NO.57

VOL.2

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

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

THURSDAY, JUNE 5, 1980

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker, in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform

hon. members of an appointment within the ranks of the Warder Service of the Province, and that is the appointment of Chief Warder Leo Biggs to the rank of Assistant Superintendent of the Penitentiary, a position which has been vacant since the promotion of Mr. Alex Yetman, Superintendent, following, of course, the retirement of Mr. Squires.

Mr. Biggs is a native of St. John's, educated at Model High School. He joined the staff of the Penitentiary in 1958 and has served in a number of capacities as acting Sergeant Warder in 1967, Sergeant Warder in 1969 and Head Warder in 1974.

Since March, 1975, he has served as Chief Warder at the Penitentiary, the main institution on Forest Road. He has successfully completed a number of courses, including a five semester correctional officer's training programme conducted by the University and a management training programme conducted by the Public Service Commission. His record in the service is one of dedicated and efficient service which has earned him the respect of the various superintendents under whom he has worked. I am sure hon, members join me in congratulating Chief Warder Biggs on his appointment to the rank of Assistant Superintendent. That becomes effective next Monday, which is the 9th of June.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Any further statements?

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MS L. VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to further

clarify my response to the question raised yesterday by the hon. the member for Port au Port (Mr. J. Hodder) on proposed new school construction for 1980 - 1981.

My colleague, the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) made the following statement in his Budget

MS L. VERGE: presentation to the House on

March 28th, and I quote: "Government will provide the necessary

funding to enable the denominational education committees to

undertake \$12 million worth of critically needed school construction

in 1980 - 1981; this is in addition to a similar amount approved a

few months ago."

Under the Schools Act, school boards are required to contribute 10 per cent towards the cost of school construction projects and in authorizing school boards, through the denominational education committees, to undertake \$12 million worth of school construction, the government share will be 90 per cent of \$12 million or \$10.8 million.

In this respect, now that the

1980 - 1981 Budget has received House of Assembly approval, each of
the three denominational education committees will be authorized to
borrow its proportion of the approved \$10.8 million from one of the
chartered banks operating in this Province and the denominational
education committees will decide which school construction projects
will be approved. These proportions are stipulated in the Schools Act
which states that moneys provided by government for school construction
must be allocated in the proportion that each of the various denominations
bears to

MS. L. VERGE: the total provincial population using the latest census available. In accordance with this legal requirement the approximate amount that each committee will be authorized to borrow is as follows: The Intergrated Education Committee - \$6,210,00; the Catholic Education Committee - \$3,969,000; the Pentecostal Committee - \$608,000; and the Seventh Day Adventist Assembly is \$13,000 for a total of \$10.8 million.

When these amounts have been drawn down by the Denominational Educational Committees government will undertake to provide to the Committees each year the necessary funds required by each Committee to service this debt.

I would like to remind this Mon. House that similar amounts were approved for each Committee under last year's budget so by the end of this fiscal year government will have provided \$21.6 million to bank financing for new school construction which together with the 10 per cent required contribution of school boards will result in \$24 million worth of new school construction during the fiscal years 1979-80 and 1980-81.

certain statements that have been made recently there have never been any indication to the Denominational Education Committee by the Department of Education and/or this government or indeed any intention that this commitment will not be honoured. Also, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to say that about \$200 million worth of new school construction has taken place in this Province over the last ten years but in spite of this major effort improvements are urgently needed to school facilities in a number of areas. I believe our effort in the past demonstrates our recognition and concern for new school construction requirements in this Province and we plan to do all we can within the next four or five years to provide necessary resources to the church authorities to permit them to meet all remaining critical school construction needs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. J. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, in responding to the minister's

MR. J. HODDER: statement, it is kind of a strange situation where the minister does not answer the question one day and comes back with a Ministerial Statement the next day in order -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. G. FLIGHT: It is out of order, you know.

MR. J. HODDER: But, Mr. Speaker, be that as it may, if she had waited I was going to ask her another question today anyhow on it.

Mr. Speaker, to answer the minister, the question that I asked yesterday was prompted by a letter which was written by the Executive Secretary of the Intergrated Education Committee to one of my colleagues. And in that letter he stated, "As you are aware the government in its Budget Speech, March 28th, 1980 said that it would be making \$10,800,000 available to the Denominational Education Committees for new school construction in this year. However, we have been advised that government is not expecting us to use any portion of that money for several months down the road." Now I take it from that, Mr. Speaker, that that means the government advised the Denominational Education Committees that they did not want them to use this particular money yet and that is the only question I ask and I asked

the minister yesterday why that was happening. Is it because the government is waiting for the interest rates to lower or is it because the money is not available or what? But that is what was contained in this particular letter from the Executive Secretary of the Integrated Education Committee. He goes on to say, "However, we have been advised that the government is not expecting us to use any portion of that money for several months down the road. As a consequence, they did not make provision in the estimates for the amortization of the \$10,800,000. It is very uncertain at this point in time when any portion of that money will be made available to us to enable us to make a commitment to the school boards." Mr. Speaker, that is why I was asking the question. Either there is some lack of communication between

the Denominational Education Committee and the minister's department or, you know-basically I had never said that the minister was backing off of the \$12,000,000,or \$10,800,000 as it translates to the Denominational Education Committee. I had never said that. The quastion I asked yesterday - the last question I asked yesterday concerns - I asked the minister in light of the fact that the Denominational Education Committee had been asvised that the department would rather that they did not send this money next year.

Mr. Speaker, I submit this and if you wish I will table it. I did read from it but that is why I asked the question, Mr. Speaker, and I ask the minister now perhaps that she could contact the Denominational Education Committee to find out just what is going on and perhaps - and I would think that and perhaps answer sometime to the House as to whether there is any relation between the Department of Education and the Denominational Education Committee or if they are talking to each other or what or if there is any understanding as to what is going on from one camp to the other.

MR. G. FLIGHT:

Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. B. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for

the Minister of Education (L. Verge) and it concerns a report that was - you cannot say it was recently done. It has been done for some time and that is the task force report on education, declining enrollment, specifically, in the Province. As we know, that task force was brought in with great gusto and was supposed to do many things for education in Newfoundland. My question to the minister is just what is the status of that report now? How many recommendations have you implemented, how many are you thinking of implementing or are you going to shelve the whole report?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MS. L. VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, the final report of the task

force on education was released last July. In the approximately eleven months since, the report has been widely circulated among educators and other interested people throughout the Province. The Education Department invited interested people to respond to the recommendations contained in the report and there has been an excellent response with quite a bit of constructive criticism and input on the many issues addressed by the task force report. The task force did touch on most important questions in education ranging from the allocation of personnel and other resources to curriculum issues.

The recommendations dealing with the

allocation of personnel were

MS. VERGE: used in government's determination of changes to the teachers'salary regulations this year. The recommendations were not accepted in total but the recommendations, along with the constructive criticism from various interest groups was a basis for government's decision. Other recommendations are being evaluated at the department, some of them can be acted on at the departmental level, others require policy decisions by government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. B. TULK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary question, the

hon. member for Fogo.

MR. B. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, one of the series

of recommendations that was in that task force report

concerns school busing and particularly the distances

that different aged students and different classes of

students should have to walk at particular times of

year. I wonder if the minister has acted on any of

those recommendations or just what does she have in mind with

regards to the recommendations of the school busing?

MR. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, the Education Department has no present intention of changing the arrangement for provision of free school bus transportation. At present that involved providing free bus transportation for all students living more than one mile from their school. This arrangement is quite generous compared with the other provinces of the country. The recommendation of a task force report to vary the distance for older children and younger children have been looked at, but at the moment there is no intention to make any change.

MR. B. TULK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A final supplementary, the

hon. member for Fogo.

Mr. Speaker, one recommenda-MR. B. TULK: tion of the task force that the minister has implemented is the recommendation that the positions of co-ordinating principal and co-ordinating vice-principal in the Province be eliminated. And another action that the minister has taken this year is to cut back on the number of regular classroom teachers - I maintain by 102, the minister says seventy-six and I am talking about regular classroom unitis - and in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, and certainly in certain parts of the Province that I have been in contact with, there has been a serious lowering of teacher morale and, I suggest, teacher effectiveness in the classroom as a result of the implementation of those two steps by the minister. My question to the minister is has she, as the chief executive officer of education in this Province, found out that indeed there is a lowering of morale of teachers, and that in many cases we are perhaps sitting on a powder keg where we may find teachers certainly at the next collective bargaining stage walking out of the classroom or even indeed going on strike as a result of some of the things that are happening now?

Tape No. 2088 June 5, 1980 NM - 1

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

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, the decision to eliminate

the position of co-ordinating or supervising, principals was based on the recommendation made by the task force. It was a recommendation which met with wide acceptance from the various interest groups in education. That position is generally considered to be redundant because of the way that the education system has evolved from twenty years ago when that position was created. As for the pupil/teacher ratio, since 1972, approximately, when student enrollment peaked in our Province, we have had a loss of approximately 13,000 students in kingdergarten through senior high school provincewide. This drop in student enrollment of approximately 13,000 has coincided with an increase in the number of teachers of over 700, therefore the number of teachers per student now in our schools is greater than it has ever been, never before have there been so many teachers for so few students in such good school buildings in our Province. And the decision to -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MS. VERGE:

- decrease the number of teaching positions

for next year, which will coincide with a drop in enrollment next year compared with this year of 3,000, is made in the context of the total budget. Cushioning measures were adopted for those boards experiencing severe enrollment declines with a three per cent limit on the number of teaching positions any one board may lose regardless of the student enrollment decline, and with the introduction of twenty-five new positions -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MS. VERGE:

- for special education.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

My question is also to the Minister

of Education. The task force report recommended that one room schools

were also entitled to extra teachers. The communities of Pinsent

Arm and Northern Bay down in Labrador are entitled to two extra teachers,

or an extra teacher each, Could the minister provide us with the

information why these two schools do not have these teachers and why

they are in St. Anthony teaching at the larger schools?

MR. BENNETT:

That is right. You are right on.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, the decision to allocate

teaching units to particular schools rests exclusively with the local school board. The Education Department makes block allocations of teacher salary units to each of the thirty-five local school boards in the Province and it is up to the local school board, comprising elected and appointed people, close to the local situation, to decide how those units are used, in which schools they are placed, which subjects they will teach. I am not intimately familiar with the schools to which you refer, but I will take that as notice, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for St. Barbe.

MR. BENNETT:

Mr. Speaker, my question is directed

to the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Culture, and it is regarding the big game hunting. At this time of year,

AH-1

MR. BENNETT:

people like to plan their holidays,

be it a July holiday or a Fall holiday. I am wondering how long before the draw takes place for the big game hunting?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. Minister of Tourism,

Recreation and Culture.

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, I am told that no later

than the last week in June people will be notified as to whether in fact they have been successful in the draw.

MR. BENNETT:

A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary. The hon. member

for St. Barbe.

MR. BENNETT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is of

great concern to the people because if they are not notified until
the middle or later part of July, they have missed the July holiday
season so they would like to have this notification. So if it is
going to be after the end of June and then it gets into the middle
of July and the last of July, they have given up their Summer holidays,
Mr. Speaker, and then they may not still get their hunting licence.

So I am wondering if there is any way to speed it up. Why does it take so long? Because it has been a couple of months already since the applications have come in.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon.Minister of Tourism, Pecreation and Culture.

MR. DAWE:

The hunting draw, Mr. Speaker, goes

through Newfoundland Information Services and there is a certain amount of other work that they have to do and they schedule in various departments and various projects into their scheduling process and I am assured that the the process will not take longer than the end of June . I realize some of the problems in planning holidays but that is as fast as the procedure will allow it to happen.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR .FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the

Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr.Dinn). I want to draw to the minister's attention a situation that exists re the Workers' Compensation Board

AH-2

MR. FLIGHT:

that is not acceptable, Mr.Speaker.

I am told they are people, men whom the Workers' Compensation Board require to come to St. John's for medical attention, for diagnosis or for meetings with the board, are being treated in a sense as second class citizens. They are not getting the travel allowance that other people travelling as a result of requests by government, they are being housed and forced to live in what would have to be considered second class accommodations in St. John's, so I wonder if the minister would want to make a comment on those statements as made?

MR.SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. Minister of Labour and

Manpower.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any

Newfoundlander that is being treated by the Workers' Compensation Board or any government department as second class citizens. If the hon. member has specific cases which he would like to relate to me,I will certainly investigate them and see what if any truth there is to it.

MR. FLIGHT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary question. The hon.

member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR.FLIGHT:

I would ask the minister then to indicate

permitted to these kind of people who are required to come to St. John's, and would he list for the House the boarding houses or the accommodations that the Workers' Compensation Board makes available and forces the people who come in for those reasons to live in?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any

citizen of Newfoundland who is forced to live anywhere. I will

MR. J. DINN:

seek the information as to what

accommodations are supplied to people who apply for Workers'

Compensation and have to for some reason or another come in to

St. John's for medical checkups and supply them to the hon. gentleman.

MR. G. FLIGHT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

A final supplementary, the hon. the

member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. G. FLIGHT:

Well, the minister is aware,
undoubtedly, as being the minister responsible for the Workers'

Compensation Board, that there are literally hundreds of people per
month coming from all over Newfoundland as a result of accidents or
industrial diseases and what have you, being put up in accommodations
in St. John's. I would ask the minister again whether or not the

Workers' Compensation Board has selected and listed boarding houses
in the city of St. John's in which these men must live, and in the
event that the people do not want to live in these particular
accommodations that the amount of money allowed for boarding in
St. John's is not adequate to get them into what they consider to
be decent accommodations in this city?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour

and Manpower.

MR. J. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, the answer is the same as the previous answers I have given the hon. gentleman. I will certainly investigate and find out and get all the information that is available and provide it to the hon. gentleman and to this hon.

House.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY: Mr.Speaker, my question is for the hon. minister of Health (Mr. House). Could the minister indicate to the House if all the beds have yet opened over at the Health SciencesComplex or are there beds on the floors over there that are not yet being used?

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

MR. W. HOUSE:

Mr. Speaker, I will have to take

notice of the question. But there is one of the floors that has not

been completed as yet and as was announced the other day by the

Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. J. Dinn), through the hospital

board and the Workers' Compensation Board there will be extra beds

go onstream in that particular hospital, the Health Sciences Complex.

I do not know of any beds that are not in use at the present time,

but I will take it as notice.

MR. S. NEARY:

A supplementary question,

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

A supplementary, the hon. the member

for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, the minister also made

a statement the other day outside the House that some beds would have to close -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! I am afraid I cannot

hear the hon. member.

