

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD:  
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.  
THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 26, 1981

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

On behalf of hon. members I would like to welcome to the gallery today a delegation representing the town of Bonavista in the district of Bonasvista South. We have visiting us today, and seated in the Speaker's Gallery, the recently re-elected mayor, Frank Little accompanied by the town clerk, Mr. David Hiscock. Welcome.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. the Premier, who will not be here today - he is gone to Harbour Grace - I have a communication, an important communication to the Right Honourable the Prime Minister by the Premier of yesterday. It is a matter of public interest that I would like to communicate to the House. Perhaps I could best do it by reading the letter itself, which I shall table and there will be copies available for hon. members. The letter reads: "My dear Prime Minister, The last several weeks have been historic for Canada. The Constitutional Accord has not only given Canadians the right to amend their own constitution but also provides for the enshrinement of their fundamental rights including women's rights and native rights. Additionally, the people of Newfoundland and Labrador are very pleased that the Accord provides protection for our Terms of Union with Canada. Clearly, Mr. Prime Minister, there is every reason for Canadians and their leadership to be proud of this achievement.

MR. W. MARSHALL: "With the process of Canada's constitutional renewal completed, it is time now for Canada's leadership to turn its full attention to the problems of the economy and to the 'economic' rights of our citizens which are now in great jeopardy. Just as First Ministers have moved to protect the constitution rights of individuals, so too must we take action to protect the rights of homeowners who are being threatened by high interest rates and similarly the small businessman and the unemployed who are also suffering. I understand that your Minister of Finance stated in the House of Commons recently that he would be prepared to look again at ways to resolve the plight of homeowners facing mortgage renewals. There is no doubt whatever that if there is any one symbol with which the Federal Government can show its commitment to resolving the economic problems of Canada, it would be to assist people so burdened. My Government believes that economic issues require an immediate response. In Newfoundland and Labrador, the effects of high interest rates are compounded by problems in the fishing industry. This resource is largely under Federal jurisdiction, and is an area where your Government must take positive action. For my Government's part, we are doing everything within our limited means to respond to the fishery and to the weaker industrial areas such as the Baie Verte Peninsula where two mine closures are threatened. We recognize that the help we can provide alone is not enough and that broader economic solutions are required if the economy of our Province and of Canada is to be revitalized. I believe very strongly that it is within the capacity of Canada's leadership to provide the kind of direction that is necessary. I am of the view it would neither be prudent nor in Canada's best interest to delay the the proposed First Minister's Conference on

Nob. 26, 1981

Tape No. 3673

DW - 3

MR. W. MARSHALL: "the economy until January of next  
year. I am convinced that just as agreement on many of  
constitutional rights of

MR. MARSHALL:

"Canadians was arrived at in good faith by means of the telephone, the same good faith could find a solution to protect the rights of individual citizens and provide response to the economic problems facing the nation.

"As Premier I am fully prepared to discuss with you and the other First Ministers at the earliest opportunities ways in which the economic rights of Canadians can be protected. The Government of Newfoundland and Labrador will co-operate to respond to this immediate challenge.

"I look forward to your reply."

Signed, "A. Brian Peckford, Premier."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

I have copies of the letter

to table -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

- to table in the hon. House.

And I hear by the comments there opposite that

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL:

- you know, you can anticipate the

response on behalf of the federal government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. STIRLING:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition

has about one and a half minutes.

MR. LUSH:

Reading letters to constituents.

MR. NEARY:

The Premier used to write letters.

MR. STIRLING:

Mr. Speaker, as the Acting Premier,

Acting Energy Minister -

MR. NEARY:

Just plain acting, period.

MR. STIRLING: - actor and part-time solicitor  
will be here with us shortly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt,  
there is absolutely no doubt that Frank Petten is doing a  
tremendous job in public relations in this Province. He is  
probably the most under-paid adviser that the Premier has.  
It is a beautifully written letter, let me be the first -

MR. PATTERSON: Do not be nasty.

MR. STIRLING: I have not said a nasty word.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: I am sorry that they are dis-  
appointed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that  
they are disappointed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: I want to compliment Mr. Petten  
on the letter which he wrote for the Premier's signature. It  
is an excellent piece of public relations, and it is sort of  
like something that needs an injection. The Premier has not  
been on national television now, sitting down talking to the  
Prime Minister for about two weeks and he misses it badly. And  
he is really upset because last night it was the President of  
the Council (Mr. Marshall) who upstaged him, who happened to  
get on.

MR. FLIGHT: Better not do that too often, or -

MR. STIRLING: He needs, Mr. Speaker -

MR. FLIGHT: - he will be on the backbench like the minister.

MR. STIRLING: - he needs, Mr. Speaker, to get on national television again and to talk about from a great distance what it is that the federal government should be doing.

In actual fact, Mr. Speaker, they are keeping up this whole business of not knowing what they are there for. And what they are doing, Mr. Speaker, is asking for a commission of the federal government to run this Province because they are showing no initiative in taking any action themselves, no initiative, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! Order, please!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member's time has expired.

Further Statements?

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform hon. members of the House of a telex I sent off this morning. This telex is addressed to the hon. Herb E. Gray, Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, Ottawa.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

DR. COLLINS: The telex reads as follows:

"You stated in a T.V. interview yesterday that it has been unnecessary for the federal government to fund the synchrolift project at the CN St. John's dock because the Province had jumped in and provided the money. Your statement is at serious variance with the facts, which are as follows: CN has been requesting funds for the synchrolift from the federal government since 1977 but met with repeated evasions and delays.

"In order to keep the proposal alive, in the Fall of 1978, the provincial government informed CN of a willingness to provide a guarantee for any loan required.

"Late in 1978, the federal Cabinet finally gave approval in principle for the proposal to go ahead with federal funding, 65 per cent recoverable over twenty-five years.

"In August, 1980 the hon. William Rompkey announced a further delay in final approval for transparently inadequate reasons."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!



DR. COLLINS: "The President of CN Holdings telexed Premier Peckford that CN interpreted this as to mean 'perhaps indefinite deferral of the project.'

"On December 19, 1980, the hon. Jean-Luc Pepin telexed Premier Peckford that 'I have been in touch with my colleague, hon. Herb Gray, who confirms that, as in my department, there are no funds allocated to the synchrolift project and there are no plans'-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

DR. COLLINS: --"and there are no plans for either department to become involved in the project.'

A few days later, the President of CN Holdings wrote Premier Peckford confirming that the federal government has no further interest in the project.

"Thereupon, the Province moved quickly to honour its two year old commitment to CN that the Province would assume the funding obligations of the federal government if this was necessary to save the St. John's dock and the livelihood of its 300 man work force.

"You are aware that the federal government has funded similar projects at Halifax and elsewhere in Canada.

"I believe you owe an apology to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador in that your remarks on TV have added insult to the injury done by the federal government's failure to fund essential dock facilities in this Province." That is over my signature.

I table the copy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Leader of the Opposition has about one and a half minutes.

MR. STIRLING: It is usual, Mr. Speaker, in keeping with the very co-operative attitude, that neither the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) nor the Finance Minister (Dr. Collins) provided us with an advanced copy of the statement. So I still have not received a copy. But, Mr. Speaker, only in Newfoundland could you have the spectacle of a Province that is so concerned to prove how great they are that they are subsidizing CN. It is the only place in Canada where a provincial government runs in, dashes in, and says, 'Listen, if you fellows do not put up the money we will put up the money'. Now, Mr. Speaker, the real question -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: - the real question here is is that what they are going to do? Is this just the advance notice that tells us that one of the places where they are getting the savings is they are going to back out from their commitment. Now next week they will be able to say they are going to back out from their commitment to the people of St. John's and they are going to drop the \$7 million. Is that the beginning of the drop of the \$7 million?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Any further statements?

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. STIRLING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Now that the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is back in the Province, let us ask a few questions about something that he can deal with, something completely under his jurisdiction, his budget, the budget that he brought down, and then his publicly announced revised budget in October, and then his mini-budget tabled here, which we were not allowed to debate. Would the Minister of Finance confirm what he said in his statement because he changes it two or three times - that there was an indication given to him in October that there was a decline of some \$50 million in our current account position? Would he tell us what that \$50 million was made up of and who advised him in October? What were the figures? What was the reduction in revenue and what was the increase in expenditures that made up the \$50 million in October?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) asked me, I believe, what was the deficit made up of. The deficit was made up of absent revenues. Perhaps I could go into that a little further. Clearly our Province, like every province in Canada and like the federal government and, I suggest, like certain other governments elsewhere, found that things were not going well from an economic point of view right from the late Spring, early Summer of 1981. Because of this we undertook to do a preliminary review, beginning sometime in September, I believe it was, of how our budget projections were holding up. Because, of course, hon. members will understand that the budget

DR. COLLINS:

that was brought down in April was essentially a series of projections, as are all budgets, projections both from a revenue point of view and from an expenditure point of view.

So we started this preliminary view in September to see how our projections were holding up. When we had the results of the preliminary review brought to our attention, it suggested we were going to be down some \$50 million from what the Budget projections were. In other words, we had projected slightly over \$10 million surplus on current account and we were now facing something of the order of a \$40 million deficit on current account.

Because of that change it was obvious that we had to go into the thing in considerably more detail. So we then - and I might add that that preliminary review was essentially carried out by the Treasury Board Secretariat - we then went back to each individual department, outlining to them the problem as we saw it on the basis of that preliminary review, and asked them to do a detailed, indepth study of their own departmental position both from the point of view of work that had been completed, costs in terms of expenditures of that work, what work was committed for the future, and also the rationale that underlay the commitments that they felt they had given, and their hopes for further work at the departmental level for the remainder of the year.

At the same time in the Department of Finance we undertook to review our revenue projections, not only the transfers of the federal government but also our own source projections. And hon. members will understand that, let us say, retail sales tax is a very large element in our own source revenues.

Out of that more indepth review, when it was all put together, at a time when we were also asking the departments to cut back where they could -

MR. NEARY: That is an abuse of the rules.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

DR. COLLINS: - on expenditures -

MR. NEARY: You are abusing the rules.

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

I must ask the hon. minister to be a little briefer with his answers. I realize the question is one that perhaps could require a complex answer, but at the same time we have to try to keep answers as brief as possible in order to provide more questions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Thank you for your guidance, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate it.

AN HON. MEMBER: I agree.

DR. COLLINS: At the same time we asked the departments to see where they could economize from an administrative and functional point of view, shall we say, without cutting back on services given to the people.

Out of that, our final review, our indepth review showed that rather than having a \$40 million deficit we were facing a considerably smaller one.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, to give the minister a chance to give a short answer, he said a considerably smaller deficit than the \$40 million. Could he tell us what that deficit was specifically?

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

DR. COLLINS: The deficit was \$6 million, which meant that there was a \$16 million variance from the projection in April which had projected a \$10 million surplus.

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) agree to table—and I believe this should have been done in a debate. If we had a full debate on the mini-budget then we would have enough time to get into it—would the Minister of Finance agree—because the Budget, he must agree, should be handled by the House of Assembly, and changes in the Budget he should report to the House of Assembly—will he agree to table the in-depth, full-scale review of the individual budgets? Could I have the attention of the Minister, please, because he has demonstrated in the past that maybe the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) can do two things at the same time, but the Minister of Finance has all he can do to do one.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: Could the minister tell us whether or not he is prepared to table the in-depth, full-scale review of the individual budgets - because it is this House of Assembly, not the minister, who approves the budget - would he be prepared to table that for the benefit of the House of Assembly?

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

DR. COLLINS: Absolutely, Mr. Speaker, no problem whatever and that is what one does every year when the Public Accounts come in, and of course there is a summary given at the

DR. COLLINS: time of the new Budget. I certainly will carry on the practice that has been going on ever since this House has sat.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) knows that this is not a normal practice at all, that you have this kind of a - he has been advised by his own secretariat that he is down \$40 million. They have juggled the figures. They have not reported them to the House, and I have a supplementary question again coming from the minister's own figures. He talks in terms of a \$15 million decrease in tax, an \$8 million increase in wage settlements, a \$5 million increase in servicing the provincial debt. So if you add those together - a \$15 million loss, \$8 million increase, \$5 million increase - that is a \$28 million net. Now, he tells us that the net difference is \$16 million. Could he explain where the missing \$11 million is?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, there is no missing \$11 million in the sense that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition says. His figures in his mind do not add up because he is leaving out a few things. I said that we did a review of all sorts of revenue projections, not only our own source. Retail sales tax is one of our own source revenues. We also did a review

DR. COLLINS: of projected revenues from the federal side of things and, of course, he has also neglected to point out that I did ask departments to carry out a certain amount of belt tightening to the extent that they could halfway through the fiscal year and to the extent that they could without any serious diminution in public services.

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Is the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) now saying that the federal government will be giving this Province more money this year than they had originally anticipated or was projected in October? Have they now found that they are getting additional federal funds that they did not anticipate?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the transfers the Province receives from the federal government in any fiscal year do not only relate to that year, they quite often relate for many years back. There are variations. There are perhaps increases, perhaps cutbacks in transfers related to other years for equalization, the EPF, for any number of things, even for some of our own source revenues in terms of personal income tax and corporate income tax which are collected for us by the federal government. So throughout the year, at least every quarter, we get new projections from the federal government as to what we can expect and then they will update it the next quarter. So all I can say to the hon. the Leader of the Opposition is that from the time we started our preliminary review in September until we completed the



DR. COLLINS: more in-depth one, yes, we had gotten new figures on the basis of projections from the federal government.

