of people who dropped out of the labour force— which was I think between December and January 9,000— 9,000 people dropped out of the labour force, and if you were to reckon these people back in, or as unemployed, which is the way you should look at them, that the percentage of unemployed would be close to twenty per cent.

Mr. Lush.

So, Mr. Speaker, here we are five years after this administration has been in power and we still have double the rate of unemployment as for the national average for Canada. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am aware that there are national problems that we should pay attention to. But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that with all of this great policy we have done nothing to reduce the rate of unemployment. It is still double, as of this month 17.1 per cent, and this is the highest rate of unemployment that this Province has had in any January since 1966. In any January since 1966 this is the highest rate of unemployment. And what of our economy today? The biggest industry, Mr. Speaker, is the unemployment insurance. That is the biggest industry that we have in this Province today. I do not know the exact figure, but I would expect that it must be close to \$20 million a month that we are receiving in U.I.C. benefits, the people of this Province. Mr. Speaker, combine that with the social assistance programme to able-bodied people in particular - and again I do not have the figure - but to make the point of what I am trying to say, combine these two figures, the amount of U.I.C., which certainly must be close to \$20 million, probably a little more, and combine that with the social assistance programme of the provincial government, and we can see the numbers of unproductive dollars that have been spent in this Province today.

And, Mr. Speaker, that is the sort of economy that we are dealing with right now. Mr. Speaker, almost every single economic indicator shows that we, in Newfoundland and Labrador, are falling behind in our struggle to build a healthy and growing economy. I do not say that with any amount of joy. There is nothing to be proud over. But that is the stark truth of the matter. The Evening Telegram in December 29 and then again January 5, they painted a rather poor picture for the economy of this Province in this coming

Mr. Lush.

year. And, Mr. Speaker, it does not look to be good. And it shows a government that is not taking the appropriate action to stimulate the economy of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, let us look further at the unemployment rate. In 1972 the rate was nine per cent. In 1973 it was ten-point-two per cent, and in 1974 it was thirteen point three per cent, and in 1975 it was fourteen point three per cent, and last January, 1976, it was thirteen point seven per cent, and today, as of the end of January, which is all I have the latest statistics for, up to the end of January it was seventeen point one per cent. Mr. Speaker, that shows the success of the present administration in fighting the high rate of unemployment in this Province.

But, Mr. Speaker, the question that we must ask, the question that all hon. members must ask, is why did the government not come through? What was the problem? The policy in itself looked to be certainly a good policy. The philosophy looked to be a good philosophy for the economic development of this Province. Why did it fall through?

Mr. Speaker, obviously it fell through in its strategy. There was no strategy to carry through. There was no plan of action to carry through on this particular plan. And the mechanism, I would suggest, was a poor one. In trying to bring about these plans, the government set up a bureaucracy around them. And whatever the reason, whether the bureaucracy did not agree with the philosophy, whether the bureaucracy did not agree with the policy, or whether, through the process, or whether because the process of decision making

MR. LUSH:

was now a long one, an unwieldy one, something that could not be dealt with effectively. Whether it was that, I do not know. But whatever, it looks like it was the bureaucracy that caused this policy to fall through. The government built around it, surrounded itself with a bureaucracy that was impenetrable. And, Mr. Speaker, today we still find ourselves without a policy, without a plan of development for this Province.

Another major objective of this particular government, Mr. Speaker - if you look through the Speeches from the Throne, you see a very popular slogan back some years ago - was to involve the people, to take the government to the people. Well, I want to suggest that with this bureaucracy that we have created that it is very difficult for the government to carry through with this plan. It seems as though the ministers themselves, that they have become very ineffective, they have become powerless almost, Mr. Speaker.

I am sure hon. members have gone through the experience of trying to arrange meetings, to try and arrange delegations with a minister. And, Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely frustrating to try and get a delegation here to see some minister. You cannot do it. I do not know what the reason is, whether it is because they have got no policy, whether it is because they have got no programme and they do not want to tell people this. But for some reason or other you cannot do it. You cannot get to see the ministers. And a government that started out, Sir, to bring the government to the people, to get the people involved, right now the people cannot even get to the government. That is the problem.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: The net result, Mr. Speaker, is that the government, as I have suggested, never got on the track with respect to developing its policies, the policies that it formulated and presented to the people in March of 1972. In subsequent speeches, Mr. Speaker, they have lost their sense of direction. We see no more plan. We see no more guidance. We see no more direction as to which way this Province

MR. LIJSH:

is going. There seems to be no visible plan for the economic development of the Province, no blueprint, no chart. And consequently, Mr. Speaker, because of this - and I have suggested that it is possibly through the bureaucracy, a bureaucracy that militated against an expedient decision making process, or a bureaucracy that did not agree with the policies as formulated by the government - whatever the reason I would advance that as a possible reason for the failure of the government to act with respect to its policies.