MR. S. NEARY:

- some beds would have to close this

Summer because of a shortage of nurses. Could the minister identify where these beds will be closed, what hospitals?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. W. HOUSE:

Mr. Speaker, I was responding to a

question from the media as to a statement that was made by another person. The fact was that we had had a report in from hospitals in the Province as of the 1st of March this year asking about the manpower situation and three of the hospitals indicated that they may have to close some beds. One, I think, was St. Anthony, another was the Grace Hospital and another was the Western Memorial. Since that particular time, of course, I know the Western Memorial do not think they will have to close any beds, but there may be some problems of opening some extra beds that would be going onstream later this year in the extended care unit. Other situations that may arise that we have no indication of

MR. W. HOUSE: at this point in time. It is the situation much as happened, for instance, in Harbour Breton last year when there was a severe shortage of nurses there in the Summer but we did not have to close any beds there at that particular time but it was touch and go. So what we are saying now is that we have the indications of the 1st of March that that may happen but we are not really expecting that it will.

MR. S. NEARY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

A final supplementary, the hon. member for

LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Could the hon. gentleman indicate what impact this will have then on the service? Will it be in the field of surgery that the hospitals will have to cut back? Where will the cutbacks take place? And at the same time the hon. gentleman is on his feet, could he indicate what is being done about the nursing shortage? I believe there was a recruitment programme underway the last time, the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. E. Roberts) asked the hon. gentleman a question. Have they had any success with the recruiting programme? Can the minister give us an idea of the amount of the shortage? You know, is it huge, is it - if the hon. gentleman does not have the figures, could he tell us if it is serious?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. W. HOUSE: We have no new figures and I want to point out that the situation anticipated this Summer is no different from what has existed in previous years. Where will the closure be if any, I can not say but one of the things that we do find in the Summer that usually a lot of doctors, for instance, take holidays during the Summer and there is not so much surgery that takes place, surgery that is not immediately required.

Nith respect to nursing shortages, the
Association of Registered Nurses of Newfoundland and our department,
our manpower planning person are working on looking at the shortage
of nurses in the Province and trying to develop a plan and I think they
are making good progress on it. When I mentioned that there was some

MR. W. HOUSE:

effort in recruiting that was not an action
being taken by the department at all, it was two or three of these
hospitals who were expecting a shortage in the Summer, these were the
ones who were recruiting and I am not aware of what their success has
been but I have some information from at least one hospital that they
do not think they will have to close any beds this Summer, one of the
three.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is the Western Memorial.

MR. W. HOUSE:

Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

The hon, the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. G. WARREN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the

Minister of Fisheries (Mr. J. Morgan). Could the minister advise if this brochure of the Fishing Vessel Assistance Plan applies to all fishermen in the Province?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, I am assuming that he is

referring to the new regulations for the Fisheries Loan Board, or the new programme, as it is called, the Fishing Vessel Assistance Programme and that programme and regulations regarding it, yes, it does include and govern all fishermen throughout the Province.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary question, the hon.

member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, on several occasions now I have heard the minister say, and this government in particular say, that they would be consulting with the people. I am just wondering if the minister and/or his officials have discussed first and foremost with his colleague, the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development, and also with the Labrador Resources Advisory Council which this government and this minister say is a consulting body or whom they say is a part of the ongoing process between government and the people of Labrador, have they consulted with the Labrador Resources Advisory Council concerning this brochure that they are bringing in concerning bounties to fishermen?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, no. Speaking of

consultations, the consultations took place with all people connected with the fishing industry. The Labrador Advisory body is not connected with the industry directly, but therewere consultations directly with the Fish Trades Association, there were consultations directly with the Fish Trades Association, consultations with the Independent Processors Association; in other words, all the organizations and groups connected with the fishing industry were consulted before we made any policy changes pertaining to the Fisheries Loan Board. And with regard to consultation with the Labrador Advisory body, I did not make any effort to consult with that group. I do not know if any of my colleagues did, or any of my officials in the Department of Fisheries did, but we saw no reason to do that because we had the Fishermen's Union, which represents fishermen on the Labrador

June 5, 1980

Tape No. 2092

NM - 2

MR. MORGAN:

section of the Province just as well

as the rest of the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simuns):

A final supplementary, the hon. member

for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. I understand from the

last part of the minister's statement he does not even know which area of the Province the Fishermen's Union represents. They do not represent any fishermen North of Rigolet, number one.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

And secondly is that the Premier -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

The hon. member is not permitted to

debate. He has to ask a supplementary question.

MR. WARREN:

- made a statement on October 31st.

saying that bounties for fishermen in Labrador would be from eighteen

feet up -

MR. HISCOCK:

North of Henley Harbour.

MR. WARREN:

- and twenty-five feet down would be

included for the Labrador fishermen. And here we have the minister going ahead and saying all fishermen are -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Question please.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The hon. member has

a question.

MR. WARREN:

I am just asking the minister the final

question. Does the minister consider fishermen's committees as part of the process of going through or considering when he is making recommendations?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that if we had to

get down to the point of consulting with all the fishermen's committees around the Province then we would have, I think we have approximately- what?

June 5, 1980 Tape No. 2092

No. 2092 NM - 3

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, could I have some quiet

from people on the other side?

MR. SPEAKER (Sîmms):

Order, please!

MR. MORGAN:

The gentleman asked a question and

wants the answer, I assume.

Mr. Speaker,

Tape No. 2093 DW - 1

June 5, 1980

MR. J. MORGAN: in consultation today it is difficult to consult with all the fishermen individually.

It is difficult, Mr. Speaker, to consult with all the fishermen's committees that are sitting around the Province -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. J. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, please!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

MR. J. MORGAN:

Therefore, . Mr. Speaker, we

consult thoroughly with the Fishermen's Union. The Fishermen's Union has a membership now of approximately, I think, something like 14,000 or 15,000 fishermen in their membership, which they consider to be bonafide fishermen. And surely when the Fishermen's Union sits down with the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and the officials, they are speaking on behalf of the membership. And the Executive Board of the Fishermen's Union we are consulting with almost every day on all matters pretaining to fisheries and fishezies development.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for St. Mary's -

The Capes.

MR. D. HANCOCK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I

have a question for the Minister of Fisheries. I am just wondering if the minister is in favour of the caplin quotas that have been laid down or would he like to see no caplin quotas at all.or,indeed,should there be a caplin quota laid down, or give up the caplin altogether?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. J. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, I am in favour of

a caplin quota based on the following: the fact that Canada was successful in arranging at the recent NAFO

MR. J. MORGAN: meetings, North Atlantic Fisheries Organization meeting, in having a total ban placed on all offshore fishing for caplin. They were successful in getting that achievement at the most recent meeting of NAFO. And we have been saying it for years that there should be a ban on the offshore fishing for caplin because we felt it was overfished for years by the foreign nations. In order to get that kind of a concurrence of the other nations, it was felt that there had to be some concession and the concession in this case was for the country of Canada to agree to place quotas on the inshore fishery. So this year they placed the quota on the inshore fishery for caplin South of Cape Freels, and the placed a tonnage, a total tonnage of approximately 16,000, I think it is, 16,000 metric tons. Last year the total catch in that area was 13, 000 metric tons.

So I have some reasons to be concerned with the quotas but I agree! with setting the total quota. But the manner in which the quota is being allocated to fixed gear and to the purse seines I think is going to see the recurrence of the problems we saw in the herring fishery where the fishermen are going to be squabbling over the quotas because certain boats, the large boats have a quota and the six gear inshore boats have a different quota and they are going to be complaining about the allocation of each quota.

But I do agree with the overall setting of a total inshore quota for caplin this year. MR. D. HANCOCK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. A supplementary, the hon. MR. SPEAKER: member for Hary's - for St. Mary's - The Capes.

MR. D. HANCOCK:

You are having a hrd time with that one today, Mr. Speaker.

I was just wondering if the caplin quotas that have been laid down will have an effect on the cod fishery around the Province? Does the minister feel that it will have an effect on the number of cod that will come in the district if there are too many caplin being taken?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the Minister of

Fisheries.

MR. J. MORGAN:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I will say

that we have reasons to be concerned right now with the lack of a sign of codfish on the inshore fishing grounds. It is now the 5th. of June and all along the Northeast coast in particular there is very little sign of codfish including

MR.MORGAN:

around to Cape St. Mary's and to St. Mary's Bay, very little sign of cod fish and we are concerned over this and we are wondering why , is it because the caplin has been over fished offshore and there is no migration of caplin to the inshore waters which could be a possibility or is it the fishing activity in the offshore? There is presently being 25,000 metric tons taken by the foreign nations of Northern cod in the offshore.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, plese!

MR. MORGAN:

It could be that, Mr. Speaker. It

could be the fishing activity in the offshore and it could be the major overfishing of the caplin species in the offshore and thirdly according to scientists, it could be the reason that the water is extremely cold and extremely dirty and there is what they call a slubby water all along the coast and that could be a reason as well. But right now there are reasons for concern because there is little or no sign of codfish in the inshore fishing grounds to date.

MR.SPEAKER:

The hon.member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, a question for the

Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), or another question for the Minister of Fisheries. Mr. Speaker, in preamble to this question, since the question is on lobsters I might say that lobster prices are up because I know when I ask the question the minister is going to respond with that particular remark, but since lobster prices are up in various parts of the Province I would like to ask the minister why we have discrepancies through the Province - and I have seen some of the figures which the minister has - why there are discrepancies across the Province of as much as thirty cents a pound, .say, between Port au Choix and Port au Port? I use those as examples but there are places across the Province where you have discrepancies of twenty to thirty cents per pound with lobster particularly in light of the view that the minister said he would be trying to stabilize the prices. I understand that he meant by stabilization

Tape No. 2094 AH-2 June 5,1980

as well that the fishermen would sort MR. HODDER:

of get a general price across the board.

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

Mr. Speaker, that question is indeed MR. MORGAN: an important one and I thank the hon. gentleman for asking it because information on the pricing of lobsters came to my attention yesterday. In fact each and every week, and almost every second day, in fact, I get a report from the Fishing Industry Advisory Board, as I earlier said that I wanted to be done, on the pricing of lobsters in the Province and our position has been we want to make sure that there is at least a minimum price of \$1.70 and the companies not to go below that and if they go below that price to indicate to the Fishing Industry Advisory Board why they are paying less than \$1.70. Fortunately in recent days the market in Boston has improved somewhat and the market for the fishermen here has improved somewhat whereby on the Great Northern Peninsula , Mr. Speaker, for the information of the members of the House, lobster fishermen are now getting in Port Saunders and Port au

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

A point of order has been raised MR. SPEAKER:

by the hon. member for Port au Port.

The question I asked the minister, Mr. MR. HODDER:

Speaker, is very clear because I knew what the minister would do, he would get up and he would sound off about the increase in the price of lobster.

What is the Order, please! MR. SPEAKER:

member's point of order?

Choix \$2.10 per pound.

The point of order, Mr. Speaker, is MR. HODDER:

that the minister is not answering the question. My question was specific; my question was what is the minister doing about the discrepancy in prices and why is there a discrepancy of almost thirty cents a pound from, say, Port au Choix to Port au Port; why are certain buyers paying thirty cents a pound more than others?

Juen 5,1980 Tape No. 2094

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! With respect to the point of order, there is no point of order. The Standing Orders are quite clear. If a member is not satisfied with the answer he receives to a question, he follows the Standing Orders.

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

AH-3

MR. MORGAN: Okay, I will make it brief, Mr. Speaker,

and rather than give the detailed information that the House should know anyway I will probably make it tomorrow in a Ministerial Statement and give the information then, so either way. But in answering the question now, Mr. Speaker, about the discrepancy between the prices paid in the Port au Port Peninsula and those in the Great Northern Peninsula, the price! on the Port au Port Peninsula right now by a collector in Stephenville is \$1.87 per pound and -

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, no (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, could I have some silence?

MR. SPEAKER: You have about ten seconds. The hon.

Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: And the price on the Northern Peninsula,

Mr. Speaker, is, as I mentioned, \$2.10.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Why the difference in price? I cannot

indicate to the House why the price discrepancy but I think that if the member is concerned over the price being paid to fishermen he could very well make representation to the company concerned and ask them why they are not paying the same price.

MR. HODDER: What is the minister doing?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The time for Oral

Questions has expired.

On behalf of hom. members, I would like

to ask hon. members to welcome to the gallery today the Mayor of the town of the Goulds in the district of Kilbride and partly in the district

Tape No. 2094

June 5,1980

AH-4

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

of Ferryland, I understand, Mayor Lewis

Power.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

I am also pleased to welcome on behalf

of hon. members a group of students from Sunnyside Integrated School in the district of Bellevue with their teacher Mr. Don Condor. We hope they enjoy their visit.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

If I may I would like to table persuant

to the Statutes and Subordinate Legislation Act a copy of subordinate legislation which is filed under that act and this, of course, is a compilation undertaken by the office of the Legislative Council and this contains additions of the Newfoundland Gazette published

June 5, 1980, Tape 2095, Page 1 -- apb

MR. OTTENHEIMER: between November 9, 1979 and May 23, 1980. I am not sure if all hon. members will wish to have all of this photostated. Some may find it extremely interesting reading but others might find it a little bit dull.

NOTICES OF MOTION

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

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, I give

notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce

a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Department Of

Public Works And Services Act".

PRESENTING PETITIONS

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

MR. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to

present a petition on behalf of 1,145 residents of

the districts of Kilbride and Ferryland. The

prayer of this petition reads, "We, the residents of

the provincial electoral districts of Kilbride and

Ferryland, specifically the towns of the Goulds and

Kilbride, object strongly to the route of the proposed

by-pass road, chosen by the government, through the

towns of the Goulds and Kilbride.

As residents of these towns we feel that our best interests would be served if the provincial government, through the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing, found an alternate route such as one adjacent to the Bay Bulls Big Pond pipeline road."

Mr. Speaker, this bypass road,or corridor for a by-pass road now appears on the St. John's Urban region plan and on the proposed Goulds town plan. And since I have been MR. AYLWARD:

elected, the first time

I saw the route proposed or to be chosen, I figured there would be trouble just as we decided to lay out this by-pass road. This road would interfere with many of the residents of the Goulds, particularly, because it would go pretty well through the heart of the Goulds, interferring with a lot of single family houses, a trailer park, several by-roads through the Goulds and, in particular, this by-pass road will interfere, either directly or indirectly, with five of the eleven existing dairy farmers who remain in the Kilbride and Goulds areas.

Over the past few years we have enforced an agricultural zone in Kilbride and the Goulds and I would suggest that this by-pass road, if built as proposed, will adversely affect the whole agricultural industry in our districts.