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, would the minister then be specific? He improved a situation from \$50 million to \$16 million of a loss, so that means \$34 million. Could the minister tell this House how much of that \$34 million came as a result of an increased revenue from Ottawa, what were the revised figures that affected that \$34 million, and how much was there as a result of belt tightening and cutbacks in expenditures?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I think the best way I can answer that is to say that I really do not have the particular figures with me at the moment. I could give rounded figures, I suppose, but then if it added up to 29.2 instead of what was required, 29.6, I would be criticized for it. So rather than do that, I will take that question under advisement.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister will take that as notice.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could the Minister of Finance tell the House how much this Province will get in equalization grants this year from the Government of Canada as a result of our becoming a Province of Canada in 1949, equalization grants that are supposed to help us as a 'have not' province? Approximately round figures will do.

DR. COLLINS: 1981 - 82?

MR. NEARY: For this current fiscal year, 1981-82, what roughly is the amount in equalization grants that we will get?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, for fiscal 1981-82, and that is equalization that is related to this year - now, as I say, there may be variations from year to year - we will receive \$440 million.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: \$440 million in equalization. That does not include transfer payments, that is just equalization grants. Now would the hon. gentleman care to project himself ahead five years, which I am sure his fiscal people have done, say, five years from now, this is 1981, to 1986; could the hon. gentleman tell us approximately, in round figures again, what equalization grants will be, say, in 1986?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, no, I cannot do that because the present arrangements terminate on the 31st of March, 1982, so with a terminated arrangement there is no way that I can project.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, right at the present time the hon. Minister of Finance told us that Ottawa is providing \$440 million in equalization grants for this Province, I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - five years from now, Mr. Speaker, I would submit that that figure would be somewhere in the vicinity of \$600 to \$700 million. Would that be a fair assumption, Mr. Speaker? If the present arrangement continues, would it be somewhere in the vicinity of \$600 to \$700 million a year in equalization grants, to use round figures?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms!): The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I wish I could answer that question but unfortunately I cannot and the reason why I cannot is that it is a very difficult projection to make, one that only could be made by a much more sophisticated system than we have in place in this Province. It could be made by the federal government. That projection could be made by the federal government. And, indeed, the provinces asked the federal government if they would project transfers for the years 1982 to 1986 if the old system, if the system that has been in place since 1977 to 1982, if that had stayed in place, what would the projections be for the following five years on a yearly basis. And the federal government has resisted giving us those projections. Now those projections will be very valuable to us because we could compare accurately, not from the partial information that we have and therefore the rather, shall we say,

DR. COLLINS: less than precise projections that we can make ourselves on the basis of those. We would then have a precise figure against which to compare the new proposals that the federal government are putting in place. We have not been able to get those figures from the federal government. We suspect, Mr. Speaker, that those projections would be much higher than what they had in their new proposals. We cannot absolutely confirm that because the federal government resists giving us those figures.

All I can say is that our own projects, inaccurate though they may be, suggest that they would have been considerably more than what the federal government are proposing to give us.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary.

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

MR. NEARY: That is wonderful news, Mr. Speaker. In other words my figure five years down the road to 1986, the figure that I just gave of equalization grants being somewhere between \$600 million and \$700 million at that time, the minister says I am being very conservative, that it will probably be higher than that. I am just basing my figures on the old system. We are now getting \$500 million; down the road five years from now, by 1986, we may be getting \$700 million, or \$800 million or \$900 million from Ottawa. I am coming to the real question now, Mr. Speaker, now that the hon. gentleman has set the stage, The hon. gentleman made some very interesting statements in Halifax recently, at the Finance Ministers' Conference, The hon. gentleman made the statement to this effect, that Newfoundland, or the Atlantic Provinces I think he was talking about, more specifically

MR. NEARY: Newfoundland, would lose dollar for dollar; for every dollar we get in equalization grants we would lose a dollar from revenue on the offshore. The hon. gentleman, I presume he is aware of what he said, Newfoundland Finance Minister Collins said he agreed in principle with the thrust. The Atlantic Province, he said, have at least two main objections to Mr. MacEachen's plan, they say that the new formula which would count all natural resource revenues as income deductible from equalization grants' -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! Order, please!  
Order, please!

The hon. member I am sure is familiar with the Standing Orders, which do not allow prefacing an oral question by reading of letters, telegrams, newspaper extracts or anything of that nature.

MR. NEARY: I am not reading, I am just -

MR. MORGAN: After 20 years, do you not know the rules?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman says that Newfoundland could lose, it could cost Newfoundland money, he said. It could cost Newfoundland more money than we are getting in equalization grants once the revenue starts to come in from offshore. Now we were told that by the Minister of Mines and Energy at a conference a couple of years ago, that in the twenty year period, the life of Hibernia, that during that twenty year period not one of these years would we not be entitled to equalization grants. We would get equalization grants for the total of twenty years. Would the hon. gentleman care to elaborate on that statement that he made in Halifax recently? First of all, just to put it in baby talk, Mr. Speaker, for hon. members -

MR. WARREN: He is a baby doctor too.

MR. NEARY: - that if we get \$900 million in revenue in 1986 and we get \$900 million from revenue of

MR. NEARY: offshore, we will just break even. If we get \$900 million in revenue from equalization grants from the Government of Canada, and \$500 million from revenue from offshore, we will still be a have not Province, we will still get \$400 million equalization grants from the Government of Canada. So we are no further ahead. Is that what the hon. gentleman is saying? We are just as well off getting equalization grants as we are having oil on the Grands Banks?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! Order, please!  
I believe the hon. member has asked the question now.

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the meetings in Halifax were very valuable. They were a bit frustrating, I might say, but they were very valuable. Out of that it is my intention to give a statement to the House tomorrow morning. I was hoping I would be able to give it today, but it is not completed. The statement is just not completed.

MR. STIRLING: You are going to have to compete with the Premier.

DR. COLLINS: But I can say this - or as a certain person used to say, I can say this about that - the point is that we could get revenue flows of a very large magnitude once oil development occurs and that could immediately cut back our equalization prior to our earned income going up all that much, prior to our debt servicing cost going down all that much, prior to our getting in place a lot of infrastructure. So it is not a case of our wanting to continue equalization payments even though we are getting large revenue inflows from our own resources, it is the timing that is important. If the inflows come and are immediately offset by drops in equalization, we are no further ahead because we still have large taxation -

MR. STIRLING: You want both.

DR. COLLINS: - levels. We have large costs in terms of debt servicing. We have tremendous infrastructure to put in place. And we just do not have the cash flow. The point we were making there was that we need some accommodation, which the Western provinces had when they began their development of natural resources.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

DR. COLLINS: We need some accommodation so that as the inflows start we do not lose our equalizational until we correct some of the defects in our economy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

A supplementary, the hon.

member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, that is the most shocking news I think that this House has ever been given, at least since I have been here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY:

It is absolutely shocking news. Here we have a government and we have an administration -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

- we have an administration putting all their eggs in one basket, in the offshore oil basket. And now we are told by the minister that after twenty years of Hibernia in production we will be no further ahead.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

On a point of order, the hon.

President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. gentleman is making a speech again. I again remind him, Mr. Speaker, he needs to be reminded that this is the Question Period.

MR. STIRLING:

To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To the point of order, the hon.

Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING:

My colleague was just in a state of shock on receiving the news and was making a preliminary remark prior to getting ready for the next question, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Unfortunately the Standing Orders do not provide any allowances for members in a state of shock.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!



MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

It does however provide for

very strict rules in that answers are not allowed to be debated, but a short preamble is allowed, and I am sure the hon.

member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is now about to put his question.

After having asked several, he must have covered the preamble.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

The answer was so discouraging,

Mr. Speaker, that I am sure that the people of Newfoundland are

going to be in a state of shock when they hear it. What the

minister said was, and what he is confirming, I presume the minister

is confirming that he did say in Halifax

MR. S. NEARY: that for every dollar that we get in revenue from the offshore, it might end up costing us more than a dollar in equalization grants. The hon. gentleman is confirming that, Mr. Speaker, I presume, confirming that he did make that statement in Halifax?

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

DR. J. COLLINS: I did make that statement in Halifax but I think the hon. -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. J. COLLINS: - member has it out of context, as he often does. In Halifax we were discussing fiscal arrangements that will be put in place for a five year period, not for a twenty year period. And when we were making those assessments, we were referring to what is going to happen in that short term. In other words, in the short-term, unless accommodation that this Province quite justifiably should ask the federal government, because other provinces had similar accommodations and similar circumstances, the accommodation that we wish is that there be a phasing out of our equalization payments in that short term until our revenue cash flows have caught up with our needs.

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

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

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I can hardly believe what I am hearing. The hon. gentleman wants to have his cake and eat it too. He wants the revenue from the offshore and he wants the equalization grants.

MR. MORGAN: Why not? Why not?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! Order, please!  
MR. MORGAN: Why not?  
SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order!

Hon. members to my left are not permitted to ask questions to hon. members to my right.

The hon. member for LaPoile has a supplementary.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, this is a very, very, very urgent and serious matter. I want the hon. minister, if he will, to elaborate on -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. S. NEARY: - a statement that he made that not only will the revenues and the income be deducted from our equalization grants, but it could mean that oil discoveries might end up costing this Province money. Would the hon. gentleman care to elaborate on that statement?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the hon. member is a fly on the wall or whatever, but I have not seen it in any document that I made such a statement as he just claimed and I cannot recall making that statement. I do not know how he has interpreted statements that have been in the press that I was supposed to have made, but certainly I have never seen that particular interpretation.

The point that I think that has to be understood is that we are asking for nothing different than any other Province in Canada has had.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. J. COLLINS: We are saying that our circumstances

DR. COLLINS:

may change rather rapidly, and, rather than having that very rapid change come out of our hides, we are asking for an accomodation for a period of time until we can adjust to it.

MR. MORGAN:

Until we become a 'have' province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

DR. COLLINS:

And at no stage did I imply that we wanted to continue having equalization for twenty years while we are having revenue inflows from offshore for twenty years, or for whatever period it is. I was referring to an accomodation at the beginning of this very major change in our economy.

MR. NEARY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the hon. gentleman has worked this through. The former Minister of Mines and Energy gave us the figures at a conference there a couple of years ago, a briefing session that we had. I am sure the hon. gentleman has updated figures. The life of Hibernia is estimated to be twenty years. The equalization grants during that time will be around a billion dollars, anywhere - they are \$500 million now. It is going to go up. By the time we start producing oil it will be up around \$700 or \$800 million and during the twenty years it will probably hit a billion dollars. Now, Mr. Speaker, could the hon. gentleman tell us, with the updated figures, if there is any year in that twenty years, any year at all in that twenty years that Newfoundland will not be entitled to equalization grants? There will be no time during that twenty years that we will be a have province. We will

MR. NEARY: continue for twenty years to be a have not province. Would the hon. gentleman tell us if that is what the latest figures show, because that is what the hon. gentleman indicated in his statement from Halifax?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I am not responsible how the hon. member interprets what he reads in the paper, but that is a strange interpretation on things. One thing I do have to point out at this stage, that all these remarks were made, as I say, in the context of the next five years, if the fiscal arrangements situation is renegotiated, as one expects it will be, but it was also made in the context of a specific proposal that the federal government is putting forward, in particular, using Ontario as the standard against which equalization payments will be judged, and all provinces reject that. All provinces reject that part of the federal proposal and that is one of the things that leads to this difficulty, this particular difficulty. The difficulty will be there to some extent anyway, but the particular federal proposal using Ontario as a standard accentuates that difficulty of relating the needs in the early years of exploitation with the revenue flows coming therefrom.

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. We have approximately one minute left

MR. STIRLING: I want to thank my colleague from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) for bringing this to the attention of the House of Assembly.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, if I understand, and trying to put it in the proper context, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) has just said that under the present equalization arrangements, and under the formula that is presently in force, and which is being negotiated for the next five years, there will be no financial impact to this Province, no benefit to this Province of any revenue from offshore gas and oil unless Ottawa agrees to make some changes in equalization. Is that correct?

MR. MOORES: Yes or no.

MR. FLIGHT: Yes or no will do.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Finance has about twenty-five seconds.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, very quickly - we were not discussing primarily present arrangements, we were discussing proposals that the federal government brought forward for the next five years, and those were very defective proposals, particularly from our point of view. They are extremely defective proposals and we are trying to point out to the federal government how defective they are. I might say that all other nine provinces also found the federal proposals defective.

MR. SPEAKER: The time for Oral Questions has expired.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

MR. MARSHALL: If I may, on a point of order, because this relates to calling of Orders of the Day, I notice on Motions that the motion in the name of the hon. the Premier yesterday is not on the Order Paper. And I believe that the motion that he gave is a government Motion, not a private member's motion, and therefore ought to be on the Order Paper.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: That is right, yes.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): To the point of order; that matter was brought to my attention just prior to entering the House. Clearly it was a mistake or a misunderstanding or something on somebody's part, but it should be printed on the Order Paper as Motion No. 2.

MR. MARSHALL: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it should be on the Order Paper, And I would like to ask the Opposition, in view of the fact that when the Premier introduced the motion on Monday the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) said, and I quote: "Since we are now unanimous, Mr. Speaker, there would not seem to be any reason to have to go through the formalities. We have established a procedure in this House with unanimous consent of dealing with similar matters in the past, and in this session, and we do not require a debate".

Now, that was in response. That was Monday. On yesterday the hon. - they did not have their act together yesterday, obviously, and having given consent, saying they would give consent, they withdrew it yesterday. Now I wonder if the hon. gentlemen there opposite would give unanimous consent to pass the motion without debate?

MR. WARREN: No. No.