And the net result of all of that is, Mr. Speaker, that the government reverted to old, traditional politics in an effort to hold on to power. This happened gradually. You could see it in every Speech from the Throne. It was digressing more from its policy and getting more into what I call making promises, cheap promises, cheap, political promises that were never honoured or never kept.

The large overall scheme for the development of this Province began to disappear and to dissipate and fade into oblivion. Mr. Speaker, promises came out with respect, in the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing, promises with respect to providing our communities with water and sewer over a seven year programme. It is going to take a long time to get water and sewer in my district. It is going to take much longer than seven years.

The Department of Transportation and Communications came up with a five year plan to upgrade, construct and pave all major roads in the Province. Mr. Speaker, I just hope that my district comes in under the five year period. It is two years right now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, the result is that we are now left with a government that does not have a policy, just a few promises for election time. It is a government, Mr. Speaker, right now that started out being concerned with the present generation and the next generation. The policy right now is not a policy that shows a government that is concerned with the present generation or the next generation, but concerned only with the next election, Mr. Speaker. This is what they are concerned with, the next election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. LUSH: Inter-regional equity, that was thrown out the door. That was thrown out the window. The baby, Sir, so to speak, was thrown out with the bath water. I take inter-regional equity to mean that the government intends to spend equally the tax dollars in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I see no indication of that. It looks like the tax dollars of the people of this Province are being distributed to those districts which support the government. The effect of this, Mr. Speaker, is to tear this Province apart. The effect is to destroy initiative, and the spirit of our people.

Mr. Speaker, this obvious blatant kind of politics is the sort of thing that causes people to lose faith and confidence in government. This kind of action creates dissatisfaction, agitation, and disenchantment on the part of the people.

Mr. Speaker, we have talked recently about separatism. It is this kind of action, this kind of partisan recognition to districts that does nothing to bring this Province together.

AN HON. MEMBER: Partisan government.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I want to refer for a moment to the elections in Bonavista North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh! Oh!

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I know something about the election in Bonavista North, but the hon. member from Bonavista North (Mr. Cross) told the story when he told of all the road construction that was going on down there, the installation of the water and sewer projects.

MR. HICKMAN: You should have been in Epworth in 1971.

I got knocked over by a paving machine.

MR. RIDEOUT: You almost got knocked over the last time without the help of a paving machine.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, it is the kind of thing that has certainly alienated the people of the district of Terra Nova. Now, Mr. Speaker, I mentioned about the road work in Bonavista North, and I mentioned about the water and sewer, but there is more to come. This was an election letter that was sent around by the Premier during that time to the people of Middle Brook, Dark Cove and Gambo. Mr. Speaker, it brings out here three, they do not call them promises, they call them commitments.

The Government of Newfoundland had a meeting with council on June 22nd., 1976. When was that in relation to the election? When was the election, the last was it?

AN HON. MEMBER: 1974.

MR. LUSH: Well, this letter came out on the day before the election. And this is what it committed to the people of Bonavista North. One, water, sewer and sewerage treatment facilities for all of Middle Brook, Dark Cove and Gambo.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. LUSH: The result was, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. MORGAN: Fifteen years waiting for it.

MR. LUSH: Could I go two more, Mr. Speaker? I have just got to read one more.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order has been called.

MR. HICKMAN: The hon. gentleman is being harrassed by his own friends and colleagues.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh! Oh!

MR. NOLAN: Harrassed when the Speaker is in the Chair?

MR. HICKMAN: I wonder would the hon. gentleman move the adjournment of the debate.

AN HON. MEMBER: Was that a point of order?

MR. LUSH: No, no, that is okay. I want to leave this for tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman has moved the adjournment of the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKMAN: Thank you very much. I appreciate that. I am overwhelmed.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred and that this House on its rising shall adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday at three o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved and seconded that this House do now adjourn until tomorrow Wednesday at 3:00 P.M. Those in favour "aye." Contrary "nay." Carried.

This House stands adjourned until tomorrow Wednesday at 3:00 P.M.