This petition, also, Mr. Speaker, is in support of a proposal, which I will deliver to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. Windsor), which was prepared by the town council of the Goulds and by certain residents of the Goulds. They have put quite a bit of work into this to try to discourage the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing planning people from putting this road in this area and they have suggested that it would be moved to an alternate area. This alternate area, I might add, is not going to be, in itself, free from problems, there are also some dairy farmers in that area and some hog producers who, also, will have to be accommodated. But the proposed route, by the people who present this petition, and by the Goulds town council, would not interfere with the people in this community as much as the route as designed on the

June 5, 1980, Tape 2095, Page 3 -- apb

by the town council of the Goulds.

MR. AYLWARD:

urban region plan.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon the member for

LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I just want briefly to support the petition because I think I can claim an assist on this one. I was the one who put the residents on to the hon. gentleman in the beginning because the people, I believe, on the Shoal Bay Road were the ones who were complaining bitterly because they woke up one morning and saw the government surveyors out driving pegs in the ground, the outline of a road that would go, in some cases, right through the living rooms of some of the residents who lived along that road. And some of these houses, as the hon. member knows, are new houses. Some of them were built within the last year or two with permits issued

So, Mr. Speaker, as the hon. gentleman indicated, it is a very simple matter to change the route, change the course of this road and I think it should be done. I think the government should lay off these high-handed tactics of sending in the surveyors, driving pegs in the ground without any warning to the residents who live in a particular area and frightening them because these people actually thought they were going to lose their new homes. And they may yet, I do not know, because there is no indication that the government is going to agree to change this route. But in some cases, the house will either have to be removed altogether because the new

omie 2, 1360

MR. S. NEARY: arterial road or by-pass road, or whatever you want to call it, would be going right through the centre of the house. So I support the petition, Mr. Speaker, and I hope the minister will give it the consideration that it deserves.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon the Minister of Forests Re-

sources and Lands.

MR. C. POWER: Mr. Speaker, I also would like to support fully the petition that was presented solably by my good friend and colleague from Kilbride (R. Aylward) and also to say that I support fully the proposal, the alternate proposal, if you want, being presented to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (N. Windsor). I would like to take exception to a remark made by the member for LaPoile (S. Neary) in saying that it is a high-handed tactic of government. One of the unfortunate points, as it relates to these types of plans for bypass roads and for roads in general, is the fact that that thing was passed at a public meeting and at a series of public meetings in the area of the Goulds in 1976 or 1977, I believe.

and because of, I suppose, almost an uncaring attitude sometimes about long-range planning, people do not pay as much particular attention to it as they might. Certainly in the town of the Goulds now, particularly where there is such a great demand for agricultural land and for residential land, and when we as a Province are losing more agricultural land each year to different types of land usages, for developments and housing and residential and the like, it is becomming extremely important for us to hold on to the small amount of agricultural land that we have left. And certainly for that reason, if for none other, it is good that we would take another route for that by-pass road that would go away from the agricultural land and go into an area on the back of the Goulds that is not now being

were public meetings held.

MR. C. POWER: developed or is not now being used for agriculture. Certainly, as I say, I support fully the petition and the alternate proposal. But certainly it was not a high-handed tactic of government to send in surveyors without people knowing as there

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Before calling orders of the day, I wish to welcome to the Galleries on behalf of hon. members and ask hon. members to join with me in welcoming, if they can take a minute or two, it is a very lengthy list of delegations or groups representing various groups. So would you welcome please members of the following groups: The Association of Registered Nurses of Newfoundland and Labrador, The Early Childhood Development Association, The Canadian Federation of University Women, the Women's Association of Memorial University, Memorial University Association of Women Students, the Newfoundland Association of Public Employees Women's Committee, Newfoundland and Labrador Federation of Labour, Planned Parenthood, Memorial University of Newfoundland Faculty Association, Canadian Research Institute for the Advancement of Women, National Action Committee on the Status of Women, The Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women, the Newfoundland Status of Women Council, The Corner Brook Status of Women Council, and the St. John's Rape Crisis Centre. We trust that they will find the afternoon's proceedings to be informative.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Provide For An Advisory Council On The Status Of Women". (Bill No. 15)

The hon. President of the Council. MR. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal

MR. MARSHALL: of pleasure to move and introduce this bill for second reading to the House. This Bill, Mr. Speaker, represents a part of the continuing determination, will and commitment of the government of this Province MR. MARSHALL: to foster and develop women's rights and the interest⁶ and concerns of women within our Province.

May I say first off, Mr. Speaker, to be on the record on this, that this is really and fittingly so a Bill originally introduced by the Premier and I think it is very fitting that the First Minister of the government should introduce the Bill. He would have hoped to have been here this afternoon to introduce it himself and perhaps he will be before the consideration of this Bill

has run its full course.

The Premier at the present time is in Corner Brook or was in Corner Brook this morning. He left early this morning for a scheduled meeting with the Chamber of Commerce in the city of Corner Brook, the Board of Trade or the Chamber of Commerce in Corner Brook and he is en route back to St. John's. So hopefully he will be back before the debate is over because otherwise, while I have great pleasure in introducing it, he would, I know have very much liked to have been here to introduce it himself.

Mr. Speaker, before getting into this
Bill which represents, really, one of the major commitments of this government in the area of social policy and social resources, I think it is
fitting to reflect on the fact that we are now, as far as this government is concerned, almost one year into its mandate. Now

EC - 1

MR. W. MARSHALL: over that period of time, I think if we reflect back we can see that the government has articulated its policies and its aims and directions in various areas. We are familiar certainly with its three main thrusts in the resource policy area and in connection with the fisheries, with the Northern cod, with the necessity of preserving the Northern cod for the inshore fishermen of this Province, and then to the offshore fishery of the Province, and then afterwards to the rest of the Canadian nation.

We are also familiar with its position on the ownership of the offshore resources as well as its position and its determination to rationalize the problem that we face in this Provice with respect to hydro development and hydro resources and recapturing a fair and reasonable rent from our hydro resources, particularly in Labrador.

But, Mr. Speaker, in the social area as well, I think that this government has shown that it is determined to foster both the social and cultural interests of the people of this Province, and it has been evident by the bills and the measures that have been taken by the government in recent times. During this session, we have seen an Arts Council established to foster the interests of the arts in this Province; we have seen the bill for the preservation of areas of land for future generations, the preservation of the wilderness areas and the like. So we have moved while we have been concentrating, as we must concentrate to some degree on resources. We have not been idle as well, I would submit, Mr. Speaker, in the area of social development. And this particular bill which we have here is one of the main vehicles of this government in the area of women's rights, in the area of advancing the social and the economic interests of women in the Province. Because, as I said, this government has a real determination, Mr. Speaker, and a recognition of the fact that there must be changes, that changes have to take place in this area as in many other areas.

I would, before I get into the bill, once again refer to the fact that the government has only been in power,

MR. W. MARSHALL: really, one year. It is not quite a year since it received its overwhelming mandate from the people of the Province. And, Mr. Speaker, I think you will see, as I say, when you reflect back that there have been dramatic changes made in this year. When one is involved in governmental process, one hopes to be able to say at the end of the term that things will not be the same as when we were there. And I think after the first year that this government can quite proudly say that there have been changes and there have been dramatic changes in the life of this Province as a result of measures it has taken and as certainly, it undertakes. It is not going to rest on its laurels and it undertakes that in the future there will be even more dramatic changes.

Now, this particular bill itself,
Mr. Speaker, that we have before the House, this bill establishes an
Advisory Council to advise the government and the Premier on matters
relating to the Status of Women in Newfoundland. By its terms it will
set up a mechanism or a vehicle whereby there can be brought before
not just the government, but the public of the Province, matters of
interest and concern to women of Newfoundland and Labrador.

It is envisaged by the terms of the bill that the Advisory Council will be considering submissions from interested groups and individuals throughout the Province from time to time and, as I say, will make recommendations to the government, not only concerning legislation, but with respect to policies and practices to promote equal opportunity for women and to improve generally the status of women in the Province.

On the other side of the coin, the bill also casts a responsibility on this Council itself, to ensure that it reports to the government, and by reporting to the government and to the public, the people of Newfoundland, each year by filing an annual report on its activities throughout this year - and it is also provided in the bill that this report will be tabled in the House of Assembly and thereby made public to the people of the Province.

MR. W. MARSHALL:

There is also provision for

financing of the Advisory Council - I will speak about that in a moment - as to the current position with respect to financing.

It is envisaged that the Council

will consist of eleven members who will be appointed by the Cabinet or the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

MR. W. MARSHALL: These members will serve without reimbursement and will be appointed for a three year term except in the first term; the appointments will be staggered somewhat half will be appointed for three years and the other half for two years.

The Lieutenant Governor in Council, the Cabinet, will appoint from these eleven members as well a President and Vice-President who will be the officers of the Council and there is provision there for the payment of a salary to the President of the Council. There will be, also, an Administrative Assistant; there is provision there for an Administrative Assistant for the purpose of directing the day to day affairs of the Council. Government this year, Mr. Speaker, has provided funding, the funding is in the nature, to the extent, I believe, of \$90,000. When one is aware of the financial condition of the Province and one is aware of the budgetary constraints under which we operate, when one is aware of the legitimate demands that come in from all sectors of our society, this represents, really, a significant commitment on the part of the government of this Province to the aims and objectives of the Council itself and, as I say, these aims and objectives are for the purpose of fostering the status of women in Newfoundland and their concerns and interests.

Mr. Speaker, as I say, I have a great deal of pride in introducing this particular bill.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear.

MR. W. MARSHALL: This government has made, I would submit, significant strides in the area of its concern for women's rights. And I will just enumerate a couple or a few of the measures that it has taken, not that the government intends to rest on its laurels because I understand that we have inherited a situation, probably, that has adhered over a number of centuries and changes have to be made and we just can not sit back on our laurels. But in the past year I would submit that the government has made significant steps in realizing the commitments that it made during the election and, in particular, the commitments of the hon, the Premier who has a particular interest in this area, the first being, of course, as we all know, the enactment of the Matrimonial Property Act.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. W. MARSHALL:

While the Matrimonial Property Act itself

I do not think it can be styled as purely and simply a matter to benefit women in Newfoundland per se because in our view it was and is a forward and beneficial statute which benefits not just women but the entire family and society and strengthens the fabric of society itself.

It is a revolutionary bill, it will come into effect in three short weeks and government remains very proud of the fact that it took this initiative and it is part of the initiative that government took for purpose, as I say, of fostering the family in Newfoundland and also fostering the interests of women in the Province.

I would also point out that there has been a policy of this government and there will continue to be a policy of this government to appoint more women on boards and councils and corporations and various other organs of the government itself. Again, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice (Mr. G. Ottenheimer) has already indicated evidence that the government has adopted a policy in the last year which certainly is revolutionary in nature for Newfoundland not necessarily for other parts of the world but here, he has indicated that he is going to see that women are going to be eligible for appointments and will be appointed to the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary.

Manpower (Mr. J. Dinn) recently indicated that there is going to be a woman employed in his ministry for the purpose of looking after the specific interests of women in the workforce in this Province and I think that that also will reap a great deal of benefit and redound to the benefit of all society. Again, in another area in which the government has moved, again in the ministry of Justice, the hon. the Minister of Justice and the Department of Justice co-sponsored a conference which took place on violence in the home which was a very successful and well received one. We realize, particularly in that area, that there is a tremendous amount of work to be done and we look to the Advisory Council and the

MR. W. MARSHALL:

Status of Women. They I know full well will be

able to give us good advice and direction in this particular area because it is a real cronic concern.

So in summary, Mr. Speaker, on that

area,

MR. MARSHALL:

I think that this particular act which we are bringing forth now is one of the indications, and one of the evidences which this government has shown in the first year of its commitment and its will and its determination to improve the status of women in this Province, to advance their interests, and to rectify discriminations where they occur. And I can assure the House, and I know I speak for all members of the government, that this particular determination and will which the government has, will be unabated for its term of office, you know, as the years go on.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I again point out
that with respect to our commitment and our actions, I have given a
resume of that over the past year. Our commitment financially has been
the amount of \$90,000 which may sound like a fair amount of money to
some people and to other people it may seem that with the costs
and the expenses and the cost of living these days, and the cost of
everything, that more may be needed. But it does, and I would assure
it represents a fair commitment as far as the government is concerned,
and determination from the limited resources which we have, I think it is
at this particular state, it is a substantial contribution and an indication
of the sincerity of this government to the effect that this is not just a
bill that is going to be enacted and forgotten, but it is going to be
funded, the council is going to be funded and we hope that insofar
as finances can go that this shows the, as I say, the government's
sincerity and commitment to it.

I started off, Mr. Speaker, in introducing this bill, by talking about our policies on resources, and again, in relation to this, I think it is relevant for me to once again point out that we cannot consider expenditures and funding for social programmes, beneficial social programmes such as this in isolation. And what I mean by that is that the government intends to, and fervently hopes to be able to strengthen this council with financial and other assistance that it can give But the extent to which it can financially, to a large extent, is going to depend to

the greatest degree on the ability MR. MARSHALL: of the government, and the future of this Province, to which it is hinged, in realizing its fervent desire and policy to require ownership of our offshore because we think on this hinges an awful lot of the financing that will be available certainly in the short-term, as well as the development of our fishery, and I think that when people see social programmes of this nature, see programmes of this nature and see what we are doing with it, if they would only realize that we can do an awful lot more if we get control of areas such as that, particularly with resources so that a general policy of the government on its desire to harness our resources for the benefit of the people of Newfoundland will include the Advisory Council and the Status of Women, will include the Art Council, and insofar as we are able to realize this, to realize the rights of the people of Newfoundland, so we will be able to nurture and foster beneficial councils and organizations such as this.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have indicated I would run through then the terms of this bill, what the government has done in the past year. I want to give the House the assurance that the government is not resting on its laurels but realizes that there is still a long, long way to go in the realizations of the aims and objectives of the women in Newfoundland, But this is a major piece of legislation, we regard it as such. It sets up a mechanism which will be not only of benefit to the women of this Province in advancing the interests of the women of this Province in removing discrimination, but it also sets up a very, very useful vehicle as far as the government is concerned to enable there to be a proper and appropriate and well informed dialogue from the representatives of the various women's organizations and from

June 5, 1980, Tape 2100, Page 1 -- apb

MR. MARSHALL: women themselves in Newfoundland to assure that we are doing our utmost to promote and foster the interests of women and to remove, insofar as we possibly can, and as quickly as we can, the last vestige of the unreasoned discrimination that unfortunately still occurs in the Province. So I have great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in introducing this bill and I look forward to remarks that may be made in the course of the debate to which I will address myself in closing the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

The hon, the member for

LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, it is

very unfortunate indeed, very unfortunate that the hon. gentleman had to lower this debate, lower this bill to partisan political politics. The hon. gentleman in introducing the bill dragged in the Northern cod stock, dragged in the offshore ownership and various other bits and pieces of politics that could have very easily been left out of this. The hon. gentleman in his usual typical fashion in this House, just could not resist the temptation to play politics with the introduction of this bill.