MR. DINN: That is breaking your word.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

In all fairness I will allow the hon. the Leader of the Opposition to respond briefly to those comments and then I will simply ask if there is unanimous consent without any further debate.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING:

Mr. Speaker, the House Leader knows the answer, and if he quoted the full discussion between the Premier and I he would find that the Premier had said, 'I would like to have consent tomorrow to debate this resolution' - which was yesterday - consent to debate.

I said, 'If it is the resolution that the native groups want, then why do we need to debate it? Let us pass it now.'

Mr. Speaker, that was when we took the Premier at his word. What we did not know was that he had included in the resolution, because he had only written it out by hand and had not provided us with a copy, he had



MR. STIRLING: included in his resolution a word which was not acceptable to the native group. And what happened yesterday was the native group met with my colleague, we discussed it in caucus and they agreed that they did not want us by unanimous consent. Now coming back to the order of the business today, the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) is quite within his rights, does not have to look for unanimous consent, can certainly bring in that resolution for debate and we will debate it because they control the rules. And that is, to put it in proper context, if he wants to bring it in for debate, then let us bring it in as a government motion which will be subject to amendment and subject to debate in the normal course. And if that is what you want to do, then let us do it.

MR. FLIGHT: You do not need consent.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Would the hon. President of the Council like to clarify his request?

MR. MARSHALL: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am just asking the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) to comply with his commitment of Monday and to pass the resolution without debate. If there is not unanimous consent, we will go to the next order of business.

MR. SPEAKER: So to clarify the request, the request is to ask unanimous consent, or leave, to deal with Motion No. 2 without debate. My role, as I explained clearly yesterday, is to ask. Is there unanimous consent for such a request?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: I do not hear unanimous consent.

Order 15. Bill No. 104.

Second reading of a bill entitled:

"An Act To Amend The Workers' Compensation Act (No. 2)". (Bill No. 104.) Last day the hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) was closing debate on the bill and he had spoken for about four minutes.

The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

When I opened debate on Bill 104, which is an amendment to the Workers' Compensation Act, I opened it and said that this basically allows the government to provide Workers' Compensation for approximately 4,500 volunteer firemen in Newfoundland and Labrador. Now, Mr. Speaker, what we heard after I introduced that amendment to the bill was basically a diatribe of untruths, an attack on the Workers' Compensation Board, an attack on the legislation. And, Mr. Speaker, I started my remarks the day before yesterday in cluing up second reading and attempting to answer some of the legitimate questions raised by the hon. members opposite, but in doing this I cannot leave on the record some of the inaccuracies, some of the displayed lack of knowledge of the Workers' Compensation Board, and some of the things that were said in debate that hon. members should know about Workers' Compensation in Newfoundland and they obviously

MR. J. DINN: do not know about Workers' Compensation in Newfoundland. Now, Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the debate, Mr. Hodder, the hon. member for Port au Port, talked about lump sum payments to widows. Mr. Speaker, he quoted Statistics Canada -

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

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

A point of order has been raised by the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I believe that in this House hon. members have to refer to their colleagues, whether they are on the same side of the House or on the opposite side of the House, as hon. members, or the member for this or the minister of that.

MR. J. DINN: Yes.

MR. S. NEARY: The minister is using last names over there about my colleague who is unfortunately not here today. Let us hope that he will be with us soon.

But I believe, Mr. Speaker, in order to maintain decorum in the House, that Your Honour should insist that he use the proper words.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) for bringing that to my attention. It is a very legitimate point of order and I apologize for not interceding earlier. He did go on to say the member for Port au Port so I let it slide. I do apologize for letting that slip.

The hon. minister for Labour and Manpower should take note of that point of order.

MR. J. DINN: I thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. J. DINN: The hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) indicated that Newfoundland Workers' Compensation, the Act does not allow or does not provide for widowers to get a lump sum payment. I just wanted to correct that because it is on the record of the House. I want to say and state that they indeed do get a lump sum payment. It is not the highest lump sum payment in Canada but it is among the top. Mr. Speaker, it is \$750, which will be increased to \$850 effective January 1st., 1982. Now, Mr. Speaker, that was one of the items raised by the hon. member.

The hon. member for LaPoile brought up several other items, items with respect to, for example, miners in Labrador West and a petition or a document that he had in his possession stating that thirty-two or thirty-three miners in Labrador West had been discriminated against in some way by the Workers' Compensation Board, by companies, and were basically being mistreated. Mr. Speaker, I have to also clarify that. Because the fact of the matter is that, to my knowledge over the past four or five years, certainly inasfar as I could do the research over the past day or so, to my knowledge not one miner that I am aware of has received a decrease in salary by virtue of the fact that he was moved from an unsafe area because of his lung problem to another area in the work

MR. DINN:

place where he received a decrease in salary and indeed, Mr. Speaker, the record shows that some of these people who were moved to other areas received an increase in salary. So I remind the hon. member that if he does have some cases, I would appreciate it if he would bring them to my attention, because it is my understanding that the companies in Labrador West, contrary to some statements that have been made, are treating their people very, very well and, in transferring from one work place to another work place to put them in a more safe condition, they generally do not - or to my knowledge, I have not been able to find where they have received a decrease in salary.

And the other thing is that when something comes to the attention of the Workers' Compensation Board, over the past year or two many, many people from Labrador West have been brought to St. John's where a complete medical review was done and, Mr. Speaker, this is done for the benefit of the workers to attempt to find out if they indeed do have compensable diseases where they are incapacitated and cannot work, and, Mr. Speaker, we do not have one to date who is in any way compensable by virtue of the fact that he is incapacitated from a dust-caused disease.

The other thing that I might point out at this point in time, Mr. Speaker, is that the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, in conjunction with the companies in Labrador West, and hopefully with the unions, is currently doing a \$2.4 million study in Labrador West so that we can find out the problems that the miners may have down there with respect to health so that we can possibly identify diseases that may be compensable in the future. The hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) mentioned pneumoconiosis.

MR. DINN: That is one of the compensable diseases that is already listed. But there are many dust-related diseases that are on the records in other places - sarcoidosis, pneumoconiosis and silicosis and so on. The reason for this \$2.4 million study that is done in conjunction with government, companies and the unions down there, is an attempt to find out if there are any other diseases that can be contracted by miners so that they can be compensable diseases under the act.

Mr. Speaker, that answers most of the questions asked by hon. members opposite.

The other point is that the board generally does not decide whether a worker in the Province does have a compensable disease, it is generally done by a board, a group of medical people and, Mr. Speaker, I think that is the best kind of system that we can possibly have, where the medical people decide and the board pays the compensation in the cases where it is recommended.

Mr. Speaker, I hope these things have answered questions raised by hon. members opposite.

I do want to say that the bill makes provision for our volunteer firemen in this Province to be covered by Workers' Compensation. And I think it is a great step forward here because these people are putting their lives on the line in Newfoundland and they have not been covered, up to this point in time. They will be covered, Mr. Speaker, as of the 1st of April.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Workers' Compensation Act (No. 2)," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No. 104)

November 26, 1981

Tape 3778

EC - 3

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Order 22.

Motion, second reading of a  
bill, "An Act To Amend The Education (Teacher Training)  
Act," (Bill No. 50).

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the Minister of  
Education.

MS. VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to move second reading of this bill, "An Act To Amend The Teacher Training Act". The principle of the bill is to provide for an improved procedure for appeals by aggrieved parties from decisions relating to teaching licences or certificates, that is, more specifically decisions on the issuance or a refusal to issue a teaching certificate or a licence, or decisions relating to the cancellation or suspension of such certificates or licences or refusal to cancel or suspend.

Mr. Speaker, the present procedure is one which has, I think quite justifiably, come in for some criticism. It is such that an initial decision is made by the Registrar of Teachers, who is a public servant, an employee of the Department of Education. If there is a grievance, then there is further recourse from the decision of the Registrar of Teachers to a committee comprising eleven persons, which is chaired by that same Registrar of Teachers. That committee, Mr. Speaker, is called the Teachers' Certification Committee, and in addition to the Registrar, who serves as a chairperson, there are ten other members, the three executive secretaries of the Denominational Educational Committee; another representative of the Department of Education in addition to the Registrar; two representatives of Memorial University Faculty of Education; two of the Newfoundland Teachers' Association; and finally, two representatives of the Federation of School Boards for a total of eleven people.

That group provides representation from the agencies which have some interest in matters of teachers' certificates and licences, and the issuance or cancellation thereof. Those agencies are, of course, the Department of Education, the Denominational Education Committee, the Federation of School Boards, the Newfoundland Teachers' Association, and



MS. VERGE: Memorial's Faculty of Education, the five main agencies having responsibility and power over education matters in our Province.

Now the flaw in this arrangement is obvious; it is that the Registrar of Teachers, who makes the initial decision, then presides over the Appeal Committee, called the Teachers Certification Committee. So that the aggrieved party in such a case does not really have a fresh hearing by an impartial group.

The principle of this bill is to rectify that deficiency by providing for recourse from decisions on the matters referred to on teachers' licences and certificates made by the Registrar of Teachers or by that same eleven persons Teachers' Certification Committee to a new body which is called a Board of Appeals.

The bill provides for the composition of the Board of Appeals having representatives, one each, from the Newfoundland Teachers' Association, a person nominated by The Teachers' Certification Committee, although not somebody who in fact served on that Committee; third, somebody nominated by the appropriate school board; fourth, an employee of the Department of Education, and then a fifth person, who is the chairperson, is a person chosen by the preceding four or, in a rare event of a failure to agree, then an appointment by the Minister of Education.

Mr. Speaker, I draw to your attention and to the attention of hon. members, the provision of the bill which says that a person who is a member of this

MS. VERGE:

Board of Appeals cannot be drawn from the ranks of the committee, so that there is a fresh group of people presiding over the final appeal.

Mr. Speaker, the contents of this bill, providing for this improved appeal procedure, have been agreed to by the important agencies responsible for education to which I have referred. This bill has met with the approval of the denominational education committees, the Federation of School Boards, the Newfoundland Teachers Association and the faculty of education at Memorial University.

Mr. Speaker, I think, as I have pointed out before, that once the bill becomes law, as I trust it will, that there will be a more just procedure for reviewing decisions relating to the issuance or refusal to issue, the cancellation or suspension, or refusal to do that, of teachers' licences and certificates.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House certainly will support this bill and commend the minister for bringing in this particular bill which, as she describes, is an improvement with respect to grievance procedure with respect teacher certification. And it certainly improves that particular system and enhances the whole grievance procedure with respect to teacher certification.

And, Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House certainly want to be associated with any measure that improves, or enhances, working conditions for a very important professional group of this Province, a group of people that I suppose performs the single most important job in our Province, that of educating, that of training our most important resource, our human resources.

MR. LUSH: And, Mr. Speaker, I would only hope that the minister would also bring in other measures that will certainly make the job of teachers in this Province much easier, that will enhance the teaching and learning process throughout the Province. And there is much to be said on that, but, Mr. Speaker, I will not delay the proceeding of this bill today by talking about the changes that need to be brought about in this Province to enhance and improve the teaching/learning process in this Province. Because, as the minister is aware, we have many inadequacies presently in our educational system, teachers teaching in buildings that are outdated and inadequate and students, of course, going to schools and trying to learn in an environment that is not at all in tune with the twentieth century. And this happens in many places in Newfoundland, particularly in rural Newfoundland, and there is one tremendous job to be done in education today.

So anything certainly that enhances that teacher/learning process then we are in favour of it and of course in order for the teacher/learning process to meet the requirements that are conducive to it, one of the things that we must ensure and that is that the working conditions of teachers is certainly in order, that it is certainly adequate and that they have all of the conditions necessary, that they have all of the elements necessary to make it conducive to the teaching process. And this certainly is a large improvement on what was the previous grievance procedure which, as the Minister pointed out, certainly was not a good process.

My understanding of the system, maybe the minister can correct me if I am wrong, my understanding was that it was the same board that issued teacher licences, that issued teacher certificates, that took the grievance. The minister sort

MR. LUSH:

of led me astray on that. The minister gave me the impression that the only common denominator was the Registrar. My interpretation is that it was the entire committee, the entire committee, certainly chaired by the Registrar, but it was the entire committee that made the initial decision. It was the entire committee that issued the licence or the certificate. So, Mr. Speaker, I think that is the way it was. Maybe the minister intended that, but I got the distinct impression that she was saying that it was only the Registrar who was common to this committee. But my understanding was that the Certification Board was made up of the Registrar and all the other persons that she mentioned, and institutions, the university and the Federation of School Boards and so on. And so this Certification Board, Mr. Speaker, issued the licence or did not issue it, so if they did not issue it they come back after coffee break and deal with the grievance. So certainly that was not a just system, the same people who denied the certificate in the first place would take the appeal. And that was a very unjust method, certainly, to deal with appeals, and now this is at least a more correct procedure, a more just procedure in which you have a neutral body to deal with the appeal. This certainly makes more sense. It is the way to go and I am sure it meets with the approval of teachers and the school boards right throughout this Province because it is something they have been wanting to change. They have been wanting to change the structure; they have been wanting to change this method of appeal because it did not make sense, Mr. Speaker, to have to go back to the same body, to the same group of people who denied the issuance of the certificate in the first place.

MR. LUSH: And as I said, they denied it in the one instance and then, after coffee or after lunch, they were going back to deal with the appeal, to deal with the grievance from either the school board or the teacher. So this certainly is more in line with the way appeal boards should be established and it is something that the teachers of this Province have been striving for for a long, long time. And the surprise is that they allowed this system to carry on for so long that, they allowed themselves to be in this particular position.