Now, first of all, Mr.

Speaker, I want to say that I think it is a good bill.

We on this side of the House intend to support the bill

and we want to congratulate, especially the Newfoundland

Status of Women and all the other women's groups that

had input into this legislation. Obviously, the only

reason, Mr. Speaker, that we have this bill before the

House - it is not the reasons given by the hon. gentleman,

not the reasons that we will hear from the Minister of

Education (Ms.Verge), the only reason we have this bill

before the House is the fact that the women in this

June 5, 1980, Tape 2100, Page 2 -- aph

MR. NEARY:

particular case carried

out a very successful lobby and they are to be congratulated for it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

So I hope nobody is

labouring under any illusions that the hon. gentleman who introduced this bill is, in his old age, getting generous with the females in this Province, it came about as a result of representation and input and pressure from the various groups of women -

MR. HISCOCK:

They were in there -

MR. NEARY:

I beg your pardon?

MR. HISCOCK:

They were in here for

eight years before.

MR. NEARY:

That is right. It took

them eight years to get around to doing it, and I would have to say that the Minister of Education certainly deserves an assist on this bill. And so, Mr. Speaker, we happen to think it is a good bill and we are going to support it. And not only that, I would like to go a step further, Mr. Speaker, to say this, the hon. gentleman said, 'Oh soon the Minister of Justice (Mr.Ottenheimer) would be admitting females to the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary'. Well, I can go a step further than that, Sir. The thought has often occurred to me, and moreso here lately, because the Lieutenant-Governor only has another year, has an extension of his term of office, to go before His Excellency retires, I would like to see the next Lieutenant-Governor of Newfoundland a lady.

MR. WARREN:

Right on! Right on!

MR. NEARY:

Now, I mentioned this to

somebody in the administration one day. I mentioned this to somebody very high up in the government and they said, 'Well, where are you going to find a lady?'

June 5, 1980, Tape 2100, Page 3 -- apb

MR. NEARY:

Now, this is the crowd who were just up boasting about all the social reforms they are bringing in. I said to a minister on the government side of the House, 'If you have - we have no say in it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: The Premier has a say in it. And the ministers on that side of the House can have a say in it. But we cannot have any say in it, we are not consulted. The Premier would be consulted. And I said to one of his ministers, I suggested to him, I said, 'I would like to see the next Lieutenant-Governor of Newfoundland a lady?' And the minister said to me, 'Well, where are you going to get on?' Now just imagine, 'Where are you going to get one?' I am sure that if you went in the galleries today you could find a dozen, a dozen, Mr. Speaker, we would be proud to have down in Government House. And I hope the administration will take my advice. I hope the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) will convey that idea, that suggestion to his colleague the Premier and see what we can do about making the next Lieutenant-Governor of this Province a woman.

And then, Mr. Speaker, this same crowd now, who are going so fast with social reforms in this Province as we are told by the President of the Council who was speaking for the Premier, what about the Transition House for battered wives? Only there a few weeks ago I heard and saw on television the proceedings of a conference that was being held in this Province where the government was being condemned for ignoring a request - I forget what group it was now - condemned for ignoring a request - and I saw the Minister of Education sitting in the audience at that conference when the government had

June 5, 1980, Tape 2100, Page 4 -- apb

MR. NEARY:

refused -

MR. HISCOCK:

'Steve'.

MR. NEARY:

Pardon?

MR. HISCOCK:

Family Planning may

also have to close if they do not get money.

MR. NEARY:

That is right. The

government refused to provide funding for this Transition House for battered wives and battered children.

MR. HISCOCK:

Family Planning is

coming up now.

MR. NEARY:

And I am told, Mr.

Speaker, that the Family Planning office will have to close very soon if they do not get some funding.

So these are just three

items that I fling out for the hon. gentleman if he wants to play politics with it. We have no intention of playing politics with it, but

MR. S. NEARY:

if the hon. gentleman wants to play

politics with it, I can give him a few more items. But I am not going to waste the time of the House doing that, Mr. Speaker, because we happen to think it is a good bill and we are going to support it. Our only hope, Mr. Speaker, is that the government will not take forever to draft the regulations. Because the last section of this bill is very important: Section 18 - "The Lieutenant-Governor in Council may make regulations for carrying out the purpose and provision of this Act." Sometimes the wheels of government grind very slowly and the only advice that I can give to the people in the galleries who are interested in this bill is to make sure that the bill is not passed in this House, signed by His Excellency, the Lieutenant-Governor, and then brought downstairs and put on a shelf down there to gather dust. Because in order to make this bill function, you are going to need a set of regulations, and unless you keep after the Minister of Education (Ms L. Verge), the spokesman or some ministers in the government, the regulations may never be made. So that is one area of concern.

The rest of it is fairly straightforward except, Mr. Speaker, that I have grave doubts, myself, of the wisdom of placing this bill directly under the Premier's office.

MR. E. HISCOCK:

Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY:

Not that I have anything against the

Premier -

MR. E. HISCOCK:

Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY:

- but would it not be better to have the

bill administered by another department, by another minister in the government?

MR. E. HISCOCK:

The Minister of Justice (Mr. G.Ottenheimer).

MR. S. NEARY:

The Minister of - I was going to say

Recreation, but that would not be suitable for this - the Minister of Justice probably or the Minister of rehabilitation, because the Premier is a pretty busy man.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Oh, yes.

MR. S. NEARY:

I am quite serious in what I am saying. The Premier is a busy man, and he is so preoccupied with offshore oil - because that is all he can think about - that you may not be able to get to see him when you want to see him.

MR. W. MARSHALL:

(Inaudible).

MR. E. HISCOCK:

That is a very valid question.

MR. S. NEARY:

Oh, I see. That is a - I am talking

EC - 2

about the bill, I am not playing politics.

MR. W. MARSHALL:

(Inaudible).

MR. G. WARREN:

The Premier has

oilmyelitis.

MR. S. NEARY:

I think it would have been wiser,

Mr. Speaker, to put this bill under a minister who can pay more attention to it. Because I hope I am proven to be wrong, but I have grave doubts. This will receive very low priority, I think, in the Premier's office.

MR. G. WARREN:

I would say in the next election we are going to have about five men on this side.

MR. S. NEARY:

And I would say in due course that you will see an amendment coming in to the bill to put it over in another department. That does not lower the importance of it, all it does is to make sure that the bill is effective, that the recommendations in the bill and the clauses of the bill and the regulations are enforced.

I mean, you can pass all the bills you like in the House of Assembly, but unless they are implemented they are absolutely useless.

I am not quite sure if the funding that the hon. gentleman talked about is going to be satisfactory or not - \$90,000. I do not know, I have not seen the Budget. I do not if that will adequately take care of the situation or not, but I guess we will just have to wait and see. There will have to be a year's experience. I presume that is only a tentative amount, that the next time the Budget is brought down in the House that there will probably be, and I hope there will be, an increase in this, because it is going to be very

MR. S. NEARY: difficult for the Advisory Council to maintain an office. And I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that the Advisory Committee should be restricted to St. John's, and unless you have a good budget so that you can travel across the Province and open offices in other parts of the Province, it will boil down that nine things out of ten that are done in this House usually end up downtown St. John's. And there are more places in Newfoundland than St. John's. So I hope that the government will provide an adequate budget so that if the Advisory Council is going to open offices that they will be able to open them in at least all the major centres throughout the Province and have staff in each centre in Newfoundland and Labrador. And that is going to be very expensive, very costly. I doubt if there are enough government buildings around where the Advisory Council could go to the government and ask the government if they could use a public building or use one of the offices in a public building. You would probably end up going out having to rent your own space and hiring your own staff.

MR. S. NEARY:

So I hope that the government will take a look at that aspect of it the next time they bring a budget into the House. I think that the budget is too little, myself. I would like to see it double that amount. I would like to see a copule of hundred thousand dollars allocated -

MR. MARSHALL:

(Inaudible) worth.

MR. S. NEARY: Well, yes, the hon. gentleman is admitting that they need more than that. But at least a couple of hundred thousand dollars to start off in order to do an effective job.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is all I have to say about it. We are going to support the Bill. We think it is a good Bill. We do wish the Advisory Council the best of luck and we look forward to getting the first report in the House of Assembly, not this Fall but in the new session of the House that will probably open next January or February. Sometime during the course of that session we should have the first report from the Advisory Council and I am sure that all members look forward to that day.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MS. L. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, it is not an unusual occurence for a member on this side of the House to speak following the hon. member for LaPoile (S.Neary) and to rebut remarks which he makes because as we all know the hon. member for LaPoile uses a great deal of the time of this House and speaks at great length.

what is unusual, however, is for a member on this side of the House to rebut his remarks dealing with women's issues because in all the hours and hours of time that the hon. member takes of the time of this House, this, I think, is the only occasion when I have ever heard him address his remarks to the needs and concerns of the women of the Province.

Tape No. 2102 June 5, 1980

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MS. VERGE:

He has from time to time taken issue with my position as he frequently calls me a freedom fighter or a women's libber but this -

MR. NEARY:

I also call the hon. minister sweet

EL - 2

lips (inaudible)

- is the first occasion that I have MS. VERGE: witnessed when the hon. member devoted his full speech to the topic of the needs of the women of the Province. And I do find it rather peculiar that instead of addressing himself to the major fundamental social and economic problems faced by women, that he would pick on the issue of the choice of the next Lieutenant-Governor.

Tokenism is not what is important to

the women of the Province.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear!

MS. VERGE:

What women are concerned about are basic -

MR. HISCOCK:

Why are you in the Cabinet?

MS. VERGE:

- widespread reforms to benefit and

improve women, all women of all classes and socio-economic levels throughout out Province. The choice of a

MS . VERGE:

Lieutenant-Governor, as the hon. member well knows, is also a matter which rests with his friends and colleagues in Ottawa, the present Liberal Administration there, Mr. Trudeau.

MS. VERGE:

Now, to turn my remarks to the matter at hand I would like to say that it is with a feeling of happiness and hope for the future that I speak in strong support of this Bill to establish an advisory council on the status of women and my pleasure now is heightened because of the presence in the Galleries of so many women representing a host of organizations who I think share my feelings.

I am confident that the Newfoundland and Labrador Advisory Council on the Status of Women will provide valuable guidance and input to our government which will result in policies and programs benefitting all the women of our Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

. Hear, hear!

MS. L. VERGE:

And I would like to stress, Mr. Speaker, that it is a commitment of this government to improve the quality of life for all the women of the Province. This means women of all ages, young women, middle-aged women, old women, women who are single, married, seperated, divorced, widowed, women who are mothers, who are housewives and homemakers, women in the work force, in our fishplants, who work as secretaries, teachers, as nursing assistants, as squid fishers, poor women, women on social assistance, rich women, women who are supported by their husbands, women in every corner and cove of the Province from Wabush to Nain to Point au Mal, Corner Brook, Woody Point, Triton, Grand Falls, Carters Cove, Kelligrews, St. John's

MS. VERGE: a great number of individual women have contacted our government and called for the Provincial Advisory Council on the status of women. When the Cabinet met in Stephenville in January, we had an excellent presentation from a woman who lived in a small community on the West Coast calling for the Advisory Council on the status of women and I would like to quote from her brief. She described herself as a woman who is a wife of more than twenty-six years and a mother of nine children, of which all but one have grown up and gone away.

She said, "During that special time in my life my one concern was to do the task I set out to do and do it well. I pride myself today in the belief that I did a good job. However, now that that phase of my life is over I am not content to sit and die, or wait for entrance into a senior citizens home, I want to take on a new role and feel my worth should be of some value out there in the world. The problem is that I do not know how or where to begin again. In my case it is not the unemployment situation that is the problem. If there were ten jobs for each person in the Province I would still be unemployable because of being out of the work force for so long." And she ends with a strong plea that an advisory council for women be established to identify the needs of women and take them to government.

When Cabinet met in Corner Brook in February, we had another excellent presentation from a younger woman, a woman, I guess, of about my age, who works in a government office, who has acted in a labour union, who is a wife and mother of three school age children. That woman concentrated her remarks on the special problems faced by the woman at home, the housewife and mother and she said in her brief and I quote, "Even though I am a woman in the work force I can empathize with the housewife. Many of my friends and relatives are in the same boat. I was there myself at one time until the economic situation MS. VERGE: forced me to take a place in the work force to help my family live a better life. This is not always a situation with a lot of women either, either through lack of education, lack of job creation, or they just want to stay home and raise their family first, put yourself in their shoes and empathize with them, feel their frustrations and maybe then you will start to move a few obstacles so they can look forward to a happy and healthier life."

I am not saying that this proposed advisory council on the status of women will solve all their problems, but at least it will be a start in the right direction.

In addition to these individuals who have spoken out about the need for a government agency dealing specifically with the concerns of women, there have been letters and requests from a number of organizations for this move. Many of these organizations are represented in the galleries here today. Many of them wrote the Premier stating their support for this move.

These groups include the Voluntary

Status of Women Council in five centres of the Province, St. John's,

the Newfoundland Status of Women Council, Central Newfoundland,

Corner Brook, Happy Valley-Goose Bay, and Labrador West, in addition

the Newfoundland and Labrador Women's Institutes, this is a large

network of women's associations in many communities around the Province,

perhaps the largest women's organization in our Province. The Newfoundland and Labrador Federation of Labour, who made a presentation to Cabinet just this week, NAPE, the Newfoundland Association of Provincial Employees; the Newfoundland Teachers Association, of whose members approximately fifty-one per cent are women; the Association of Registered Nurses of Newfoundland; the Catholic Women's League; the Memorial University of Newfoundland Faculty Association; and the Canadian Federation of University Women.

Mr. Speaker, the commitment of this government to create programmes and policies to benefit women is one which will improve the situation for women not at the expense of anyone else but

MS. VERGE:

to strengthen the whole society. The aims and objectives of women's organizations to improve the quality of life for women is often misunderstood. Many men often feel that somehow they are being threatened by this process. And I would like to emphatically state that that is not the case and that is not the attitude of this government.

I would like to ask your indulgence to quote from a poem which, I think, expresses the kind of approach taken by many of the women's groups and by this government in setting up a Provincial Advisory Council for Women. The poem is called, 'For Every Woman', and it says, 'For every woman who is tired of acting weak when she knows she is strong There is a man who is tired of appearing strong when he feels vulnerable/ For every woman who is tired of acting dumb/There is a man who is burdened with a constant expectation of knowing everything; For every woman who is tired of being called an emotional female/There is a man who is denied the right to weep and to be gentle / For every woman who is called unfeminine when she competes/There is a man for whom competition is the only way to prove his masculinity/ For every woman who is tired of being a sex object/There is a man who must worry about his potentcy/ For every woman who feels tied down by her children/ Thereis a man who was denied the full pleasures of shared parenthood/ For every woman who is denied meaningful employment or equal pay/ There is a man who must bear full financial responsibility for another human being / For every woman who was not taught the intricacies of an automobile/ There is a man who was not taught the satisfactions of cooking/ For every woman who takes a step toward her own liberation / There is a man who finds the way to freedom has been made a little easier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, some people may question why there is a need to establish an agency to look out to the particular concerns of women. They might argue that the needs of women are adequately addressed by the mechanisms now in place, the same as the rest of the population. Of course, government in the past has moved to set up agencies and decision making bodies to focus attention on the needs of other special groups. These groups include the youth, the old people, our senior citizens, native people, rural people and Northern people. And I think there are many good reasons for taking this move for women. Women , after all, constitute about 51 per cent of our population. And women as a group, regardless of their age, their marital status, their occupation, their lifestyles, their place of residence, women as a group do have distinctive characteristics of special needs and concerns common to the group. These issues involve the economy, Many economic issues revolves around women's place in the work force. Several of these points were addressed in the brief given to government this week by the Federation of Labour and they are illustrated in a recent release from the Federal Minister of Employment, the hon. Lloyd Axworthy who said that although one out of every two women now has a paid job, the jobs held by a significant proportion of women continue to have lower wage levels, inferior working conditions and fewer opportunities for advancement than those held by men. Occupational segregation on the basis of sex has changed little over the past decade. Canadian statistics indicate that 62 per cent of women work in occupations in the sales, clerical and service categories.

Tape No. 2104

DW - 3

MS. VERGE:

June 5, 1980

Occupational segregation is

a major obstacle to the achievement of full equality in the work place.

Other concerns relate, to

social issues. The fact is that single mothers,

MS. L. VERGE: mother led single parent families and widows are among our most financially deprived people. Statistics show that today in Canada the poorest group of people are elderly women many of whom are widows. Women by virtue of their traditional role as the primary care giver to children have a special interest in meeting the needs of children in seeing that there is adequate provision for the care and education of pre-school and young children.

Women have many special concerns in the area of education which I, in my department, am trying to meet. And in addition to being a special group constituting 51 per cent of the population with destincitive charactistics and special concerns and needs, there is an added reason for creating a special government agency to look out to these matters and that is the virtual absence of women from the House of Assembly and from senior decision making and policy making positions in government. And this, of course, is not unique to our Province, it is a worldwide phenomenon so that mechanisms are not already in place to ensure that these special needs and concerns are dealt with with the appropriate degree of awareness and sensitivity.

structure for the Advisory Council set out in this bill is an excellent one, In choosing the model a great deal of care was taken. The Advisory Councils which exist elsewhere in Canada, the Canadian Advisory Council and the Status of Women, which was established by the federal government a number of years ago and the Advisory Councils in a couple of the other Provinces, particularly New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, were studied and the best features of those other councils were incorporated in this bill. Mr. Speaker, contrary to the remarks of the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. S. Neary), I believe that it is extremely important and necessary that this Advisory Council report to the Premier. The Advisory Council, after all, will be examining a wide range of economic, social and cultural issues, issues which do not fall within the limits of any one government department, which cross departmental boundaries and which can most appropriately be communicated to government through the Premier.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, it is my belief

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that the

MS. L. VERGE: that this establishment of a Newfoundland and Labrador Advisory Council on the Status of Women indicates the progressive visionary approach of this administration and government in meeting the social and economic needs of all of our people.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. D. JAMIESON:

Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to

dwell at any great length on this most important measure other than to re-afffrm what has been said already and that is that we on this side of the House are completely supportive of the principles of this bill. Some reservations have been expressed and I suppose will continue to be expressed by members of the House of all persuasions and members of the public because this is not the kind of measure that one can introduce and cover everything at the same time. I think it is a learning experience to some extent and perhaps I might be forgiven for reminding members of the House that I have had a great many years in which I am pleased to say that my support for this kind of activity, this kind of legislation has been manifest and where I have been able to do a fair amount.

I simply want to say that I think MR. JAMIESON: an awful lot is going to depend, in the formative period and, indeed, even further down the road on the experience that is gained and upon the calibre of people who are appointed and upon the receptivity of the government to the various proposals that are put forward. I can say, again with a good deal of experience, that the most important element in here is to ensure the independence of this particular organization. If it merely becomes an offshoot or, as it were, an arm of the government, however far removed that may be, then I do not believe that it will function anything like as well as it ought. I say that out of my recollections of what happened and what is happening and the changes that have become necessary with the national equivalent of this particular body. And there are many, many difficulties that lie ahead but that does not detract at all from the principle of having a group of this kind to whom various women's groups throughout Newfoundland and individual women can make representations in the expectation that something positive will be done. I have no hesitation at all in saying that it is an historic step forward to get a group of this kind established, at least to get it established on paper. But this first few months and the first year are really going to be most important, otherwise we may well find twelve months from now, ten months from now that members of the group feel frustrated, feel that they are not really getting to the nub of the matter, are not being listened to in the way in which they ought to be listened to or perhaps, indeed, that they are being influenced or sought to be influenced in ways that they do not particularly like. I do not say that by casting aspersions on anyone but it is the very nature of this kind of organization as, by the way, it was when we were discussing the Art's Council, I think it was recently, that all of these bodies, the most important thing about them is the wide representation that is contained in the membership of the group, that it is not an elitist movement, that it is not a regionally confined representation and that it is also one

AH-2Tape No. 2106 June 5,1980

which can feel totally free to act

MR. JAMIESON:

free from what might be described as the big brother, if you want to call it that, of government and the like because one has to remember that a substantial amount of what this organization will be looking at will be, in fact, the actions of government. I think that is one of the most important things that I learned over the years, that it is, in fact, to be able to perform in the role in a way of ombudswoman , if you like in this particular case, with regard to legislation. So, therefore, there will be times when the council is going to have to be in a position that it can say to the government and have the government receptive to the fact, that it does not particularly like certain proposals that are coming forward and also that the government is prepared and this side of the House is prepared, to support a legislation which is designed to enhance what the group is proposing and suggesting and what they have clearly, out of their findings, determined is in the best interest of the women of this Province. So, therefore , Mr. Speaker, I am most pleased that we have managed to rearch this point in development and that during this Session of the House we have been able to get this legislation through second reading today and I would hope through all phases before we rise for the Summer.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (BAIRD):

If the hon. President of the Council

(Mr. Marshall) speaks now he will close the debate.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. MR. MARSHALL: Leader of the Opposition for his remarks that were made. I would point out that it certainly is not the intention of this government, in setting up the Advisory Council and leading in this legislation to attempt, and I underline the word attempt because that is all it would be because it would not succeed, but they have no desire of even attempting to make this Advisory Council an arm of the government. And as to his

June 5, 1980, Tape 2107, Page 1 -- apb

observations, well taken MR. MARSHALL: as they are, to the effect that he had hoped that this would not become a regional body, it is not the intention, it is the intention that this be representative of women throughout Newfoundland. Indeed, under section 6 of the bill itself, there is a provision here that meetings of the advisory council may be held anywhere in the Province. And it is certainly the intention - you do not find that in bills of this nature but by expressing it this way the government is giving its desire and its intent that, indeed, these meetings would be held in all parts of the Province from time to time. So this would, I think, tend to derogate from any possibility of it becoming regionally located.

I cannot add too much more to the words that the hon. the Minister of Education (Ms.Verge), the eloquent words that she made in her presentation with respect to this matter. I will address myself to a few of the observations though made by the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). As the hon. the member for LaPoile would anticipate, I cannot resist the temptation so to do.

MR. JAMIESON:

Try. Try.

MR. NEARY:

You are familiar with

the whole (inaudible) you know.

MR. MARSHALL:

I realize that, Mr.

Speaker, but I always welcome the views of the hon. the member for LaPoile whether they be in Committee or third reading. So I am just responding, I hope not in kind, but I am just slightly responding, as I say. He said the only reason why this bill was being brought in was because of a lobby from various groups of women in the Province.

Now, the first thing I would

June 5, 1980, Tape 2107, Page 2 -- apb

MR. MARSHALL: say to that is that we do not deny that we listened to all groups of women in this Province as well as all groups in this Province and this is indicative, Mr. Speaker, of our -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

You know, we are very proud, as a matter of fact, of that fact and I would ask the hon. the member for LaPoile - and I cannot resist this - who spent a number of years in government some years ago, what excuse the hon. member had and his administration of that period of time, for obviously not listening to the women of Newfoundland?

MR. NEARY:

Can I answer that now?

MR. MARSHALL:

No. the hon. member can

answer it any -

MR. HISCOCK:

(inaudible) social

revolution.

MR. MARSHALL:

Well, I mean, if the

hon. member wishes to utter two or three words I would not mind, but I have no intention of giving away the floor for the hon. member to deliver a dialogue.

The other thing, Mr.

Speaker, as well - you talk about a lobby. Look, let me say that this government has enacted legislation here and in effect, I suppose, if you wanted to picture it so, it very much welcomes a lobby. It has enacted a council and it hopes that the council will lobby. The whole purpose of the council itself, or one of the main purposes of the council is so that the government can receive representation, so that they will make representations, so that they will bring the interest of the women of Newfoundland to the government. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, this is one of the main reasons why the bill is here, it establishes the formal framework for this Province and for this purpose.

June 5, 1980, Tape 2107, Page 3 -- apb

And this government has MR. MARSHALL: not been shy, Mr. Speaker, to receive in an open manner, the open government that it is, a lobby - if the hon. genteman wishes to call it a lobby he may call it a lobby - the views, the representations of the women of Newfoundland as well as all citizens of Newfoundland. And we are quite happy to be able to enshrine this in legislation to ensure that in the unlikely event, in years to come, that some other members form the government in the reasonable future, that this is enshrined as a part of the legislation, the law of this land and even though the hon. gentlemen, whomever they may be who form the government, may not wish to listen, there will be this particular council set up so that they will have to listen, and it will be formalized.

So, in fact, if the hon. gentleman wants to talk about lobby, we are very proud of the fact that we listen to lobbies, we listen to representations, we listen to all people in the Province and that is one of the reasons why this administration has got the reputation it has of an open government, not afraid to face the public, not afraid to listen to their views and, hopefully, heeding of their views themselves.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

GH-1

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman on the other side indicated - he wondered about the wisdom of putting this under the Office of the Premier. The hon. the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) has given a very appropriate reason and good reasons for this, but I would also add that the fact that it is being put under the Office of the Premier means that it is being put under the office of the First Minister of this Province and is indicative of the priority which this government places upon this Advisory Council. It is to ensure that the First Minister of this Province - that the representatives of women in Newfoundland have an opportunity to get directly to, a direct voice, the First Minister of this Province to assure that other ministers, operating other areas, that they will not get the opportunity to hear and not be heard, as it is, by the First Minister. Sc, it gives a direct pipeline to the most important ministry, to the most important office in the Province, and we make no apology for that, Mr. Speaker, that is the purpose of the bill itself.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL: And may I say also — and the hon.

gentleman — I should not, really. I do not want to engage with the

hon. gentleman who is —

MR. G.FLIGHT:

(Inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL:

- hon. gentlemen who are real gentlemen,

I do not want to. I might end up disgracing myself.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in closing can I say also - point out to the House that there was a rumour I had heard to the effect that the government - there is some legislation on the Order Paper - and I do not know where the rumour started, but the rumour started somewhere along the lines that we were going to put this off - I think it was probably engendered by, maybe, I would say, some people not in the Opposition but some people in opposition, few and all as they may be - that we were going to put this off to the Fall session and, of course, nothing could further from the truth. It was our intention to bring this in now. We are now coming,

MR. MARSHALL:

as I say, to the end or near, and
it is dangerous for a Government House Leader to indicate as to when
we may be coming nearer to the end of the session because nobody knows
when the bills are considered appropriately. The fact of the matter
is we are coming nearer to the first part of the second session,
nearer to the end, and the very fact that we have brought it in at
this time and carried through our original intent is indicative, again,
of the importance that we put on this particular measure.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, as I say, I make no apologies to the hon. gentlemen from having an open government, from enacting a measure such as this which formalizes and puts into law, gives legislative sanction to a council of people who have very legitimate interests who, in order for them to be able to assure that they will be able to communicate these interests to the government, not only this government but in the decades ahead when this government has finished its job in resource development, has finished its job in social development, but to some government in the future, maybe in the year 2020. Even the grandchildren of the hon. members will then have to listen to the views of the Council of Women. That will be because of the Tory administration, no thanks to the Liberal administration who never heeded them for the twenty-five years they were in power.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

Order, please!

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Provide

For An Advisory Council On The Status Of Women", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave.

(Bill No. 15)

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Order 36 to number 46.

(Inaudible) the hon.

Leader of the Opposition in, just indicate the order of business.

MR. MARSHALL:

We would hope to call the remaining

Finance bills, which is the Increase of Certain Pensions, the Financial Administration Act and the Act to Amend Certain Taxation Statutes, and then, by leave of the House, we could, perhaps, go into Committee, clear those that we have in Committee, and if there is any time get back to second reading on the residual bills we have.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

Order, please!

DR. COLLINS:

Order 36 you mean, do you not?

MR. W. MARSHALL:

Did I not say Order 36?

DR. J. COLLINS:

You said 38.

MR. W. MARSHALL:

My apologies, Mr. Speaker, I am

corrected by the Minister of Education (Ms L. Verge) and the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins).

Order 36. Bill No. 42.

Motion, second reading of a bill,

"An Act Respecting An Increase Of Certain Pensions," (Bill No. 42).

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Before I recognize the hon. the

Minister of Finance, if I may, although it is not quite 5:00 P.M.,

but rather than have to interrupt in a few minutes, I can inform the

House now that I have not received notice of any matters for debate

at 5:30 P.M. when a motion to adjourn will be deemed to be before

the House unless there is some further agreement.