So this measure, this bill by the minister today will correct that procedure and allow for a more improved procedure for grievances with respect to teacher certification.

So, Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House support this measure and I am sure that the teachers throughout this Province will be glad that the government finally saw fit to give a better system, a more equitable system, a more just system and one in which now they will be able to get a fair and just hearing. So, Mr. Speaker, we support it and commend the government for bringing in this measure. Although long overdue, we commend them for having done so today.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. the Minister of Education. If the minister speaks now she closes debate on the bill.

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) for his support for this bill and for his kind remarks and respond very quickly to two points he raised. First, government has acted very swiftly in initiating this legislation. The fact is that it was only relatively recently that one of the parties involved in this procedure, namely the Newfoundland Teachers' Association, made a request for an improved appeal procedure in teacher certification and that request was then referred to the four or five agencies involved and it was only a couple of months ago, just this Fall as a matter of fact, that those agencies agreed

MS. VERGE: among themselves on the exact provision of an improved appeal procedure which is embodied in this bill. So I think government have been quite swift in responding to the first call for an improved appeal procedure.

Secondly, the existing or old procedure, as I understand it, and it is set out in the explanatory notes on the inside cover of this bill, did involve an appeal from a decision of the Registrar to the Teachers' Certification Committee, comprising eleven people, of which the Registrar, himself, is Chairman. However, the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), being a member of the teaching profession and presumably having had some personal experience, may know more about what happened in practice. But I think we both agree that the fundamental weakness or flaw in the old arrangement was that it was essentially the same person or people presiding over the appeal as had made the original decision.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I move second reading of this bill:

SOME HON. MEMEBERS: Hear, hear!

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Education (Teacher Training) Act", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently, by leave. (Bill No. 50).

MR. MARSHALL: Order 20, Bill No. 89.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Remove Anomalies And Errors In The Statute Law". (Bill No. 89).

MR. SPEAKER(Butt): The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, as hon. members will recall, every year a bill similar to this is introduced. There is really nothing one can do to explain it. The explanatory notes put it very straight-forward. What it is is during the course of a year a number of anomalies are found, sometimes they are typographical errors, sometimes they are grammatical errors, sometimes they are incorrect references to statutes, that kind of thing. There is nothing of substance, indeed one could not introduce any legislation of substance of this nature. That is essentially what it is and, as I say, every session such a bill is introduced and there is really not much more, without wasting the time of the House, I can say about it.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The minister moves second reading?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes.  
On motion, a bill, "An Act To Remove Anomalies And Errors In The Statute Law", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently, by leave. (Bill No. 89)

MR. MARSHALL: Order 28.  
Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Enable Price (Nfld.) Pulp & Paper Limited To Become A Federal Corporation". (Bill No. 115).

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, this is similar to a number of pieces of legislation which have been introduced during the past one, two or three years. The purpose of this is that it will allow Price (Nfld.) to incorporate federally, to become a federally incorporated company.



MR. OTTENHEIMER: In terms of any taxation with this Province, it has no affect whatsoever. There is no financial or taxation affect. Revenue, money, it has no reference to that whatsoever. The Newfoundland companies' law is peculiar in the sense that when a company incorporated in this Province wishes to be incorporated federally, it requires an act of the Legislature.

As hon. members are aware, a new companies act is envisioned, and, indeed, is before a Select Committee and, no doubt, one of the changes that will be made will be to get rid of this anachronism. But during the past two or three years, hon. members will recall, a number of bills which have been introduced of a similar nature, and what it is is when a company

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

wishes to incorporate federally it needs an act of this Legislature to so do. But, as I said, it has no effect on taxation or revenue; the amount received by the Province with respect to the amount received federally, it has no consequences in that area.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I only learned a couple of hours ago that I would be piloting these bills through the House for this side of the House. Our spokesman on Justice is headed for Grand Bank to be with his constituents in their hour of need. And so, Mr. Speaker, if what the minister says about this bill is correct why then we have no objection to endorsing it, to supporting the principle of the bill.

I am always very, very suspicious, Mr. Speaker, maybe I am suspicious by nature, of these multi-national companies when they ask government to do something for them like we are being asked to do here in this bill. The minister says it is merely just a formality, a routine matter, asking to establish Price (Nfld.) as a federal corporation -

MR. STIRLING: So the head office can be somewhere else.

MR. NEARY: - so that the head office can be outside of this Province. Now I do not know -

MR. STIRLING: And come under federal jurisdiction.

MR. NEARY: Yes, I know. We did it a couple of years ago, I believe, for a company that the hon. member is familiar with.

MR. STIRLING: It has been done in a number of cases.

MR. NEARY: And it has been done in a number of cases but nevertheless I am still a little bit suspicious about Price because we all know the way they con-

MR. STIRLING: Do we have any assurance that they will maintain the full operation?

MR. NEARY: Well this is really the question. Can the minister give the House assurance that Price will maintain

MR. NEARY: their operation in this Province at the same level as they are at the present time? And, Mr. Speaker, could the hon. gentleman tell us where they intend to have their head office? Is it going to be in Quebec or in Ontario? What will happen in Newfoundland? Will it mean a phasing down of the office employees in Grand Falls or in Stephenville? It must mean something, Mr. Speaker, Does it mean income tax concessions for Price? Is that the reason behind having this made a federal corporation -

MR. STIRLING: Move beyond control of this Province.

MR. NEARY: - move it outside the control of Newfoundland? Now for what reason? I cannot put my finger on it but, as I say, I am awfully suspicious, Mr. Speaker, because I have seen the way that Price operate and I have seen the way they can con this government. They conned the former Moores administration into giving them, passing over, gratis, free - as a matter of fact, it will cost the taxpayers of Canada, it will cost the taxpayers out of the federal Treasury money and the people of Newfoundland \$60 or \$70 million for giving them - we gave away Labrador Linerboard, we gave it to Price.

AN HON. MEMBERS: That is not true.

MR. NEARY: That is true, Mr. Speaker, we gave it to them and then in concessions gave them tax concessions to the tune of \$60 or \$70 million.

MR. TULK: This year, I think, is the  
(inaudible)

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. STIRLING: Could they have not traded off some of those wood areas, woodlands or something?

MR. NEARY: That is right.

Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend reminds me there - the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) -

November 26, 1981

Tape No. 3783

SD - 3

MR. NEARY:

that in this trade off it might  
have been possible to get some of the concessions that we are  
trying to get our hands on.

10007

MR. NEARY: But they managed to con the Newfoundland Government, the former administration, into giving them this multi-million dollar, ultra-modern mill in Stephenville. And they talk about giveaways. This crowd have the cheek and the face to talk about giveaways. \$500 million they spent of taxpayers' money on it, \$500 million. \$500 million, Mr. Speaker, that much -

MR. CARTER: Who conceived the whole thing in the first place?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: - much of which was spent in a questionable manner.

Mr. Speaker, they spent \$500 million on it. It would cost about - oh, let me see, \$200 million to replace it - No, more than that.

AN HON. MEMBER: What?

MR. NEARY: The replacement value.

The replacement value would be about \$500 million. And they passed it over to Price -

MR. WHITE: Mega projects.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. WHITE: Mega projects.

MR. NEARY: Yes, well that is true. That passed it over to Price; they said, "Here, you can have it for nothing and get tax concessions from the Government of Canada," this year alone \$70 million in deferred profit.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is typical of the philosophy and the thinking of this government. And, Mr. Speaker, I want to remind members of this House what happened recently in Manitoba where you had a government that followed the same policies and the same philosophy as the administration in this Province, they believed in mega projects, big projects. The only thing they could talk about was \$100 million projects. Anything over \$100 million,

MR. NEARY: that is what is known as a mega project, anything over \$100 million is a mega project. They would not waste their time talking about anything under \$100 million. Any project less than \$100 million they would not waste their time talking about it.

Now where is the similarity, Mr. Speaker? Where is the similarity between the policy of the former government in Manitoba and the administration here? Well, all the Premier and this government can talk about is multi-million dollar projects. They talk about aluminum smelters. They talk about offshore oil and gas. They can only talk about things that are over \$100 million. The poor old fishing industry, the logging industry, the forest industry, the construction industry -

MR. FLIGHT: Gone.

MR. NEARY: - ignore that. That is a bother to them. In the last two years in this Province, Mr. Speaker, this administration had completely ignored every industry in Newfoundland except offshore oil. The Premier eats it, sleeps it, dreams it, talks about it, talks it. All he can think about is oil, multi-million dollar projects. Ignore everything else. And while the whole economy is collapsing down around our ears, the only thing he can talk and think is oil. And today, Mr. Speaker, in this House we got the shocker of shocks when the Minister of Finance admitted that over a twenty year period when Hibernia is producing, if you would just take that one oil well alone, and that is all we can talk about at the present time, over a twenty year period Newfoundland will get equalization grants from Ottawa seventeen years out of that twenty.

In other words, only three years out of that twenty will we be a have Province. The other seventeen we will be a have not Province. What a shock,

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker. The minister made a statement over in Halifax; he said, we could get a dollar from offshore revenue and end up costing us more than a dollar in equalization. Now, Mr. Speaker, by -

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

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please! The hon. Minister of Fisheries on a point of order.

MR. MORGAN: It is a very minor point of order -

MR. TULK: Well it would be if you got up.

MR. MORGAN: - that what the member is reading from, if he is reading from something in debate he has to table that document.

MR. TULK: He is not reading it, he is summarizing it the same as the Premier did with the constitution.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order?

MR. NEARY: I will wait for Your Honour to rule.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, I understand that you do table documents, letters.

MR. NEARY: I have not read from anything yet.

MR. SPEAKER: You are not reading? I am sorry, because I was engaged in just a very small conversation with the hon. Leader of the Opposition, I really have to observe for myself unless the hon. member speaking wishes to table anything he is reading from.

MR. NEARY: I understand. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: So there is no point of order.



MR. NEARY: Thank you, Your Honour.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) stated in Halifax that for every dollar we get from offshore oil in revenue, for every dollar, a dollar is deducted from equalization grants. And he said, and he confirmed that in the House today, that could mean that oil discoveries off the Coast of Newfoundland might end up costing the Public Treasury in this Province money. That is what he said.

Then later on he came up with some kind of a convoluted formula of his own that we should get equalization grants and revenue from offshore at the same time, which is just the same -

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

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): A point of order, the hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: With regards to my earlier point of order, the hon. gentleman is quoting from some document on his desk saying that -

MR. TULK: How do you know that?

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, if the Yahoo from Fogo Island (Mr. Tulk) could keep quiet -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Hon. members are not allowed to refer to other hon. members by Yahoo.

MR. MORGAN: Well, the hon. Yahoo, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Yahoo.

MR. TULK: No, no!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the member in debate is quoting from a document on his desk, and he is saying that 'the Minister of Finance said.'

MR. TULK: How do you know that?

MR. MORGAN: In other words, somebody else is saying what the Finance Minister (Dr. Collins) said. I want to know from what source the Finance Minister is being quoted, so that that document should be tabled in the House.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!  
As I ruled before, I do not see any document that the hon. member is referring to.

MR. MORGAN: It is on his desk.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!  
Therefore no point of order.

Just let me simply say to the hon. member, I was about to call him to order because we are debating Bill 115, second reading which deals with making Price (Nfld.) a federal corporation and therefore I fail to see where the hon. member's remarks are relevant to the bill we are now debating.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Your Honour, I did get a little bit carried away there. I was comparing actually, giveaways. I mean, we hear so much about giveaways, I said they gave away to Price (Nfld.) Labrador Linerboard and all the goodies and all the concessions that go with it, Then I went on to point out to the House that all this administration can think about is mega projects.

MR. TULK: Large corporations.

MR. NEARY: Multinational, large corporations. They rush into the House, Mr. Speaker, with bills like we have before us here, when the multinational cracks the whip, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) jumps.

MR. CALLAN: Not that high, but he jumps.

MR. NEARY: Well, he jumps, I do not know how high he is jumping now, but, Mr. Speaker, they would not be as quick, this administration would not be as quick reacting, bringing legislation into the House if it had anything to do with an ordinary Newfoundlander. But as soon as the

MR. NEARY: multinationals crack the whip the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer), or whatever minister, it does not take him long to move.

So, Mr. Speaker, we support the bill. The hon. gentleman may get up and say, well, he is not sure, like we heard a minister saying the other day. He said we supported the bill, but we said this and we left the impression that this is the way we felt about it or we felt that way about it. Well, Mr. Speaker, what is legislation for if it is not to be debated? What is it for?

I can get up and say I support a bill and I can point out the weaknesses in it and I can express my views on it as I am doing now. And what is wrong with that, Mr. Speaker? Not a thing in this world as long as you are relevant and as long as you stick to the matter under discussion.

MR. NEARY: And I say again, we support the bill. But I have to say this before I take my seat, Mr. Speaker, that we were told at the beginning of this session by the Premier - it was broadcast from one of the Province to the other; from one end of this Province to the other - we were told the promotion that the session of the House of Assembly had - we were told, Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of this session that major reforms were in the offing in the form of legislation. We were told there is a legislative reform programme the likes of which we had never seen in this Province. Now, is this an example, Mr. Speaker, of what the Premier meant by legislative reform? Mr. Speaker, is this going to do anything for the ordinary Newfoundlander? Is it going to do anything for the economy of the Province? Is it going to solve the crisis in the fishery? Is it going to solve our unemployment problem? Is it going to do anything about electricity rates and the high cost of living? No, Sir, it is not. All it is going to do is help a multinational company, and that is in keeping, Mr. Speaker, with the tradition of the Tory Party. Toryism, that is Toryism at its finest. Do not bring any legislation into the House that will help ordinary people or ordinary Newfoundlanders, bring in legislation that will help the multinationals. There is nothing on the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker, to indicate that this government cares about the real problems that are facing the people of this Province, namely, the crisis in the fishery, record unemployment, high cost of living, high cost of electricity, ever increasing vandalism and crime, federal/provincial relations, and I could go on and on and on, Mr. Speaker. But I know Your Honour has heard all this before and Your Honour is well aware of the philosophy of this government. Therefore, Mr. Speaker,

MR. NEARY: I will just end up by saying that we support the bill, but I would like for the minister, if he could, to tell us in his own opinion what is the real reason behind this kind of legislation.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. the Minister of Justice. If the hon. the minister speaks now he will close the debate.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned in introducing the bill, this is similar to a number which have been introduced in the past two or three years, and in this instance it is where Price (Nfld.) Limited wishes to be incorporated federally.