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. W. MARSHALL:

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, in the interest

of getting business, with leave of the House, that perhaps we could go

to 6:00 P.M. today if that is the agreement.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. D. JAMIESON:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are in agreement

with that and in the process of doing so, I think members should realize that certainly, the member for Torngat Mountain (Mr. G. Warren) and the member for Port au Port (Mr. J. Hodder) both gave up what is to them a quite important part of the parliamentary process, that is the so-called Late Show, in order to accommodate us, and I am grateful to them, as I am sure, members opposite are.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

So it is agreed then that we will adjourn

at 6:00 P.M. when a motion to adjourn will be deemed to be before the House.

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. J. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, when I had the honour and privilege of bringing in that document of great progressive action, the Budget Speech, earlier in this session, it was announced that 'All pensioners will receive an increase of at least 8 per cent effective April 1st and as well, other pensioners who were receiving quite small pensions from previous years' - from years long-time gone would get extra increases. And, Mr. Speaker, this bill - I will not speak long on this because there is really, I suppose, not too much to say about it - but this bill just puts into effect those provisions in the Budget.

The first clause brings in the 8 per cent increase for all pensioners and the second part of the second clause brings in the other increases. So there will be two increases for those receiving pensions in the period from 1961 to 1970. They will get the 8 per cent and then on a progressive basis, going back over the years they will get on top of that, increasing amounts, so that a pensioner who was receiving his pension on or before December 31, 1961 will in actual fact get an 18 per cent increase in pension, and for the calendar year, 1972, will get 9 per cent in addition to the 8 per cent - 17 per cent, and so on and so forth so that when one comes up to the calendar year, 1970, that such a pensioner will receive 8 per cent plus 1 per cent, in other words, 9 per cent, and then from 1971 onward everyone will receive 8 per cent increase in pensions. There is in addition to that, provisions there so that the increase in pensions will not go below a minimum amount and then the amount of a pension that anyone can receive will also have a floor underneath it, will not be able to go below a minimum amount.

Mr. Speaker, I have great pleasure in second reading.

On motion, a bill, "An Act Respecting An Increase Of Certain Pensions," Bill No. 42, read a second time, ordered referred to a committee of the Whole House presently by leave.

moving

June 5, 1980

MR. W. MARSHALL:

Order 37.

Motion, second reading of a bill,

"An Act To Amend The Financial Administration Act, 1973," (Bill No. 49).

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. J. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, hon. members will remember

that in the first Budget of this administration, brought in last year, it was indicated that government intended to pay interest on overdue accounts from those supplying services and goods to government. And it was discovered in trying to implement that intention that in actual fact, Section 30 of the Financial Administration Act restrains

DR. COLLINS:

government from doing it. There was a provision in there whereby government could only pay out the amounts of money actually contained in a contract. In other words, we could not pay out any extra, we were constrained from doing so. So this amendment, in actual fact, recognizes that fact and corrects it so that we are allowed to pay out monies out of the consolidated fund not only for goods and services received, not only the contract price but in addition to that any interest that may be due because of late payment of an invoice.

MR. JAMIESON:

So (inaudible) better on late payments

now than you were?

Very much better. In the past six DR. COLLINS: months we have undertaken almost, you might say, a campaign to correct this. Some of the difficulties there were these: For instance, there were agencies of government - for instance, say, take the vocational schools; they would get in certain supplies, say, during the Summer and then they would get billed early in the new training year, Well, they would have such a load of work put on them getting their programmes into effect that the actual processing of the invoices they would receive would just get pushed on the back burner and sometimes we would not receive these invoices for payment as much as nine months later. Quite often these got very much behind times. Now, we have instituted measures in the departments of government so that invoices are processed much more quickly and we are attempting to get the agencies of government to do the same thing. It is not as easy to get the agencies because we do not have the same hold over them. But we are making as many efforts as we can to do that.

MR. STRILING:

Are you going to make it retroactive?

DR. COLLINS:

It is, yes. It will come into force

as of when it was intended to come into force, that is the first of April, 1979. This will be retroactive -

MR. STIRLING:

April, 1979, retroactive for a full

year.

DR. COLLINS:

Yes that is right.

MR. SPEAKER (BAIRD):

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

I want to ask the minister one question

about how did McConnells Advertising receive interest on money that was owed by the Newfoundland Government and then later they had to refund the amount of interest that was paid on the outstanding debt? How did that happen? Could the hon. gentleman give us an explanation of that? I think the hon. gentleman is aware of it. It has been in the - we received a letter recently saying that the money had been refunded. But how did it happen in the first place?

DR. COLLINS:

What was the question again?

MR. NEARY:

McConnells Advertising that had this

contract with the Newfoundland Government received interest on money, you know, that they were owed from the Public Treasury. And later they had to refund that interest because there was no authority for paying interest on it. Nobody else in Newfoundland - we are doing it now for the first time - but nobody else received interest on outstanding debts except McConnells. Could the hon. gentleman tell us how that happened? MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): If the hon. minister speaks now he

will close the debate.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I will have to get an

answer for the hon. member on that. I can speculate as to what happened but, you know, I presume that going on the announced intention of government that it was done and then it was found that the authority was not there when the action was given a closer look. But I am just speculating on that. In the Committee stage I will have the information, the details

MR. NEARY: Okay.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Financial Administration Act, 1973", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave. (Bill No. 49)

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An

Act To Amend Certain Taxation Statutes". (Bill No. 53).

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, what this bill does when

it becomes an act is to actually define more fully what a return is. And the present definition just speaks of return and it is related to the

DR. COLLINS:

confidentiality of information that comes to government in regard to the collection of Retail Sales Tax
And the confidentiality

June 5, 1980

relates to return and this DR. COLLINS: defines just what return is because there was some doubt as to what amount of information was intended to be kept confidential in the interests of the taxpayer. It just defines return for the various acts that would be involved, the Gasoline Tax Act, the Retail Sales Tax Act, the Insurance Companies Act, the Insurance Premiums Tax Act, the Tobacco Tax Act. So, that is the purpose of this amendment. Further debate, the hon. the member MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) for Bonavista North.

Now, it is just a question and he MR. STIRLING: can continue on as if he were on the floor if you have no objections, Mr. Speaker.

No, I will take it as the hon. MR. SPEAKER:

member for Bonavista North now speaking in the debate.

Did this come up as a result of the MR. STIRLING: questions put to the Deputy Minister of Finance in the Public Accounts Committee when the Public Accounts Committee was looking for some information and the Deputy Minister indicated that he felt he could not release that information to the Public Accounts Committee? Is the purpose now to block that loophole so that the Public Accounts Committee will not able to get that information?

If the hon. minister speaks now,

The hon. Minister of Finance. MR. SPEAKER:

he will close the debate.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is DR. COLLINS: quite correct. It did come up as a result of the hearings in the What could be released because of Public Accounts Committee, the constraints in the act in regard to confidentiality, that issue came up. An opinion was sought from the Department of Justice as to exactly what had to be held confidential because of the provisions of the act. As a result of going to Justice to find that out, it was determined by the Department of Justice that the definition of return was imprecise, and this is what makes it (inaudible).

DR. COLLINS:

It is not a case of blocking it.

It is just determining more precisely what the act intends should be held confidential. It is not blocking it. It is just that we had to go to Justice to find out what return meant, and now we are actually, on the basis of what Justice advises, we are now putting that into written form.

MR. STIRLING:

Will you permit a question?

DR. COLLINS:

Certainly, certainly.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. STIRLING:

Will you permit a question?

DR. COLLINS:

Certainly.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. minister yields.

MR. STIRLING:

Is you advice now that, once this

amendment has been implemented, the department can refuse the information which was requested by the Public Accounts Committee?

Is that the effect of the advice, that as a result of putting through this amendment you will be able to refuse the information requested by the Public Accounts Committee?

DR. COLLINS:

No. All it does, and it says that, if information is obtained in confidence during the implementation of taxation, that information is considered just like a return is considered. And, of course, a return is a written thing. So, there would be no more withholding of information, in other words, no more keeping confidential in the interests of the taxpayer anything more than is done now for returns. There is nothing new added here. It just, really, lays out more clearly what is supposed to be kept confidential. It is not an addition to it, it just defines it.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend Certain Taxation Statutes", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave. (Bill No. 53)

MR. MARSHALL:

I would like to now order 31

Bill No. 35.

MR. JAMIESON:

Bill No. 35?

On motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Education (Teachers' Pensions) Act".

(Bill No. 35)

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, this is purely and simply an act which allows the reciprocal carrying over of pensions of

an act which allows the reciprocal carrying over of pensions of teachers from one province to this Province. Before, under the Education Teachers' Pension Act, you could only carry over where teachers had been employed by the Government of Canada, say, up in the Northwest Territories or wherever it may be. Now, what this act does is allows a teacher to transfer into Newfoundland and, at the same time, carry over his pension benefits from another province - his or her.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend
The Education (Teachers' Pensions) Act", read a second time, ordered
referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave.

(Bill No. 35)

MR. MARSHALL:

I move that the House resolve itself
into Committee of the Whole to consider said bills.

On motion, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on said bills, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

June 5, 1980

Tape No. 2112

IB-1

MR. CHAIRMAN (BUTT):

Order, please! Bill No. 7.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The District

Count Act, 1976". (Bill No. 7)

Motion, that the Committee report having

passed the bill without amendment, carried.

MR. MARSHALL:

Order 3, Bill No. 30.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please! Bill No. 30.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. JAMIESON:

I am going to take advantage of this

bill to ask a question if I may of the Minister of Fisheries in an attempt to be helpful. This bill relates to Burgeo Fish Industries and while perhaps what I have to say is not completely relevant to the first clause, is the minister aware that the DREE agreement, for instance, with regard to Burgeo Fish Industries, requires National Sea to maintain a very specific through-put in that particular plant? And if he is not I would suggest to him that he take a look because when the funds were granted to Burgeo Fish Industries and/or National Sea - I am not exactly sure - one of the requirements which was undertaken by National Sea was that there would be a - and it is spelled out I believe - a reasonable through-put in that plant enough, for instance, to provide, say, for a forty hour week. I may be making up the figures. But I just wanted to call the minister's attention to this. . on the grounds that if we are talking about landings in Newfoundland there is, in addition to whatever else may be in the package, in the DREE agreement there is a requirement that they keep that plant going at a particular level. I just pass it on.

A bill, "An Act To Ratify, Confirm And Adopt An Amending Agreement Entered Into Between The Government And Burgeo Fish Industries Limited And Others". (Bill No. 30)

 $\label{eq:Motion} \mbox{Motion, that the Committee report having}$ passed the bill without amendment, carried.

MR. MARSHALL:

Order 4, Bill No. 34.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please! Bill No. 34.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Public

Service (Pensions) Act". (Bill No. 34)

Motion, that the Committee report having

passed the bill without amendment, carried.

June 5, 1980

Tape 2113

EC - 1

MR. W. MARSHALL:

Order 5, Bill No. 50.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt):

Order, please!

On motion, Clauses 1 through 5,

carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Shall Clause 6 carry?

MR. W. MARSHALL:

Clause No. 6, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. W. MARSHALL:

I move that Paragraph (L) of subsection 1

of section 6 of the bill be deleted and the following substituted therefor:
'Notwithstanding the bidding procedure set forth in the petroleum
regulations an addition to any permits acquired pursuant to Paragraph (K)
acquire up to four groups of permits within six months after the coming
into force of this act, and the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may, where
such permits are situate adjacent to permits on which a petroleum discovery
has been made, raise the requirements of section 22 and 29 of the
petroleum regulations with regard to such acquisition.'

And what this amendment does, Mr.Chairman, is it just deletes the words 'blocks of' in effect from that particular clause, so that it will read 'select four permits.'

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. W. MARSHALL:

Four groups of permits, yes.

On motion, amendment carried.

On motion, Clause 6, as amended, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Shall Clause 7 carry?

MR. D. JAMIESON:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. D. JAMIESON:

If I have been able to keep up with

the rapidity of this, we are now talking about the Board of Directors, is that correct? An observation and a question.

I was most interested yesterday and would have, in fact, spoken on second reading except that I was in the midst of an interview and suddenly found that the minister was on his feet closing the debate. I was interested to hear his observations on the

MR. D. JAMIESON: problems he faced in trying to determine the structure of this particular corporation, and having had some experience with groups of this kind, I can first of all sympathize, and secondly, I am not at all certain that he has the formula resolved in the bill that is now before us.

It says that 'There shall be a Board of Directors of the Corporation' - 'the President and not more than six other persons appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to the Board.' And then later on there are some other references. But first of all, I would suggest that six is a comparatively small number for an organization which is going to have the responsibilities of this kind, and I am wondering why he has set it at six? And a second point - and perhaps even more important - is that by limiting it to six, it is likely to be found that the largest percentage of those will be public servants. And it seems to me that there is a good deal of wisdom, when one is dealing in the hundreds of millions of dollars, perhaps even billions of dollars, to have some outside advice. I will ask the question - and I am not even being argumentative about it - but why six, for instance, and if six is going to mean that you have to have three or four or five or perhaps all who are full-time, in a sense, employed, then there is no room on that Board for bringing in outside independent advice of a financial nature, of a governmental nature, and I can assure the hon. member that this will not be in operation very long before there will be one son of a gun of a lot of complaining about the inability or the confining of the operation in that way. So perhaps the minister would like to talk about it.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Chairman, I think the point made by the Leader of the Opposition is a very valid one with respect to the number, and it is an arbitrary number that you select here. If the hon. member wished to move an amendment to increase that to ten, I would

EC - 3 Tape 2113 June 5, 1980

be happy to recommend that we -MR. L. BARRY:

Up to.

MR. D. JAMIESON: Or I can do it myself, whichever

way you want to have it done. I think any more than ten, you get

MR. L. BARRY:

MR. L. BARRY:

into an unwieldy type of situation. As far as the public servants are concerned, apart from an interim arrangement with respect to getting the corporation organized and before it really starts operations, ultimately I would not expect or hope to see any more than maybe one or two public servants at the most. They would be available as resource people but the Board members, I would anticipate and expect, would come from the general public because that is the philosophy that I have for Crown corporations. In order to get it as efficient as possible, as close to a private enterprise business operation as possible, it is desireable to bring in members of the general public for the Board. So I can say, if I am still around to have any influence on it, that it would be only for the interim period that there would be public servants and ultimately that there will be members of the general public apart from, maybe, one or two public servants. If that answers the question? MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. D. JAMIESON:

I would be glad to move and seconded by somebody opposite, if that is the wish, that the wording be changed to 'up to ten'. And in speaking to that amendment let me also point out a difficulty to the minister which he is bound to run into and there is nothing, I do not think, the legislation can about it except that I recommend that he consider it and that is the conflict of interest issue. When one starts to appoint boards of this kind -

MR. L. BARRY:

Section 12 pertains to this.