A company can be incorporated in Canada in two ways, either in a province or by federal incorporation. And the reason that a company like Price (Nfld.) would wish at this time to have a federal incorporation would, I think, be that, you know, being the kind of company they are with business dealings throughout Canada, throughout North America and, no doubt, countries outside of North America as well, the fact of a national, Canada-wide corporation, I suppose one could say, enhances corporate identity - it would enhance their corporate identity. As far as any revenue goes, or income tax, there is absolutely no effect whatsoever. And I would point out that to the best of my knowledge, in every other province - I think I am right there - in every other province, such a bill would not come to the Legislature. It is only because our Companies Act is antiquated that it is necessary that this would come to the Legislature. In other provinces it would not be necessary at all, the provincial Legislature would have nothing to do with it, and I would certainly assume that will be the case in Newfoundland as well when a new Companies Act is passed

MR. OTTENHEIMER: by the House. While we are operating under the old one, it is necessary for this kind of legislation to come to the House of Assembly but, certainly, as I say, in other parts of Canada that would not be necessary at all.

I move second reading.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Enable Price (Nfld.) Pulp & Paper Limited To Become A Federal Corporation," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House, presently by leave. (Bill No. 115)

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: Order 2, Bill No. 106.

A bill, "An Act To Ratify, Confirm And Adopt An Agreement Between The Government And The Government Of Canada Respecting Reciprocal Taxation Of These Governments And Their Agencies". (Bill No. 106).

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

MR. MARSHALL: Order 3, Bill No. 66.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Government Reorganization (General And Miscellaneous Provisions) Act, 1973".

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

MR. MARSHALL: Order 4, Bill No. 46.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Constabulary Act". (Bill No. 46).

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

MR. MARSHALL: Order 5, Bill No. 52.

A bill, "An Act To Convey Certain Trusts And Properties In The Province To The Montreal Trust Company Of Canada". (Bill No. 52).

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

MR. MARSHALL: Order 6, Bill No. 61.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The St. Clare's Mercy Hospital (Incorporation) Act, 1960". (Bill No. 61).

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

MR. MARSHALL:

Order No. 7. Bill 64.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The  
Summary Proceedings Act". (Bill No. 64)

On motion, clause 1, carried.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (BUTT):

The hon. President of the Council

on clause 2.

MR. MARSHALL:

There is an amendment, Mr.

Chairman, to clause 2 to substitute the word 'shall' for  
'may' at the end of subclause 1 and this is in conformity  
with the observations that arose out of the debate in  
second reading. What in effect it will do, before it read  
"The judge may order the matter to be set aside in the event  
that he did not have - it has been shown that the complain-  
ant did not have notice of a summons or prima facie as a  
good defense. To change 'may' to 'shall' so that the judge  
will be required to. So, I move, Mr. Chairman, that clause  
2 of the Bill be amended by striking out the word 'may' and  
substituting the word 'shall'.

On motion, amendment, carried.

On motion, clause 2 as amended, carried.

On motion, clause 3 and clause 4

carried.

Motion, that the committee report

the bill with amendment, carried.

A bill, 'An Act To Establish The  
Alcohol And Drug Dependency Commission Of Newfoundland And  
Labrador". (Bill No. 109).

Shall the short title carry?

MR. MOORES:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Carbonear.



MR. MOORES: Mr. Chairman, I never had an opportunity to speak to this bill when it was being given second reading in the House the other day-through no fault of my own, I might add, and I would like to make a few comments. I would like to make a few comments as germane as possible included under the heading of clause 1, the short title.

I noticed, Mr. Chairman, when the minister responsible for introducing this bill into the House rose to introduce it some time ago, he brought before the House a variety of facts and figures, statistics, all purporting to claim that this bill was about to be the panacea in bringing forth the much needed change and emphasis on drug and alcohol dependency in this Province, and that was all fine and dandy, Mr. Chairman.

Certainly I do not propose to stand here in my place today and chide the minister on introducing to the House statistics of a nature to support the introduction of this bill. We all know that this bill is a good bill and we all know that for the last twenty-five years there has not been a commission of this sort. However, if my memory serves me correctly, what I did find most unamusing about some of the ministers' statements and remarks was the sorry, very sad lack of understanding of what drug consumption, either use or abuse, in this Province is today, a very sad lack of understanding.

I recall, when my colleague from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) was speaking on the bill, he pointed out to the minister that one of the primary causes of drug and alcohol dependency in our society today can be directly associated with the state of the economy and the resulting

November 26, 1981

Tape No. 3788

EL - 3

MR. MOORES:

negative things that occur such  
as vandalism and crime and what have you. And at that point,  
the Minister

MR. R. MOORES:

of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) let out a big hee-haw, both he and the Minister of Health (Mr. House), and accused my colleague from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) of politicking on this topic, of bringing in unrelated matters just to politic, to get back at the government.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Chairman, I was reading in Time Magazine just a while ago about the alcohol problem that is being experienced in the United States, about the drug problem that has manifested itself now into one of the most enormous catastrophies of our time. And I am not just talking about hashish and marijuana, I am talking about the so-called hard drugs in society.

And this is another aspect of the drug dependencies problem that the minister had all screwed up in his mind. But there are at the present time seventeen reports available on drug dependency in Canada and the United States and other parts of the world, seventeen reports, including one of the most famous of its kind, the LeDain Commission. That was a royal commission appointed here in Canada. And none of those reports have come to any conclusive statements on the effects of marijuana and hashish, none of them! They have all made speculations, they have all made theoretical advances, but they have never come to any concrete conclusions. And everybody seems to always pass one on to the other, that drugs and alcohol are the same because they happen to create basically the same problem. And that in itself is a misunderstanding. Alcohol right now is socially accepted and has been for thousands of years literally; therefore you cannot compare a traditional accepted problem, social habit to one that is very recent in its nature. Nobody knew what a toke or

MR. R. MOORES: a jay was twenty years ago in our society. But in the 1960s in the so-called drug culture these types of dependencies came to the forefront. And our society was ill-equipped, as it is, today to deal with it because, like the minister, they missed understanding it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. MOORES: And what the Minister of Health (Mr. House) and the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) continually do is get up in their places and compare it to alcohol. And say that the two are the same and must be dealt with the same. And I am telling you, gentlemen, as a young person in this Province I have stood with a half a million people, half a million people in a field in Woodstock, New York, as a young boy. And I have seen marijuana and hashish and every other drug consumed like it was water. And I have yet to get a table turned over in my face, I have yet to get a broken nose, I have yet to be aggravated by the conduct or behavior of the personality of a person under the influence of hashish or marijuana. And I have yet to witness one case of criminal activity, such as we purport like somebody getting their head kicked in,

MR. MOORES: a wife getting her head kicked in and thrown out of her house, children being beaten to death and so on. Now once we get into the hard drugs - and there are almost as many of them as there are types of whiskey and rum and so on - once you get into those you are talking a completely different type of drug dependency. Now, on the other hand, about fifteen or twenty years ago when I used to drink, I remember the only time in my life that I ever got drunk. I was on the floor of the Halfway House Motel in Harbour Grace, looking up like a fool, wondering why everybody was laughing at me. And that night I was involved in no less than three or four fisticuffs, I walked out of the Halfway House with a half a dozen scrapes on my face and half the shirt tore off my back. And I made a decision that night that never again would I participate in the consumption of alcohol.

MR. TULK: Confession is good for the soul.

MR. MOORES: And my colleagues here, as well as my colleagues on the other side of the House, would confirm to you that I am a teetotaler. The same thing happened with cigarettes; I used to open four packs a day and more often than not I would smoke the fourth one. In university professors used to order me out of the classroom because I was like a smokestack. And I have watched, as a teenager and as a student, and I have watched as a MHA the devastating effects of alcohol. I have taken my friends out of cars dead.

MR. MORGAN: Any colleagues?

MR. MOORES: Yes, colleagues of mine, taken them out of automobiles dead on the highway. Just a few years ago a friend of mine was returning from a curling game in Springdale, and he was drunk and he said to his wife, 'You drive the car and I will get out in the back seat with your father'. And they pulled off the highway on the way home and there was a truck coming behind them - a pick-up with three men aboard loaded drunk - and they were hit from behind and my friend was

MR. MOORES: crushed to death. And there has never ever been any action taken on that matter in a court of law.

You cannot compare alcohol, and any man who does, and the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) did it implicitly if not actually in his comments and in the tenor of his remarks, if you compare them then you are bigger fools than anyone would expect you to be. They are not related. The only things about them is that they both create dependencies. The behavioral patterns of the people who participate in their consumption are completely different and cannot be diagnosed the same. And I listened to Carl Sterrett on VOCM the other morning, one of the very few times I have done so, and if there has ever been a scare tactician in this Province, hyping up scare tactics to create a situation amongst the public to favour his point of view on drugs - and I doubt very much if he has ever participated in them; well, I do not mind saying that I have, I do not mind saying that as a student at Memorial University I was one of thousands and thousands who participated in drug consumption, marijuana and hashish. And there are people in this House and outside of this House who do it now. We do not abuse it; use and abuse are two different things, So is use and abuse of alcohol two different things. But the tragedy, dear God, Mr. Chairman, the tragedy is when you get a Minister of Social Services, a man responsible for at least a guidance of the thinking in this Province, using statistics

MR. R. MOORES: from agencies in this Province who were supposed to be interested and concerned with this problem to point out ignorance, ignorance in the understanding of the problem and a general acceptance of that ignorance on the part of legislators here. What I suggest you do is read some of the report, including the LeDain Commission which I keep referring to, because it dealt with the legalization and the decriminalization of marijuana and hashish. And that commission came out very clearly in favour of decriminalization if not legalization.

I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, genuinely sorry that there is such a misunderstanding, particularly about drugs. And that word is used like a maul, used like a maul for some people to protect their ignorance. And they continue to remain ignorant when there is so much information available, inconclusive information, but the fact that it is inconclusive should act as enlightening to point out to people that if you cannot conclude that something is harmful, then the least you can do is say, 'Well, God, I cannot prove!' Therefore if nothing worse, let us compare it to alcohol in its worst form. And if you compare it to alcohol in its worst form, then all you do is point out the weaknesses of a drug problem that has been in existence for 2,000 or 3,000 three years. And treat it like that! What would that mean if you took it to its logical conclusion? It would mean that we would be able to go into a Brewer's Retail and buy our drugs. It would mean that we could go into a club or something and order up a jay and toke away, provided we were of a specific age. Now what is wrong with that? If taken to its logical conclusion it is no worse than alcohol until you abuse it.

MR. R. MOORES: Alcohol affects the brain.

MR. MORGAN: Are you advocating the use of drugs?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. R. MOORES: No, let me answer please. Just a second! Let me answer the question. You are damn right I am advocating its proper use in our society, and if you do not like that, my friend, then you are more in the dark than I think you are.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. R. MOORES: Are you not listening? If you would listen rather than interject you would hear what I am saying. I said compare the usage of it to alcohol and let us treat it the same way if you are going to consistently look at it that way. Not on the one hand come in here and use its comparative analysis to support you and then when you walk out the door say, 'My God, you would not dare talk about the use of drugs in our society. I might lose a few votes on that.' And therein lies the problem. People, legislators, administrators who are irresponsible enough to play politics with this while there are thousands and tens of thousands of lives in the offing. And that is what I am saying very clearly.

And this Province need not depend, Mr. Chairman, upon Ottawa. We do not have to depend upon Ottawa to move on matters relating to the proper use of drugs in our society. We do it with alcohol, and if we can do it with alcohol then we can implement our own laws. The only thing, Mr. Chairman, is we have to have the guts to do it, the gumption to realize our responsibility.

Mr. Speaker - Mr. Chairman, it does not matter how I refer to you, the intention is the same,



MR. MOORES: the authority figure is the same.

I am certainly glad that Mr. Speaker and also the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) were kind enough to allow these slightly irrelevant-in the sense of clause by clause - remarks, allowed me to speak today. And I have a feeling that most of the members listening took the remarks in the way that I intended them to be conveyed.

I thank you very much,

Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

A bill, "An Act To Establish The Alcohol And Drug Dependency Commission Of Newfoundland And Labrador" (Bill No. 109).

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

MR. MARSHALL: By leave, Order 15, Bill No. 104.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): By leave, Bill No. 15, "An Act To Amend The Proceedings Against The Crown Act, 1973".

Oh, I am sorry.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Workers' Compensation Act (No. 2)," (Bill No. 104).

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

MR. MARSHALL: By leave, Order 20, Bill No. 89.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before we pass this bill through Committee, I have to make the following announcement on behalf of His Honour. Pursuant to Standing Order 31H, it being 5:00 P.M., I can now inform the House that I have received no Notices of Motion for debate at 5:30 P.M., when a motion to adjourn will be deemed to be before the House.

MR. NEARY: On a point of order,

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, just so the House will not misunderstand what Your Honour is saying, I had one in but I had to withdraw it because I have to go and pick up my young daughter at 5:30 P.M. or around that time.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Of course, and the hon. member knows that that is not a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: To that point of order, Mr. Chairman. You know it is very nice to know that there was only one question arising out of the week that the hon. gentleman had been dissatisfied with, so this speaks well for the government.

A bill, "An Act To Remove Anomalies And Errors In The Statute Law," (Bill No. 89).

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

MR. MARSHALL:

Order No. 22, Bill No. 50.

A bill "An Act To Amend The Education (Teacher Training) Act". (Bill No. 50).

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

MR. MARSHALL:

Order No. 28, Bill No. 115.

A bill, "An Act To Enable Price (Nfld.) Pulp & Paper Limited To Become A Federal Corporation". (Bill No. 115).

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

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

MR. SPEAKER(Simms):

The hon. member for Conception

Bay South.

MR. CHAIRMAN(Butt):

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the

Whole has considered the matters to it referred and reports having passed the following bills without amendment; Bills 106, 66, 46, 52, 61, 109, 104, 89, 50 and 115, and Bill 64 with amendment, and ask leave to sit again.

On motion, report received and adopted, bills without amendment ordered read a third time on tomorrow, Committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

On motion, report received and adopted on bill with amendment (Bill No. 64). Amendments ordered read a first and second time now, by leave.

On motion, amendments read a first and second time, bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow, Committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL: Order 14, Bill No. 113  
Motion, second reading of a bill,  
"An Act To Amend The Department Of Finance Act". (Bill No.113).

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

DR. COLLINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this bill in effect enables us to do certain administrative restructuring within The Department of Finance. Up to this time there is a Deputy Minister in the Department of Finance who by statute, carries out a wide range of duties and these duties extend all the way from fiscal policy across to tax administration and clients with tax statutes dealing with giving advice to government, and also to financial matters and so on.

It became apparent as time went along, that it was a very large load on the individual in this particular position and that the size of the duties placed on the Department of Finance, arising out of our increasing complexity of government, the increasing size of the population and so on and so forth, that there should be some restructuring done to break up the duties and to give these duties to two individuals rather than one individual.

That recommendation, I think, fitted in with a recommendation that arose out of the Public Accounts Committee on one occasion. I think the Auditor General at one time advocated it. I know that when we were studying the various departments of government for the Five Year Plan this was one of the recommendations that the Department of Finance brought in itself.

Essentially what it will do; it will leave the Deputy Minister of Finance in charge, particularly of fiscal policy and debt management, whereas the Comptroller General, which will be his counterpart, and who will have equivalent status to the Deputy Minister, will be in charge of tax administration and pension policy, payroll

DR. COLLINS: and so on and so forth. This is what the bill essentially does.

It also does permit other officers and employees of the Department to be appointed without having to bring in amendment to the act, which is a very cumbersome deal. For instance, I think, previously to appoint an assistant deputy minister you actually had to bring an amendment into the House. So the particular position may need to be filled and one could not see it being legitimized perhaps for eight or nine months, until the House had an opportunity to pass an amendment. It was just not an efficient way to go.

DR. COLLINS:

So this bill does permit the appointments of those below the level of deputy minister to be done without carrying out an actual amendment to the act.

So I move this amendment.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird):

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

MR. ROBERTS:

Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER:

I am sorry. The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS:

Thank you, Your Honour. I realize I am an insignificant bump on the log, but I am glad Your Honour was able to see me.

MR. SPEAKER:

You were rather slow getting up, I did not notice.

MR. ROBERTS:

Well, Your Honour, I apologize if I was slow getting up. I was on my feet, whether that is getting up or not. It takes a while to get up in this House, particularly in response to the minister.

The bill itself, Sir, is insignificant, and the minister's introductory remarks were equally insignificant. Perhaps in response, when his turn comes, he could tell us what is this bit about needing an amendment to legislation to appoint an assistant deputy minister. If the minister has some indication that that was so, I would be most interested in it. I will not say it was not so, I will simply say I never heard of it here or anywhere else. And I do not think that there is any legislation in this Province which requires an amendment to any legislation, to any statute to enable the minister or more correctly the Governor-in-Council -- I think he is probably getting that word from his colleague, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer), who is, among many other better things than the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), he is a better lawyer.

MR. ROBERTS: I do not really know what he is talking about, but since he said it. I suppose we have to try to respond. If any hon. gentleman opposite can help me on the point I would be most grateful.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry?

DR. COLLINS: The holder (inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Well, the holders of this might well like to have legislative sanction, but there is nothing in this that says anything about an assistant deputy minister.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I do not know.

The minister made some reference

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Well, there may well be another reason, in which case perhaps the minister ought to have given it. I mean, how do I know what passes through the minister's mind? I have enough trouble trying to understand what comes from the minister's mouth. But the fact remains that, you know, whatever the minister is up to with this bill, I suggest it is not a matter of needing authority to appoint an extra assistant deputy minister. There is nothing in the bill that does that. So maybe the minister in closing can do what he ought to have done in opening and tell us exactly what the bill will achieve and why he wants to achieve it.

Now, as for the splitting the headship of the Finance Department into two, we have no problem with that. It was recommended by the Public Accounts Committee two or three years ago. I am not sure if it was during the chairmanship of my friend, the member for Lewisporte (Mr. White), that the Public Accounts Committee recommended that the

November 26, 1981

Tape 3795

PK - 3

MR. ROBERTS: functions of the Finance Department  
be further divided and that we have an official called the  
Comptroller General who, if I understand it, would simply



MR. ROBERTS:

briefly put, be in charge of the expenditure side and we would have a deputy minister who would be in charge of the policy side. Again I am not sure if that is a correct understanding, and again I would say the minister could perhaps -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS:

- when we are all ready to go we will go on - the minister could perhaps address that in his closing remarks and tell us exactly what each of these officials is going to do. But I understand that they are going to divide up the functions of the officials in the Department of Finance.

MR. WHITE:

It has been done, boy.

MR. ROBERTS:

As my friend from Lewisporte (Mr. White) says it had been done some considerable time ago and we are, as always, locking the barn door, whether the horse has been stolen or not, we are locking the barn door after the act.

I would be grateful - it just peaks my curiosity - if the minister could tell us how he is going to choose between two deputy ministers. Subsection 2 of the new section 4 will provide that both the Deputy Minister of Finance and the Comptroller General of Finance shall be deputy heads of the department. Now, I do not know if that means they are equal in every sense and, if so, I am not sure I understand how that will function. Are we to have two Departments of Finance or one? My understanding is that by law in this Province there must be a deputy head of the department who is responsible to the Auditor-General and through the Auditor-General to this House for the expenditure of funds. The ministers themselves are not responsible in the legal sense for the expenditure of funds, they are responsible politically, and it is the deputy head of the department, the deputy minister who is responsible for the expenditure of the funds voted by the House.

MR. ROBERTS:

Now in the case of the Finance Department we are apparently to have two deputy heads of the department and I wonder if the minister could tell us where that gets us? Is one to be senior to the other or what? I am just not sure, It is as if we had two Premiers or two Ministers of Finance, I am not just sure how that works, perhaps the minister can tell us. I am sure he has thought the matter through.

The rest of the bill simply allows officials, other than the deputy minister, the Comptroller General, allows officials other than them, to sign documents. That in itself does not particularly bother me, similar provisions, I think, are probably found in most of the legislation which has been set up from time to time to govern the different departments into which the Queen's government in this Province is currently divided. And there is no particular reason why a junior official ought not to be allowed to sign as long as the government are prepared to be bound by what junior officials may do or may not do. Given the growth in government and the growth in activity, there is no problem.

Now having said that, Mr. Speaker, I have been asked by one of my absent colleagues, who is away for a bit -

MR. NEARY:

I am here.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, I am sorry, my friend is back. Well I shall very briefly speak and then allow the gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) to touch upon it, because he is much more aware of it than I am. But I would remind the minister that a year or so past he informed the House that, righteous as he was -

MR. NEARY: The Premier.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, the Premier, Well, the Premier is even more righteous than the minister, if possible, and certainly at least as sanctimonious - that in response to certain points raised by the Auditor General with respect to the administration of the Department of Finance, and in particular certain jollities which have been paid for out of public funds that ought not to have been paid for out of public funds, namely - was it a dinner in Gander?

MR. NEARY: No, a shoot.

MR. ROBERTS: A shoot.

MR. NEARY: Yes. It was the Tory Convention.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, it was the filming, it was the political filming of the Tory convention in Gander.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. STIRLING: And the political poll.

MR. ROBERTS: And the political poll, both of which -

MR. NEARY: And the Public Works spending.

MR. CARTER: Do not look at us.

MR. ROBERTS: I would prefer not to look at the gentleman for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) for aesthetic reasons if no other. I would say to him, you know, he is over there clad in his seamless garment and he is like a prostitute living in a brothel and pretending to be a virgin. You know, do not look at him!

MR. NEARY: You just shocked the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook).

MR. ROBERTS: I did not shock any member of this House, What I said was perfectly parliamentary and also perfectly correct, as well as being accurate and as well as being true.

Now, we were back on the -

MR. SPEAKER (BAIRD): Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: If Your Honour has an order in this case, Your Honour better be very careful what the order is.

MR. SPEAKER: Relevancy.

MR. ROBERTS: I would think, Sir, that in talking to the finance policy of this Province it is quite relevant, to talk of things like that,

Now, where was I before -

MR. CARTER: Raking up ancient history.

MR. NEARY: That will hold him for a while.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, my friend, the member for St. John's North, speaks of raking up ancient history. Sir, his mind stop thinking about 1969, politically. He has been doing very well raising savory since then. Excellent savory it is, Sir. The only savory thing about the administration of which he is such an adornment is what he produces up there on Mount Scio. I am not raking up ancient history, Sir, I am speaking of a document that I am sure the hon. gentleman would just as soon he never heard of, the most recent Auditor General's report, in which it was pointed out that Her Majesty's ministers, righteous, sanctimonious, dedicated as they are to the public weal - w-e-a-l for the benefit of the gentleman for St. John's North - have seen fit to use money which they had taken from my constituents and other people throughout the Province by such delicate means as, you know, taxes on building supplies and taxes on almost everything that we can think of, by such delicate means as the property tax which the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) is slowly but steadfastly shoving down the gullets of every person in this Province, and this tax money that has been

MR. ROBERTS:

exacted by the Minister of Finance and his minions was being used to finance political polls and used to finance political television commercials.

MR. NEARY: And McConnell's stuff too, do not forget that. McConnell Advertising.

MR. CARTER: It was not used to build Premier's houses.

MR. ROBERTS: It was not used to build Premiers' houses. Well, of course, it is being used to pay for the Premier's house, is it not? And, of course, the gentleman from St. John's North (Mr. Carter) supports wholeheartedly the fact that we have only one Premier in Canada who is living on the public trough and that is the Premier of this Province. The only Premier in all Canada who is living on the public trough, with his snout in the public trough, is the Premier of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: And the hon. gentleman from St. John's North supports that, I do not.

AN HON. MEMBER: The next Premier (inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: The next Premier is not living on the public trough, the next Premier is sitting here in his seat as the Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Sir, as I was saying before the hon. gentleman opposite - I simply want to ask the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) if he would be kind enough in his generosity to let us in on the well-kept secret of what he has done to honour the commitment which he made, or which his Premier made to the House? What was the commitment?

MR. STIRLING: The Premier agreed with the Auditor General and he would get the money back.

MR. ROBERTS: My friend, the Leader of the Opposition reminds us the Premier agreed with the Auditor General. And well he might. The Auditor General was dead on.

Ah, they have yanked out the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) now, they are sending in a substitute, the gentleman from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Tweedle Dum!

Now, where was I?

I would remind the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) that the Premier made a solemn commitment and we know the Premier is a man of his word. We know that we are entitled to rely upon the Premier's word. We know that the Premier's commitment is his bond and there can be no more solemn commitment than the commitment of the Premier standing in his place in this House saying that he is going to take action to recover public money. Now, he made the commitment.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. ROBERTS: And all I want the Minister of Finance to tell us, if he would be so kind, is how much money we have recovered, when we recovered it and from whom, and if we have not recovered anything as yet, what are we doing about it? Has he got his bailiffs out? Has he issued a writ? Has he sacked the RCM Police on to it? What has he done? That is all we want him to answer. It is grand to have a Comptroller General, it is grand to have an Auditor General, it is grand to have all these people. In fact, the more I see of the Minister of Finance in the performance of his duties, the more I believe he needs even more help, and I, for one, will gladly vote him as much help as he could possibly want

MR. ROBERTS: and then more because he  
needs it.

MR. STIRLING: There would never be enough.

MR. ROBERTS: But what I do want to know -  
I mean, I could talk a great deal about the Finance  
Department, but there will be another time. I could  
talk about the Minister of Finance's (Dr. Collins)  
poltroonly performance in bringing in a mini-budget and  
refusing - and his colleagues

MR. ROBERTS:

over there, Twiddle Dum, Twiddle Dee.

DR. COLLINS:

Say something substantial.

MR. ROBERTS:

I am sorry.

DR. COLLINS:

Say something substantial.

MR. ROBERTS:

I will - say something substantial.

The trouble is, Sir, that saying something substantial to the minister is throwing pearls before swine, Sir.