If it is covered fully in MR. D. JAMIESON: section 12 - perhaps I can wait until we get to that point and it will give me a chance to look at it. But no member of the Board shall speak on any matter before the Board and so on where their interests are at stake. There is a thin line here between denying the Board expertise and at the same time loading it with people. who are, in a sense, in a conflict of interest position and who have to bow out of virtually every key position that is made. So I appreciate that this conflict of interest clause is in here but I again forecast that there is going to be extreme difficulty because, particularly in a thing of this kind, it is going to be very, very hard since its ramifications are so widespread as to what constitutes a legitimate, if you like, conflict of interest and what does not. And I recommend, that is all I can do or anybody could do, to the minister and the Lieutenant-Governor in Council that this is one, perhaps, where somebody should spell out some guidelines. But I make that amendment, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BARRY: I second that motion to the

amendment, Mr. Chairman.

MR.CHAIRMAN (Butt): The amendment is that the number be increased from six to ten on the Board of Directors.

On motion, amendment carried.

On motion, clauses 7 as

amended, carried.

On motion, clause 8, carried.

Shall clause 9 carry?

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

MR. D. JAMIESON: Here once again - I am beginning to sound already like the elder statesman - but here I can offer both a question and some advice. If we are on, as I understand it, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council shall appoint a president, a general manager and such other officers of the corporation as are considered necessary. This, I suggest, is an unusual procedure. This is 9 (1), Officers of the Corporation. Now, basically, if you are going to get a Board of Directors who are worth their salt it has been my experience that there is no percentage in putting a Board of Directors in place who are simply told by the way, I think one could agree with the president as being a sensible Lieutenant-Governor in Council appointment. But not to give the Board the opportunity with regard to the general manager and includes, indeed, such other officers, is really to say, in effect, that the Board, if one tries to equate it, as the minister has done, with a private corporation, I suggest that no private corporation would be prepared to assume the responsibilities of a board and say we have no say in appointing either the general manager or the officers. It seems to me that the Board is really going to be told in this case, 'Well, first of all, you are on the board but the president is going to be so and so. I accept that. Incidentally, I think this is also an

MR. D. JAMIESON:

issue here which-I am not sure if you can correct it legislatively or not, of the relationship between the Chairman and the President as to who is the Chief Executive Officer and if you want me to include that question now, I would like to do that. But basically I would strongly recommend that the board be impowered to, at the very least, at the very least make recommendations as to the general manager and that the officers of the corporation should be appointed by the board. Otherwise, I think, if the hon. minister consults any reputable businessmen they would tell you that there is no way that they would serve on a board where if the minister came to them as the responsible minister and said, "What happened or what are you doing". They could simply turn around and say, "Well you loaded us up with a secretary or you loaded us up with officers, do not blame us, you are the people who put those people in place". So, that if the board of directors is going to perform as a Board of Directors should then I recommend very strongly that there be a change made in this particular section because I cannot conceive of responsible people serving on a Board of Directors with such a total hamstringing. There are even cases where indeed boards have refused even to accept that the President be appointed by the lieutenant governor in council. But, I think that can work but beyond that I think there would be serious trouble. I do not know why it has gone this far I do not recall any precedent for it.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird):

The hon. minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I will have to check and check

the acts.in drafting this bill we looked closely at the Petro-Canada incorporating documents, we looked at the Soquip incorporating documents,

MR. JAMIESON:

Quebec.

MR. L. BARRY:

which is the Quebec Petroleum Corporation

and others. And the -

MR. NEARY:

Tell us about (inaudible).

MR. L. BARRY:

I cannot without checking, say, whether this

was taken directly from one of those, I MR. L. BARRY: can say that I agree with the Leader of the Opposition's comments as to how it should work. But I would suggest that it can and, in fact, would work in that way, in that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council's appointments would be pursuant to the recommendations or would be following recommendations of the Board of Directors. And this would be the normal way that this section would operate. It does not say that it has to operate that way, it would be the way that I would intend as a minister, to see the board operate and I would strongly recommend that that be the way it be always pursued and I am not always going to be around to see that it would be done that way. But I agree with the philosophy of the Leader of the Opposition but I do not think there is anything that prevents that in the way it is drafted. It is not made mandatory by the legislation but, in effect, I would see the Board of Directors bring in recommendations for officers, including the President. There would be recommendations brought in. The Lieutenant-Governor in Council or the minister and Cabinet would have its discretion as to how far it pursued the appointment of these individuals. But if Cabinet is wise, it will realize that the businesspeople who are put on the board - this is a very important function for them to make recommendations on and their advice should be given very serious consideration. So, while it is not mandatory I think it is permissive for the operation of the appointment of officers to take place in the way the Leader of the Opposition has indicated. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition. MR. SPEAKER:

MR. D. JAMIESON:

I am not going to hold it up on this account because it is the minister who is going to have to saddle it.

But, may I point out to him that the very next section is really one - and let me please assure him that I have been through it.

MR. BARRY: Sub-section or section ?

MR. D. JAMIESON: One says the Lieutenant-Governor shall

MR. JAMIESON: appoint the President, General Manager and such other officers of the corporations as are considered necessary. The one immediately below says that the officers named in subsection 1 shall be paid such salary by the corporation as is fixed by the board.

MR. BARRY: With the approval of the Cabinet.

MR. JAMIESON: With the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. Now, you know, the situation is that you cannot very well have the Lieutenant-Governor in Council say boys, this is the new treasurer of the corporation and now, you go and negotiate a salary with him, that he has been named. So that therefore the two are, I suggest, very contradictory.

MR. BARRY:

Well now, they are interrelated.

June 5, 1980 Tape 2116 MB - 1

MR. JAMIESON: Well, all right. I think the minister will find differently. But as I say, just remember that I told you so, in that sense.

On motion, clauses 9 through 14, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Baird)

Shall clause 15 carry?

The hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. G. FLIGHT:

Mr. Chairman, maybe the minister would

want to comment on it. Clause 15 (1) the authorized capital of the

corporation is \$100 million. Now, as he indicated yesterday in introducing

the bill that is a lot of money. Would he care to comment on why that

figure was fixed at \$100 million; Why not \$200 million, \$50 million?

Does the minister anticipate involvement by boards now that would require that kind of capitalization at this particular time? Would the

minister indicate just what that clause will dictate.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Chairman, it has been recommended to me that for the fiscal year 1980-81 that there would be no need to subscribe for shares any more than \$500,000 over the next year. But in order to permit this corporation to play in the same league as the big boys, as it were, it is going to have to be able to deal in fairly considerable dollar amounts. I think this is one thing that we have to recognize that the Province is moving into the big leagues when it starts contemplating seeing an oil field producing and a Provincial Crown Corporation being set up to act as a Provincial Oil Company. That the smallest of decisions made by your oil companies - whether it be a Petro-Canada, or a Mobile, or a Chevron - involves frightening, staggering, astounding amounts of money. And we have seen, Mr. Chairman, the size of the profits made by some of these companies in the last few years, something that a lot of us look upon with a jaundiced eye

MR. G. FLIGHT:

(Inaudible) eye?

MR. L. BARRY:

No, I said some of us. I am sure that
myself and the member opposite, however, are fairly close in our view
here of this point. But it is recognized that these companies have to
have large cash flows. If they are going to spend several billions

MR. L. BARRY: of dollars, as they have done in the North Sea in putting production facilities out there to develop an oil field, you have got to have some equity, some significant equity participation. There will also be a need to borrow money and a little later on there is a section that limits the ability of the corporation to borrow. But I do not think that \$100 million is an unduly large amount of capital to have set out for the corporation. I hope that answers the member's question.

It does to a point, Mr. Chairman. But MR. G. FLIGHT: I think the minister indicated that in this year \$500,000 is the amount of money that he would expect the corporation - Well, there is a lot of difference obviously in \$500,000 and \$100 million. The minister might care - I am not going to belabour it all that much - to indicate when he sees, and obviously he is aware of the sequence of events over the next two or three years, when does he see the corporation turning the profit he talks about. It looks like we are establishing a mini Petrocan here. And I agree with the minister that they have to have the money to play in the market. But what is the minister anticipating? Will that \$100 million capitalization take the corporation to a point where it will be turning a profit for the Province based on the equity situation he sees in developments down the road in the next two or three years. When does the minister see that corporation making money for the Province instead of borrowing off the backs of the people of this Province.

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

MR. L. BARRY: Well, Mr. Chairman, this is not a Petrocan.

We may call it a Petronewf possibly.

MR. JAMIESON: How about Newfiecan?

MR. L. BARRY: Oh Newfie can and will. Mr. Chairman, the question is a good question and it is one that is going to be dependent upon how quickly we can see the oil fields proven up on our shores and production commence. And we are

MR. BARRY:

not going to be approving production from any oil field until there has been a development plan filed, until there has been adequate examination and hearings, public hearings of the plan, environmental hearings, examination of the profitability and so forth. And we can anticipate, as we have indicated, Mr. Chairman, that production could quite reasonably be expected to commence in a period of from four to five years. It may be a little faster but that is a reasonable expectation. And at that point it would be a question of whether the Province was in there right away with a working interest or whether it was going to have a carried interest and wait until the capital investment of the companies had been recovered under the regulations before its participation commenced. So there are a number of decisions that have to be made before we can say when the corporation will be participating in the cash flow from any oil field including Hybernia.

MR. CHAIRMAN (BUTT):

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I find it very difficult to follow the line of reasoning put forward by the Minister of Mines and Energy. It is tragic, Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate, it is heartbreaking, it is enough to make you sit down in this House and cry when you see a bill being rammed through the House of this magnitude. The government trying to force the closure of the House when we are debating a bill of such importance. I suppose it is safe to say it is the most important bill ever to come before this House. Here we are abdicating our responsibilities in this House, we are abdicating our responsibilities and we are putting all the power for borrowing and spending the revenue and the expenditure from the offshore resources in the hands of a bunch of outsiders. And what I mean by outsiders, I mean people outside of this House. We are the people who were elected to protect the interests of the people, not to abdicate our responsibilities and give it to a group of businessmen, whether they be from St. John's or some other part of this Province. The fact of the matter is that once this bill goes through and this corporation is established we, in effect, lose control, this House, every member of this House loses control of

MR. NEARY:

what is happening to the revenue and the expenditure of offshore.

I do not know if Your Honour is aware of that or not, of the serious nature of this bill. I remember back in 1969, 1970 and 1971 in this House, the argument was put forward that every dollar spent, every dollar of public money spent and every dollar taken in should be approved by this House. Does Your Honour realize that? In this bill, does Your Honour realize what we are doing? We are appointing, we are giving the ministers and the Premiers and the Cabinet the right to appoint a corporation, appoint it. They do not even have to come to this House for approval, to go out and do what they like with the revenue from offshore.

MR. FLIGHT: What revenue? It is not known where the revenue is going to come from at this point?

MR. NEARY:

Well, we have an idea. After the
briefings we had in the last two or three days we have an idea where
the revenue might come from. But I am very concerned about this 40

per cent equity that the hon. gentleman is talking about. Mr. Chairman,
I asked the hon. gentleman yesterday and I ask him again now to explain
to me, because I cannot see for the life of me how the company, Mobil,
can be allowed to take three times their investment even though the
Province, this corporation will have a 40 per cent equity in any company
that is developing offshore, Mobil in this case, before we can get
any return on that 40 per cent investment. That could be a substantial
amount of money. It could run into hundreds of millions of dollars.

MR. FLIGHT: It will be.

MR. NEARY:

Yes. It could go up to a billion dollars depending on how much money the companies want to spend, these wealthy oil companies. The minister just told us there a few minutes ago that we would have to compete, we are getting in the big league, he said, the big league.

MR. WHITE: Real big.

MR. NEARY: The real big league we are getting into.

The companies could pour in billions of dollars and here is poor old

MR. NEARY:

Newfoundland trying to get a forty per cent equity into this operation, the development of the offshore. So we have to

MR. S. NEARY: get into the big league. So this crowd will go out and borrow right, left and center and we could end up, Mr. Chairman, we could end up penniless. If you put a crowd on this corporation who know nothing about the oil business, inexperienced, who could not run a bull's—eye shop, who would not risk their own capital.

MR. G. FLIGHT: We are giving them a \$100 million to start to play with.

MR. S. NEARY: Giving them \$100 million to start out with. God only knows what they will do with it. Where are we going to find the people in this Province with the expertise, the business men.

MR. G. FLIGHT: The ante is \$100 million.

MR. WHITE: (inaudible) the local (inaudible) is

to (inaudible).

MR. NEARY:

I am very very concerned and very worried about this and whether the government wants to close the House tomorrow or not I am going to have my say about it. Because there were other occasions when I saw things of an important nature go through this House at the last minute that came back to haunt us two or three or four or five years hence, came back to haunt us. And I am going to go on the public record as saying that I am deadly opposed to this concept. I think it is wrong. It is removing the authority from the legislature and putting it in the hands of a crowd of inexperienced businessmen.

And it is not right, Mr. Chairman. And the minister has not given us a satisfactory explanation or any justification for doing this .

AN HON. MEMBER:

What clause are you on?

MR. NEARY: The clause we are on is the authorized capitalization. And then you can follow right on through to borrowing powers. The borrowing powers - The corporation can borrow all the money it wants. All it has to do is get approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, no reference to this legislature. I think that is terrible and it is wrong, Mr. Chairman, and I do not care what the Crown corporations do in Ottawa and in Quebec, we are in Newfoundland. And I am worried about what we are doing in this Province. And they

MR. NEARY: can decide-the Lieutenant-Governor in Council can fix dividends to be paid, no reference to the legislature. What we are doing we are abdicating completely our responsibility and putting our authority that should remain on the floor of this House - at least we could have some say and some control over it - we are putting it in the hands of a bunch of outsiders. I do not think that is good enough, Mr. Chairman. And we can argue all we like now, I suppose, it is almost too late. The government will use their majority to ram this bill through the House anyway. They are hellbent on shutting it down tomorrow. By one o'clock tomorrow this bill will be gone through and I know I will have many a sleepless night over it. I do not know about other hon. members. I will have many a sleepless night. Especially if and when Hibernia goes into production. The minister is talking about the staggering amount of dollars that are involved. There is an awful lot of money involved, billions piled upon billions of dollars. And I think the control should be kept in this House. If any member on the other side thinks it is funny take it and read it. Just look at what we are doing. We are walking into this, Mr. Chairman, with our eyes wide open. The only thing that I can say is forgive them for they know not what they do.

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

MR. G. FLIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I concur with most of the things the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) said. I want the minister to address himself for a minute or two on the aspects of what the member for LaPoile was talking about. Here we are capitalizing this corporation by \$100 million to start with. Subsequent clauses gives it the right to borrow an unlimited amount of money. We could be talking about billions of dollars.

MR. L. BARRY: No. \$200 million (inaudible).

MR. G. FLIGHT: All right, Mr. Chairman. Here is the problem. This legislation, as the member pointed out, is being rammed through. We are under a deadline to push this legislation through.

Tape 2118

June 5, 1980

MB - 3

MR. L. BARRY:

By who?

MR. G. FLIGHT:

By who. By government of course.

By the minister. And, Mr. Speaker, I would like to hear him explain to the House why is it that the oil companies - Mobil or whatever oil company is concerned - are given the right by this Province, under this Province's regulations to make three times their investment before the Province gets a cent. We are

MR. FLIGHT:

funding them by \$100 million, they can borrow up to \$200 million,
that is \$300 million, if there is no more. The minister said limited this clause here sets no limit on the amount they can borrow. They
can issue debentures, issue debentures or securities of the
Corporation, limit or increase the amount to be borrowed. I do not see maybe the minister while I am up, maybe he can point out to me the
appropriate clause he is talking about that limits the \$200 million.

MR. BARRY:

Section 20.

MR. JAMIESON:

Shall not at any time exceed \$200 million.

MR. FLIGHT:

Yes, there is probably a loophole

there. How is he going to play with the big boys if he is going to limit the Corporation the \$200 million?

MR. NEARY:

Over \$200 million he can go back

to the Cabinet with no reference to the House.

MR. FLIGHT:

Right. Over \$200 million,

\$500 million, \$2 billion, they come back to Cabinet, the minister says - we see another replay of Hydro all over again.

MR. NEARY:

That is right and no reference to

the House.

MR. FLIGHT:

No reference to the House.

This legislation has limits at

this point but they do not have to come back to the House any more once this Corporation is founded. And why is it - and why will the minister not stand up now and give us an explanation that under his regulations, under this Province's regulations, that the oil companies are going to be permitted to to take out of profits three times their investment before this Province can take out one cent. There is no telling how much this Province will be in for by the time that company gets out three times their investment. So, maybe the minister would want to have a word on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Butt)

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. JAMIESON:

Just in the interests of getting all
of the answers at the same time, and once again relying upon my
memory, I cannot recall that anything of this nature is structured
in such a way that, at some point at least, annually the capital budget
of a corporation of this nature has to be referred to the appropriate
Legislature, or that is the normal structure. I am thinking now,
for instance, of Canadian National, Air Canada. Most of these
corporations, their capital budget comes before the Legislature
and is debated in the Legislature. What is the reason why that
should not be the case here?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and

Energy.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Chairman, it is not done with other Crown corporations in the Province. What is debated, Mr. Chairman, is any amount that would flow from this House in the way of either a grant, included in the annual estimates, or a guarantee or something of that nature. But the budget of Hydro, for example, is not debated -

MR. JAMIESON: It is a good point, though, is it not?

MR. BARRY:

— it is not debated. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, the way it works, and again it gets back to the role of the Board — it is the Board of Directors who, under the present Hydro legislation, approves the budget of the Corporation. It is filed with the minister and, ultimately, the annual report of the Corporation is tabled in the House of Assembly, but the budget of Hydro is not subject to the approval of Cabinet or the House. The Board of Directors approves the budget, and that is a very important part of the function of a fully operating board of directors.

MR. JAMIESON: I agree with that part of it.

MR. BARRY:

Now, there is going to be adequate
opportunity to debate the policy from time to time with respect to
issues that the Petroleum Corporation might be involved in. In fact,
Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that this type of act
is something that should be engraved in stone. If we find - it is a

mr. Barry:

if we find that there are problems in operation, then, Mr. Chairman,

I will not feel sheepish about coming back to this House and recommending
an amendment to the legislation. If hon. members opposite become aware
of problems in operation, I will be very amenable to having their suggestions
for ways of amending the legislation. In fact, when I was Minister of
Energy before, there were a number of occasions when we came in with a
complete restructuring of, first the Power Commission, then the Power
Corporation, ultimately Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro.

If I could just mention the point raised by the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) and partly by the member for Lapoile (Mr. Neary) with respect to the participation by the companies and the right of the companies to get three times their investment before

MR. BARRY:

we start sharing in profits. First of all we have to remember this is in addition to the 10 per cent royalty which the Province gets right from the commencement of production and a sliding scale royalty which increases with the profitability of the field. So this participation is a sharing in profits. And we can start sharing in profits right away, as soon as the corporation or as soon as the oil field becomes profitable, provided we decide to take the risk in terms of expending money on exploration and on production facilities. We can either, in other words, get in at the front end or we can get a free ride and come in later after all the risks have gone, the companies have borne the risks, we can get in at that stage. But in that case if we take that so called free ride or carried interest then we have to recognize that a company has taken the risk and there has to be a somewhat greater return for the company that has spent the money on doing the full exploration, the full investment on production. They are entitled to a higher return than if we shared it fifty-fifty with them from the beginning. And all I can say is that this is contained in the regulations, the oil and gas regulations approved in 1977. It is regulation 97 (2) (a) which was approved by this House of Assembly in 1977, the House in which I understand both members opposite sat. So I was not here, they can inform me. I was on sabbatical. They can inform me whether they approve the oil and gas regulations and that particular section or not.

MR. NEARY: We did not have to approve it,

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (BUTT): The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, we already have a classic example in this Province, we have in front of us a situation

MR. HISCOCK: A monster.

that developed in connection with Labrador Linerboard.

MR. NEARY: That is right, where the government created a monster, where the government formed a Crown company to take over, to nationalize and to operate Labrador Linerboard. And we had as much

MR. NEARY:

control over it, Mr. Chairman, as that stick of pencil. We could not get any information from the ministry. They ran the thing into the ground and they drove the debt up to \$500 million. Up to this day we do not have an accounting and we cannot get it of how that \$500 million was spent. The Auditor General was not allowed to audit the accounts. The Minister of Justice at the time, the Attorney General who is now a judge of the Supreme Court, who was a Director of that Crown company, refused point blank to give this House any information. As a matter of fact, I have correspondence down in my office with the hon. gentleman, Mr. Hickman, telling me this was a private company established under the Companies Act and the House, how dare we as members, elected representatives of the people, how dare we ask for this information, for an accounting of how that \$500 million was spent. We are just as wise as the man in the moon as to how it was spent. The government moved it off the floor of the House, set up a Crown company similiar to what we are doing here now except this is a Crown corporation. The Auditor General will not be allowed to audit the accounts and they can go out and do what they like. And the minister uses the analogy of the Newfoundland Hydro Corporation. Well, Mr. Chairman, surely hon. members are aware - their memories cannot be that bad unless premature senility has set in - that we have been year in and year out trying to get information on Newfoundland Hydro and we cannot get it. We have been trying to find out the salaries. I put a question on the Order Paper recently to try to find out how many employees of Newfoundland

MR. S. NEARY:

Hydro are earning over \$25,000 a year? I cannot get the answer. I do not have it yet. We cannot find out how much feather-bedding has gone on in Newfoundland Hydro. We cannot find out about all the reports of extravagance and waste in Newfoundland Hydro. All we do is get a little booklet every year with a colour picture on it, called the annual report, and you would want to be a Philadelphia lawyer to figure it out. As far as Newfoundland Hydro is concerned, I think it is time we brought the Premier's cousin before the Bar of this House and made him give us an explanation of what is going on with Newfoundland Hydro, because they have too much authority, because they can do what they like. Should we allow that also to happen to the offshore oil? It is a very weak argument, Mr. Chairman. And I can only reiterate what I said previously. And I believe my hon. friend, the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. G. Flight) shares my concern that what we are doing - and let us not fool ourselves, let us not beat around the bush what we are doing is we are abdicating our responsibility. And the minister can tell us all he wants that, 'Well, you know, this is not enshrined in stone; next year we can make an amendment, the following year we can make an amendment.' It is too late to lock the barn door, Mr. Chairman, after the horse is stolen. We saw that in the case of Labrador Linerboard where we had a cesspool of corruption - embezzlement, corruption, theft, robbery. We have not been able to get an inquiry into it or an investigation into it. Destruction and waste and extravagance all you had to do was go down and look at the equipment in Goose Bay and down in Stephenville.

MR. G. WARREN:

Look at all the equipment in

Goose Bay.

MR. S. NEARY:

In Goose Bay and down in Stephenville:

(IMaudible)

MR. STAGG: MR. HODDER:

Nobody stole any confidential

documents.

MR. S. NEARY:

What is the hon. gentleman talking about?

There is no such thing as confidential documents when it comes to

MR. S. NEARY:

using the taxpayers' money.

There is too much privacy and secrecy. Mr. Chairman, do we want that to happen again? Well, it could happen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. F. STAGG:

(Inaudible)

you are

very sensitive (inaudible).

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt):

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. F. STAGG:

I am talking about Labrador Linerboard

documents.

MR. G. FLIGHT:

Tell us about the Labrador Linerboard

documents.

MR. S. NEARY:

Tell us about Labrador Linerboard

MR. F. STAGG:

I know who distributes them.

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter

I would like to know who stole them,

is that I do not want to belabour the point because I have a feeling the government are going to ram it through without amendment. They are not going to listen to what we are saying, they are not going to listen to our pleas. They are going to go ahead as they have gone ahead with the flag, as they have gone ahead with everything else. They are going to go ahead anyway. Whether we debate it or whether we make suggestions for changes or whether we put forward amendments it does not make any difference. With the arrogance and contempt that this crowd has developed for the people of this Province it makes little difference. We saw an example of that this afternoon. The minister introduced that Status of Women Bill supported by the Minister of Education (Ms L. Verge) who can only speak - the only time she breaks her silence in this House is when it has something to do with the Status of Women, Women's Lib, and then gets up and has the gall and the face to accuse me of -'I do not speak,' she said, 'about Women's Lib, I do not speak about women's rights only when this bill came in.'

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please: I think the hon. gentleman

is wandering.

MR. S. NEARY:

Well, what I speak about in this

House, Mr. Chairman, I speak about men, women and children -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY:

- not just women. Men, women and

children - and that is what I am trying to do in this case. It is to protect the rights of the men, women and children of this Province.

MR. L. BARRY:

In a childish fashion.

MR. S. NEARY:

I am doing it in a sensible fashion.

MR. HANCOCK:

Talking to the children now.

MR. S. NEARY:

And the hon. gentleman just cannot

get up in a wishy-washy way when we are talking about billions of dollars and say, 'Oh, well, you know, it is not enshrined in stone; we can change it in another year or two. That is not good enough, Mr. Chairman, and I do not intend to let this bill go through, even though the government want to close the House tomorrow, until I get an explanation to my satisfaction that the thing is going to work.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear!

MR. D. JAMIESON:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. D. JAMIESON:

I would like to ask - I am sorry the

Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) is not in the House. But with regard to the powers - and

MR. JAMIESON:

I-suppose we are really talking about, as the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) said, this whole section, not just the one clause. But, basically, whatever this corporation borrows is presumably a contingent liability on the Province itself, that, in other words, it becomes really a part and parcel of the obligation of the Province as was the case with and, I guess, it is the case with Newfoundland Hydro and the like. What is the mechanism - I do not see it here and I am asking - whereby, for instance, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) who has his own responsibilities annually to raise x amount of money for whatever else is needed in the Province and so on, what is the mechanism through which this corporation gets in the queue. Now, I want to say once again that there is ample precedent for what I am speaking about, that if the government is, in a sense, the parent of this organization, as it clearly is, and in 1981 it wants to borrow, to take a figure, \$50 million or \$20 million or whatever the case might be, where does the Finance Department come in and say, "Look here, that is going to be too strong a burden in relation to the general borrowing which the Province has to do". Now, this is precisely why I said earlier that the Budget of the corporation really ought to come before the Legislature so that there is a total awareness of what the borrowing activities are in any given year. As things happen now, and my hon. friend will know, or I have a suspicion he knows, that one of the real difficulties in terms of almost any level of government these days but particularly a provincial or, let us say, a federal government or a state government or the like, is the fact that its utilities and its various other quasi private organizations are constantly going to the market, in a sense, separate from the government, even though the government has the liability. So what I want to get clear is how does one get this queue established? You have Hydro, you are going to have other things and a whole variety of things. It seems to me there is no mechanism here whereby once we have put through the Budget it really becomes in a way secondary. The

MR. JAMIESON:

House, the legislative process is secondary in terms of the degree of commitment of what is in total the public debt. So what is the means through which this is safequarded?

MR. CHAIRMAN (BUTT):

The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Chairman, I think the point to be

members and the Lieutenant-Governor in Council appoints the board members and the Lieutenant-Governor in Council by that mechanism will have the opportunity to give certain directions to the board. And specifically with respect to financing, the Minister of Finance will know what the needs of the Province are from time to time. He will request information, through the minister responsible from Hydro, from the Petroleum Corporation as to what its borrowing plans are and if they conflict with the government's borrowing plans -

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

I have to interrupt the hon.

minister. The time has expired.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave!

MR. BARRY:

The board - stop the clock for a

moment.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Is it agreed to stop the clock?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. BARRY:

The board will be instructed to fall

in line with the Province's borrowing plans.

MR. JAMIESON:

(Inaudible).

MR. BARRY:

No, no. But that is the way it

operates now with other corporations. It is in line with the other corporations.

MR. MARSHALL:

With Hydro borrowing.

MR. BARRY:

With Hydro borrowing, for example,

there is nothing in that bill. Now maybe, and I would be perfectly interested in having, maybe some general piece of legislation considered to apply to all Crown corporations. The philosophy does not, again, bother me. It is an important matter but it is done right now through the control

MR. BARRY:

of Cabinet over the board and ultimately the power of Cabinet to dismiss board directors if they do not comply with the policy objectives of the Province.

MR. CHAIRMAN (BUTT):

Order, please!

On motion that the Committee rise,

report progress and ask leave to sit again. Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

GH-1

Tape No. 2123

June 5, 1980

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

Is it agreed to stop the clock?

Agreed.

The hon. the member for Conception Bay

South.

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole

has considered the matters to them referred and has passed Bills 7, 30 and 34 and has made some progress on Bill 50, as amended, and ask leave to sit again.

On motion, report received and

adopted.

MR. SPEAKER:

The motion is that this House do now

adjourn.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House

at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow at 10:00 o'clock.

On motion, the House at its rising

adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, at 10:00 A.M.