Now what I am saying is substantial, Sir, it is \$36 million, and if the minister - you know, is it not interesting how the minister when he gently prodded in - he knows he has done wrong. He knows he has no justification. He knows that he and his colleague have no reason to refuse to tell the people of this Province where they have cut \$50 million.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Why are they hiding it?

MR. ROBERTS:

Why are they hiding it? Oh they hope to sneak it through in next year's Budget. They suspect that there will be so much bad news in the next Budget, if in fact we ever see a Budget, - my friend for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) who, from time to time is not a bad prognosticator has prognosticated, that is, p-r-o-g-n-o-s-t-i-c-a-t-e-d, for the benefit of the minister -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS:

- has prognosticated, has made a prognosis that the government will not have the intestinal fortitude to bring a Budget before this House, that instead they will go to the country. It is all the same to us. I would just as soon see the people do the job on them than to have to do it here in the House.

DR. COLLINS:

(Inaudible) sensible (inaudible) for a change.

MR. ROBERTS:

Mr. Speaker, you know, how can I deal with that? I mean, when I was a child I spake



MR. ROBERTS: as a child, but the minister speaks as a child even though he is well beyond the years of official maturity.

Now, Sir, I could go on.

MR. TULK: You have said enough.

MR. ROBERTS: I am not going to, I want to give the minister a chance to do what he ought to have done in opening the debate, namely, to explain what this bill does.

MR. TULK: You have said enough.

MR. ROBERTS: And in terms -

AN HON. MEMBER: Give him time.

MR. ROBERTS: Maybe I cannot understand - give him time. Yes there is a saying 'Give a man enough rope and he will hang himself'. It happened to Sterling Lyon and I venture to say it will happen to the present Premier. All we need is the election, but we cannot call the election. It may even happen to the hon. gentleman for the Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow)-

MR. WOODROW: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: - who is in a long, long time. But knowing the gentleman for the Bay of Islands, Sir, he will have arranged to have the rope well greased.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: (Inaudible) is always ready, always prepared.

MR. ROBERTS: I must say, Sir, -

MR. NEARY: Like the greasy poll that they used to have down at the Regetta.

MR. ROBERTS: - this House would be a different and a far lesser place without the benefit of the hon. gentleman for the Bay of Islands.

MR. WOODROW: I might say, I might say -

MR. ROBERTS: They too have a right to be represented.

MR. WOODROW:

My friend for LaPoile

(Mr. Neary) turned against me the other day, I am surprised.

MR. ROBERTS:

Well, Mr. Speaker,

MR. WOODROW:

I do not seem (inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS:

- all I have to say is, not

with reference to my friend for LaPoile, and the hon. gentleman's friend for LaPoile, but the rest of the hon. gentlemen opposite's friends, if he has more friends like that he does not need any enemies, because we know what they say about him. He should be over here fighting -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS:

- for his principles, l-e-s.

Now, Sir, I simply want to say to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) that I would ask him to support this bill by explaining, We are prepared to vote along with him, but more than that I wonder if he - and I am quite serious, Maybe I am speaking in my own jocular and festive manner, but I am wondering if he would be kind enough to tell us what he, as the minister in charge of collecting money and of the government's financial

MR. ROBERTS:

affairs, what he has done, and he is the man to do it, to discharge the Premier's solid commitment? The Premier did make a commitment publicly here in the House. And whatever doubts and differences I may have with the Premier, I know he is a man of his word and I know he meant it. And I am sure that as the words fell from his lips the minister went scurrying—and I know how the minister can scurry, I have seen him scurry many times when words fell from the Premier's lips. And I am sure the minister scurried and said to his officials, Now let us get cracking, boys—or boys and girls if we are liberated down there now—let us get going. We have not heard a word on it since then. If the minister would be kind enough to tell us what he has done. The matter was well ventilated. It is in the Public Accounts Committee, it is in their report and I think that perhaps he owes it to the House.

Now, if he chooses not to answer, and he is quite capable of it, Sir, and he also has the right not to answer, we will draw the inference, the unavoidable, inescapable and really quite unimpeachable inference that he has something to hide. What he is hiding may be inaction.

DR. COLLINS: That is the shyster's way of operating.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I do not know anything about shysters. The hon. gentleman can speak about his own friends. I do not know anything about that. All I will say to the hon. gentleman is I ask him to answer. If he does not answer I am saying to him that any objective observer will draw an inference and the inference is that the minister has something to hide. What he may have to hide may be simply inaction. It may be stupidity. It may be cupidity. I do not know what it is. All I want to say is let the minister answer. Then when we have heard what he has to say we can judge and we shall judge. That is our function here.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, that is all I want to say on the bill. The bill itself is absolutely unexceptional. It achieves nothing to help to solve the problems of this Province. It is not going to put a piece of bread on a plate in this Province. It is not going to help the fish plants. It is not going to help the workers in the fish plants. It is not going to help to build roads. It is not going to help to build schools. It is not going to help to solve the labour difficulties. It is not going to help to do anything. But if the government really feels that we are going to get further on by having another official, another senior official, then, for my part, I am prepared, as I have said, to give the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) all the help he wants. If ever there was a man, Sir, in this Province who needed help with his official duties it is the Minister of Finance. Thank you.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I presume the House will rise at five-thirty. Anyway I only have a couple of minutes, but in the couple of minutes that I have I want to congratulate my colleague, the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts), for making such a magnificent speech in this House, Mr. Speaker. I do not think that I have ever heard the hon. gentleman as good as he was today. I have heard him when he has been excellent but today

MR. NEARY: I think he outdid himself. And I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that some of the hon. gentlemen in the government benches have been taught a lesson, not to spar with my hon. colleague, the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts).

MR. ROBERTS: Their trouble is they come to the battle of wits half armed.

MR. NEARY: That is right. They will come out on the losing end every time. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to also thank the member for the Strait of Belle Isle, in my absence, for bringing up this matter of the unfinished business in connection with the Public Works spending, the Devine Advertising political poll and the McConnell Advertising misuse of public funds.

Now all these three matters were supposed to be dealt with. There has been a recommendation made to the House by the Public Accounts Committee, that civil action be taken to recover these monies and so far there is no indication that anything has been done, that any steps have been taken by the Justice Department to recover the funds or to determine whether or not criminal action should be laid. I want to thank my friend for raising that matter. He dealt with it adequately so I will not bore the House with repeating some of the things that he already said.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) before we adjourn, - and the minister has the authority and the right to do this, Mr. Speaker - I would like to ask the minister if he would bring into this House now, while we are debating this bill -

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Fifteen seconds.

MR. NEARY: Fifteen seconds - bring in a list of all those who are in arrears with their retail sales tax, as indicated in the latest edition of the Auditor General's Report - as of March 31, 1981, a list of all those in arrears with their retail sales tax. I move the adjournment of the debate, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. -

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Pardon?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: If a motion to adjourn comes up now, right?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I do not know how long the hon. gentleman wants to be, we could -

MR. NEARY: No, I want to reserach so we will do it tomorrow.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Right. Well -

MR. WHITE: We will adjourn now.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourn now?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Well, it depends on the majority vote, you know, whether we adjourn or not.

MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to Standing Order 31 (h) it being five-thirty a motion to adjourn is deemed to be before the House. And the motion is that this House do now adjourn. Those in favour say 'aye', those opposed say 'nay'. I therefore have to declare that the 'nays' have it and the motion is not carried.

MR. STIRLING: That means we carry on until 8:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER: Six o'clock.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: This being Thursday, I presume that we would then carry on now-having agreed that it is not now six o'clock, that we go on until eight o'clock.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: No, that is not correct.  
MR. SPEAKER: With respect to the point of order

raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) at 5:30 p.m. the procedure is that the notice is given by the Speaker that a motion is deemed to be before the House. But there are no matters for debate on today's Late Show as per the usual situation, so then we put the motion to adjourn obviously now, which I did, but the motion to adjourn now was defeated. But actually the motion should be put at six o'clock.

MR. STIRLING: Do we put the motion again?

MR. SPEAKER: At six o'clock.

MR. STIRLING: At six o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, that would be my interpretation of it.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: How much time do I have, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member spoke for two minutes only, he has twenty-eight minutes remaining.

MR. NEARY: Twenty-eight minutes remaining.

MR. SPEAKER: Up to twenty-eight minutes.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I was about to ask - I wish I had my time back, Mr. Speaker, if I only had my time back -

MR. TULK: Do not we all.

MR. NEARY: - I would go ahead with my Late Show, because I wanted to leave and now I have to stay anyway, because I wanted to move the -

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

MR. MORGAN: By leave (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Unless, Mr. Speaker, I could move the adjournment of the House until three o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): Well, if the hon. member would like, I can ask if there is some sort of leave because I understand the hon. member has a special reason to leave early and he, in fact, withdrew his Late Show question. So if hon. members, to clarify it, could agree we could allow the hon. member to use his twenty-eight minutes the next time this debate comes up and let somebody else speak right now.

Is that agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed. So the hon. member can have his twenty-eight minutes when the debate carries on the next day and we will allow somebody else to speak, if there is somebody else who wishes to speak.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Okay, the hon. gentleman has now moved the adjournment of the debate, that is what has happened, correct?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Okay, then we can still continue on until six on other matters or adjourn the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Oh, I see. Okay.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Now that the hon. the President of the Council is here I will (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: So the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has simply adjourned the debate on that bill, which is quite in order, and we can carry on until six o'clock with any other matter that wishes to be raised. Fair enough? The hon. member has twenty-eight minutes remaining the next time.

Order 19. Bill No. 99

Motion, second reading of a bill entitled: "An Act To Amend the Insurance Companies Act". (Bill 99).

The hon. Minister of Justice.



November 26, 1981

Tape No. 3802

SD - 3

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As the situation now is, without this amendment, I think that is the best way to explain it, without this amendment the Superintendent of Insurance or somebody designated by him may order an audit or an

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

inspection of insurance companies' books if he is of the opinion that there is something wrong, that there are errors or if there is something wrong. What we wish to do by amending the act is to establish it as a right for such inspections to be carried out.

In other words, there should be on a regular basis, a fairly regular basis - I do not mean people snooping around every day or every week, but on a fairly regular basis, inspections and audits as an aspect of protection of the consumer, protection of the user of insurance. And one could well say that if an inspection or an audit has to wait until the Superintendent of Insurance or one of his agents has reason to believe that there is something wrong, then, obviously, one could be closing the barn door after the horse is gone. So it appears to us that what is certainly preferable from the point of view of protection of the consumer is to establish the right of the superintendent to have an inspection or audit when he so wishes. I should add, I think, in fairness to the insurance industry, that we have in fact carried on inspections and audits without the insurance industry requiring any proof. There has been one going on.

But this will establish it as a right for the superintendent to have an audit or inspection without having to have any proof or inkling or feeling whatsoever that the books are inaccurate or that somebody is not complying with the law. And from the point of view of consumer protection, certainly, it is preferable, and it could well be argued that it is only in this way that adequate consumer protection can be provided. And I think it has a special relevance in a kind of economic and financial situation that we are in now, which can affect, obviously, all kinds of businesses. That is the principle of the bill.

MR. STIRLING:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Opposition.

The hon. the Leader of the

MR. STIRLING:

Mr. Speaker, we would like to support the bill. I specifically have some knowledge of the subject matter, having spent most of my business career in the insurance business.

We have developed in this Province quite a large number of local companies, and people are under the impression that this kind of audit is taking place; and this legislation is needed to give the superintendent the full authority to do the kinds of audits and inspections

MR. STIRLING: needed in order to reassure people that they can have that kind of sense of security. There have been some recent bad examples, not necessarily in Newfoundland but elsewhere, of where an adequate audit programme must be carried out. And we, on this side, would have no hesitation in supporting the need for this kind of thing. We do have an excellent Superintendent of Insurance and a first-class staff, but they need additional staff, they need additional authority. Because up until this time many Newfoundlanders may have been living under a kind of false sense of security. The federal companies have a very elaborate inspection service, audit service and the Newfoundland companies have not been subjected to the same kind of scrutiny as they will now be subjected to with this new bill.

Mr. Speaker, we would not wish to delay the passage of this bill any longer other than to say that we support it and support the need for it.

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

If the hon. minister speaks now he will close the debate.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the hon. Leader of the Opposition for his support of the bill and certainly he probably knows more directly about insurance than anybody else in this House.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not necessarily now.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Well, perhaps not. I do not know. Which reminds me, and I will just make a passing reference to it, that during the Summer the Superintendents of Insurance from across Canada had their annual meeting in Newfoundland. They go from province to province and I presume every ten years they get in Newfoundland. But that was a group of several hundred, because it is not only the superintendents, it is representatives from the entire insurance industry. I believe there must have been 500 or 600 people here including spouses. And I do believe that the people in the Consumer Affairs Division of the Department of Justice, the Superintendent and

MR. OTTENHEIMER: his staff did an excellent job in organizing such a huge group. I did not realize when I went to speak to them one evening - and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) was there and attended a number of their functions, and I spoke to them one evening and I did not realize until I was there what a huge group it was, 600 or 700 I would think and perhaps more, from all across Canada and, indeed, some from the U.S. and the U.K. and I believe from Germany and a few other countries. Certainly there is no doubt that the insurance industry is a very important factor in the commercial life of the Province. Apart from the protection it affords people, the number of people employed in the various aspects of the insurance industry would be a considerable number, at least some hundreds in the Province.

MR. STIRLING: More than in the offshore gas and oil.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Eight or nine hundred, that many?

MR. STIRLING: Or more than that.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: It could be. Of course the difference being, and this is no denigration of

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

of the insurance and the other primary production, but that does not make it any less important. It certainly is extremely important.

And I just wanted to draw to hon. members attention, they may not have been aware of the quite, quite large gathering of people in the insurance industry across Canada which was held in St. John's during the Summer, and what an excellent job those who made the arrangements, and they included the local insurance industry who had an involvement as well, what an excellent job people did and I think it certainly showed the Province in a very good light. I often think that a successful gathering of that nature- I mean, it would be something like when the parliamentarians from across Canada were here as well -that a successful gathering of that nature can do an awful lot more toward the development of understanding and goodwill toward our Province, and if you wish, tourism in a certain sense, but certainly goodwill than, you know, a lot of money, perhaps, spent on advertising, you know, on the Mainland or through the United States or that kind of thing.

However, be that as it may. I

move second reading.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Is it the pleasure of the House?

MR. STIRLING:

By leave. By leave!

MR. SPEAKER:

By leave.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING:

I would like to -it is one of those rare moments when you get the opportunity to compliment somebody on the other side. I attended that function that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) referred to and I told him then, and I would certainly like to say it now in this House of Assembly, that he made one of the finest speeches, certainly the finest

MR. STIRLING: speech I have ever heard him make, but it was also one of the finest speeches that I ever heard anyone make setting out the feelings that we have in Newfoundland and Labrador and something of our interests and ambitions. And he did it from a personal point of view, a personal philosophy. I complimented him that night and I do so again, it is one of those rare times when we can.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: It is not hard to see why he was chosen to head up the worldwide organization that he just won the election on. I was very proud of him and very pleased to be there and I certainly want to take this opportunity to compliment him and would certainly like to see him continue in that same vein whenever he speaks on behalf of Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. BAIRD: Come on over.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms): I thank the hon. member.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Insurance Companies Act", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No. 99).

MR. MARSHALL: Order No. 21, Bill No. 100.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend  
The Provincial Parks Act". (Bill No. 100)

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the  
Minister of Recreation, Culture and Youth (Mr. Andrews), this  
is a bill that is, I suppose you might say, housekeeping in  
nature although it still is an important bill. The purpose  
of this bill is to provide that provincial parks shall have  
the effect of provincial parks, from the point of view of  
law since July 1, 1978, notwithstanding the fact that under  
the Statute and Subordinate Legislations Act the effect  
of the naming of the acts or the promulgation of the acts  
was not put in the Newfoundland Gazette until August of 1980.  
So notwithstanding the fact that it was published in the Gazette  
in August of 1980, we lead this act in so that there will be  
no doubt that provincial parks did exist and were constituted  
as provincial parks for the purpose of fees, and what have you,  
that have already been collected as of December 31, 1978.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, that is not necessarily  
a very good explanation. Because, obviously, somebody slipped up  
along the way, if there is a need for this type of housekeeping  
legislation. It is almost retroactive legislation and I think  
the minister, when he closes the debate, should tell us exactly  
what the problem was, who made the mistake, where the mistake  
was made and how often this kind of thing happens. Because  
it should not happen. There could be legal consequences and  
that kind of thing, if somebody does not spot it and bring  
in the necessary change quickly.

I am not going to say very much on  
it except to ask the minister to be a little more elaborate  
in terms of explaining the need for this bill and what went  
wrong in the first place.



MR. WHITE: I would also like to raise one other thing, Mr. Speaker, with respect to provincial parks, which the government might tell us now. The former minister responsible for provincial parks indicated at one stage that the government was thinking about the privatization of provincial parks, leasing some of the parks or actually selling them to private enterprise in the Province. And I would like to know, when the minister closes the debate, whether or not this thinking is still going on within the administration.

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

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, just a brief note on that, the privatization of the provincial parks. I am also extremely interested in that. But in bringing this up, one of the things I would like

MR. HISCOCK:

to ask - there were supposed to be possibly two national parks for Labrador. I do not know if the minister would ever like to comment on that, if we are having any negotiations and if we expect to have these national parks in the future, if it is five years, ten years or when.

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

MR. BENNETT: A few comments, Mr. Speaker, if you would. Provincial parks; we have a couple in my district and naturally the opportunity to express a view is appreciated. When my colleague wonders about the possibility of leasing, and then I look at the ramifications of certain lands being held up, prime areas, for park development and not being developed for the good of the people of the Province and visitors - and I speak specifically, Mr. Speaker, of an area in my district, know as Three Mile Pond. People of that general area have been asking to have a park established to accommodate the overflow of traffic that finds themselves in the gravel pits. They cannot be accommodated in the existing parks, so they are quite anxious to have a park established in the Three Mile Pond area. And it is a beautiful spot. I have travelled over it and took a look at it myself and I have supported their efforts in their approach to the minister in having a park established. If the provincial government finds they cannot finance such an enterprise or an expansion, I wonder if indeed lands of that sort could not be leased to private entrepreneurs who could develop and provide the service that we so badly need in that area. While I have the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, I do not know how many of you know of fatalities brought about by chains being drawn across the gateways of provincial parks after season, after the season a chain is put across. Now, in my district there

November 26, 1981

Tape No. 3807

RA - 2

MR. BENNETT: have been two young persons killed on snowmobiles. I brought it to the ministers attention last year and wondered if these chains could be removed, after a fatality at River of Ponds Provincial

MR. BENNETT:

Park - a young lad, 17 years old got a chain across his face and it killed him. It was the second one in the District of St. Barbe and I think it is a real deathtrap to have such chains - an obstruction that is a real hazard. You speak of safety belts- chains across the gates of Provincial Parks and young people on snowmobiles are inclined to use Provincial Parks. It is a beautiful place to be able to use snowmobiles. They are generally alongside of lakes the lakes are used and the parks get to be used by snowmobiles and it is just natural to use the access that is used all year. When you have a chain across the road that is used for three or four months of the year -

I am sorry, when you have no chain across a public road that is used for three or four months of the year and then all of a sudden you have a chain erected, then you have a snowfall that camouflages a chain that is about three feet or less, two feet probably off the road, the snowfall will hide that chain, camouflage that chain and it is a very dangerous situation we find ourselves in to have such obstruction. And I would certainly like to see something better put across the access to our Provincial Parks. I notice already that chains have been put in place now. As I drove along by River of Ponds Park a few days ago, there is a chain drawn across the road and there are a few red ribbons to identify it; to make it more visible. But, all of this gets covered in snow and a youngster going along ten miles an hour on a snowmobile stands to have his neck broken. There was a young fellow last year in River of Ponds, a chain took him right across the mouth and killed him instantly, and it is the second that I know about over in that area.

I think there was one in the Bay of Islands. Mr. Speaker, I wish the hon. member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) was here. Mr. Speaker, I

MR. BENNETT: would certainly like to recommend to the minister that something that will not cost any more money than a chain be put in place. You can have like a gate that is visible, quite visible and high enough to stay out of the snow, and once it is closed, it is closed, and nobody would try to go through that roadway again. It has been a real disaster.

So I hope, Mr. Speaker, that will get to be a reality in time, and I hope, Mr. Speaker, while I have the chance to reiterate, my desire to see a provincial park established in the Three Mile Pond area, because we are swamped - since the road is completely paved up in the Northern Peninsula, we have a lot of people looking for places to pitch their tents or to be accommodated. And it is much easier to control garbage that accumulates if we can assemble people in parks and provide the services. People are prepared to pay for these services; proper water facilities available, proper garbage disposal available. So, Mr. Speaker, I most certainly want to see the government take another look at it. They have already, in their wisdom, decided against putting a provincial park in the Three Mile Pond area, but I certainly want to reiterate now as strongly as I possibly can, they change their minds on this particular issue and hopefully we will see a park in the Three Mile Pond area.

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

If the hon. the President of the Council speaks now he will close the debate.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I address myself first to the legitimate concerns raised by the hon. the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Bennett) over the unfortunate

MR. MARSHALL:

incidents which occurred.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, the provincial parks had always had chains across them when they were closed all year, but they had done it legally and they had streamers, which were required by law, attached to them.

Now, after this unfortunate incident, what was decided to be done was during the Wintertime when snowmobiling starts, the chains are to be removed in the future, they will not be there any longer. At the present time, the hon. member sees them across the parks and certainly, they are there now and they are there for a very good reason, because of the soft condition of

MR. MARSHALL: of the soft condition of the road and we do not want, obviously, unauthorized traffic going in there and tearing up the roads that are in the parks. But during the snowmobiling season, the chains will come down and they will remain down until the snow goes. So I think that will answer that particular question. Commenting on what the member for Lewisport (Mr. White) said, you know, he is in some respects correct. Obviously, this should have gone in to the Gazette at a certain period of time. And, you know, you can get up and you can heap blame on people but fortunately we do not deal with computers, people are not computers, they are not machines, Everybody makes mistakes. Even the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House make a perfusion of them. Even, sometimes, ministers in the government make mistakes from time to time. And even the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) makes mistakes from time to time, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: What? What? No!

MR. MARSHALL: So that is why we have - this is why - I think the hon. member for Lewisport was sort of making a mountain out of a molehill but yes, we will confess there was a mistake and that is the reason why this bill is brought in. It was not a very critical mistake, Mr. Speaker, it was just an oversight, they forgot to run it in the Gazette at the period in time. They found out after it was not a felony, it was not a crime or anything like that. And that is why we are doing what we are doing now, bringing this bill in. And with respect to his question of privatizing the parks, this is a matter that is still of some concern to the government. We are looking at it and we are always examining ways to improve the service to the public. At such time as we see that the service to the public, and the public can best be served by privatizing the parks, it will be

MR. MARSHALL: done. But that is not what we see in the immediate future, At the present time, however, we are still considering it. The member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) asked when are we going to get, I believe, the national parks in Labrador. Would that, Mr. Speaker, he could tell us when we are going to, because it is part and parcel of the attempts to get the federal government to respond to the legitimate requirements of this Province. And anything the hon. member for Eagle River can do to assist us in getting his colleagues in Ottawa to bring about this, we would very much appreciate it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: I think I have answered all of the questions. The member for St. Barbe (Mr. Bennett) asked about Three Mile Pond and, you know, and also when more parks are going to be there. We would like to provide - we have provided parks and we have provided services to the parks. They are well received by people. We have spent a considerable amount of money, as the hon. member knows. We have limited resources in this Province. But as we go on and our resources increase, so will the number of parks increase and we will certainly keep in mind



MR. MARSHALL: the proposal in his district - now I am not being nasty and we will bring it in as soon as we can. We would hope that the time, it would not be too long, certainly in time, for his successor to probably sit on this side of the House. But we will bring it in, Mr. Speaker, and we will put that park up there as well as all the other parks that are needed in this Province, as soon as we get the money.

So I think I have addressed myself to all of the questions that have arisen, and, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the minister I move second reading.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Provincial Parks Act", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No. 100).

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Friday, at 10:00 a.m. and that this House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: Before I put the question to the motion I feel obligated to, since the debate a little earlier mentioned the fact that everybody is human and makes mistakes, admit to having made one myself. Perhaps it could be called an oversight. But for clarification purposes I have to admit to a misinterpretation, at least on my part, something which rarely occurs, I know hon. members will agree.

AN HON. MEMBER: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: With respect to the proceedings that transpired at 5:30 p.m., and I think everybody will admit there was a bit of confusion and things happened

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): quite quickly, but the  
Standing Orders -

MR. STIRLING: We did raise a point of  
order then.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes. - Standing Order  
31(h) states, and that is with reference to the debate  
on the Late Show on Thursday, "Notwithstanding the  
the provisions of Standing Order 14, the motion to  
adjourn the House has been made and seconded, whereupon  
such motion shall be debatable for not more than thirty  
minutes, but no matter shall be debated during those  
thirty minutes unless notice has been given as provided  
in Standing Order 31(g). No debate may last" -and  
it goes on to talk about that.

"When the debate has  
lasted for a total of thirty minutes, or when debate on  
the matter or matters raised has ended" - it could be  
argued whether or not there was any debate on matters or  
not - "whichever occurs first" - at 6:00 p.m. or when  
the matters raised have been completed - "the Speaker  
shall put the motion to adjourn, and if the motion is  
carried, shall leave the Chair until Friday, but if the  
said motion is defeated, the Speaker shall leave the  
Chair until 8:00 p.m. when the order of business", blah,  
blah,blah!

What I wish to point out,  
first of all, is that because of the confusion and the  
matters that transpired and the request from the member  
for LaPoile(Mr. Neary) to let him carry on on another  
day and to raise another matter and so on and so forth,  
there was an interpretation on my part, and perhaps I was  
incorrect, obviously I was, and maybe I was not, but  
there was an interpretation on my part that there was  
sort of an agreement to carry on until six p.m., but

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): that, obviously, was not the case because, as the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) points out, they did raise a point of order on it.

In any event, I point it out because things were a bit confusing, I point it out now with apologies so that members can be aware of that if it should arise in the future. This is not really an alteration to my ruling, because I do not have the authority to alter my own rulings. But I want to point it out for clarification purposes in case it should arise in the future and I trust members will accept that explanation at this stage.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: In accordance with that interpretation, I presume that you will, having put the motion at 5:30 p.m. and the motion having been lost at 5:30 p.m. to adjourn, we voted for adjournment but the other side voted against it, that you will now leave the Chair and we will come back at 8:00 p.m. and then you will determine whether we carry on at 8:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER: No. I would have hoped that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition would have understood what I was trying to say. I was trying to apologize for making a mistake myself, on my own part. I cannot alter my own rulings. I ruled then, at that time, that we could carry on until 6:00 p.m. when the motion could be put. So we will now put the motion that has been placed on the floor by the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall). But I am pointing it out for future reference and asking for your sincere understanding.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, at 10:00 a.m.