

VOL. 2

NO. 65

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
10:00 A.M. - 1:00 P.M.
25 NOVEMBER 1983

The House met at 10:00 A.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

Before we begin, it is an extreme pleasure indeed for me to welcome to the Speaker's gallery today the Member of Parliament for St. John's East, the hon. James McGrath.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

I would also like to welcome to the galleries twenty-five students from the Elwood Regional High School in Deer Lake, with their teachers, Mr. Feltham and Mr. Griffiths.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the hon. House about the budworm situation in this Province as forecasted for 1984. It is currently estimated that moderate and severe defoliation may occur over 43,000 hectares with another 45,000 hectares expected to be lightly infested for an overall Island total of 88,000 hectares. Mr. Speaker, just let me say that our means of estimating at this time of the year is, that besides our observations on the ground, we also do what is called an egg mass count during the Fall where we go out and collect samples from many areas of the Province and by counting those egg masses on the branches of trees we can reasonably predict what kind of infestation you will have for next year. However, it is not perfectly accurate and it is usually followed up by some more observation during the Spring and that will, I guess, decide exactly the level of infestation you will have in 1984. This 88,000 hectares expected for 1984 is

MR. POWER: compared with the 1983 actual infestation of 57,000 hectares of moderate to severe infestation and 36,000 hectares of light infestation. In Labrador severe defoliation may occur over 1,000 hectares along the Beaver River with another 5,000 hectares of light defoliation expected near Goose Point.

Mr. Speaker, we have reviewed these figures jointly with the Canadian Forestry Service and the pulp and paper industry. This information will be further analyzed to identify the size of next year's insect control programme. Forecast maps, cutting plans and other information will now be reviewed by forestry officials to determine the magnitude of the control programme which will be necessary in 1984 to protect priority forest areas. It is intended that these plans will be prepared before the end of this year and an announcement made at that time.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to

MR. POWER:

take the opportunity to briefly inform the hon. House about the 1983 spray programme and its results. Although we had planned to spray 86,000 hectares based on forecast information, the actual area sprayed in 1983 was 73,000 hectares. This area was revised downwards because of some lower than expected budworm populations. In addition to using normal regular matacil, we also used a new formulation called flowable matacil which is an improvement because of the absence of nonylphenol in this formulation. One DC-6 and one AG-CAT aircraft were used in the spray programme which lasted from June 6 to the 26th 1983 and was completed without any problems.

Mr. Speaker, the programme was successful in terms of 73-100 per cent mortality of the insects in the spray areas and good foliage protection was obtained.

Mr. Speaker, looking at the 1983 infestation and the 1984 forecast, it appears that the infestation in 1984 will be lower than it was in 1983. This is certainly good news. However, considering the history of budworm infestation and magnitude of accumulated dead and dying wood, we cannot afford any further losses. Therefore, a protection programme will have to be instituted in 1984. I shall further advise the hon. House when plans are formulated and areas delineated for the protection programme.

Let me also say, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, that the spruce budworm spray programme is part of an overall forest management plan for the Province of Newfoundland, a forest management

MR. POWER: plan which, I might add, is gaining some credence in all of Canada as being one of the most progressive and aggressive forest management plans in any province in this country. In combination with this forest protection programme we are also doing a wide range of silvicultural projects. Since this administration took control in 1979, when we planted 200,000 seedlings, this year we are planting 6.5 million seedlings. So all our silvicultural work, our reforestation programmes, our nursery programmes in combination with this spruce budworm programme, which has been done in 1983 and predicted for 1984, all those things should at least assure, as well as man can, that we will have a good forest in the future.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, it is Friday again. I do not know if there is any significance to the fact that the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Power) always bring in these Ministerial Statements concerning the spray programme on Fridays.

MR. MORGAN:

He has not brought one in for months.

MR. NEARY:

And, you know something, Mr. Speaker, that is right, there has been nothing brought in this House for months, and I suppose this statement is about the nearest that we can get in this session to a statement on the economy or on our natural resources.

MR.NEARY: This is about as close as you could get, Mr. Speaker. But anyway,I will tell you one thing about the statement that concerns us very much, Sir, is the fact that the spruce budworm has moved into Labrador.

MR. NEARY: We understand it is spreading rapidly in that area. In the Eagle River - Goose Bay area the damage that is being done, so I am told by my colleague, the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), is devastating.

MR. WARREN: It has increased from last year.

MR. NEARY: Yes, increased from last year. We are very concerned about this and we are very concerned about what is happening to our forests in this Province, Mr. Speaker. We cannot debate the minister's statement now under the rules of the House, but we will look forward to the spray programme, when it is announced for the coming year, and we will have more to say about that when the minister gives us some more details here in the House, Mr. Speaker. We are glad to hear that the count is down, that the situation is improving, but I cannot help noting that this may never have happened if we had had proper forest management in this Province. Mr. Speaker, as hon. members know, the spruce budworm thrives and prospers where you have mature and over-mature timber.

MR. MORGAN: You oppose the spraying.

MR. NEARY: And so did the hon. gentleman when he was a member of the Cabinet. As a member of the Cabinet, the hon. gentleman opposed it. But it is too bad that there was not better forest management.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have to say this since I was so rudely interrupted by the hon. gentleman, that the spruce budworm came to Newfoundland in 1972, the same year the government changed and the Tories took over in this Province. But, Mr. Speaker, I am not implying that there is any connection between the two happenings.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!
The hon. gentleman's time has expired.

Before we continue, I would like to welcome to the galleries a delegation from the Badger's Quay - Valleyfield - Pool's Island Town Council, with councillors James Compton, Winston Ricketts and the Town Manager, Harry Hardy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of questions for the hon. the Premier in connection with a very important matter that we have not heard very much about recently. As usual, of course, the information is kept very tight to the hon. gentleman's vest. They seem to want to carry on all kinds of secret talks and negotiations and not tell the House or tell the people of this Province what is going on. Now, could the hon. gentleman inform the House if negotiations

MR. NEARY:

are still continuing with the Province of Quebec in connection with the reopening of the Upper Churchill Falls agreement, and the development of the rivers whose headwaters are in Newfoundland and Labrador but flow into the Province of Quebec, and the development of the Lower Churchill? Are these negotiations still ongoing, Mr. Speaker?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. gentleman indicate to the House what is being talked about? is it a package deal or is it just one particular, specific item that they are talking to Quebec about? Could the hon. gentleman tell the House whether it is the package deal that is being talked about that was put forward by the Government of Canada, by the Minister of Energy at the time, the hon. Marc Lalonde, and by the Energy Minister in the Province of Quebec? Is that the package that we are talking about?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am unable at this time to provide the House and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) with the details of the talks that are proceeding. When it is appropriate, obviously we will fully inform the members of the House and the people of the Province.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could the hon. gentleman tell the House if there is a deadline on the negotiations

MR. NEARY: and, if so, could he tell us the deadline date?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: No, Mr. Speaker, Talks are proceeding and, as I said, we will inform the hon. gentleman and the House and the people of Newfoundland when it is appropriate.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it has been reported that the deadline for negotiations is the end of December. Could the hon. gentleman tell the House that, if it is necessary, negotiations will continue on past the end of December, on into 1984?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, when it is appropriate we will inform the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) and the House and the people of the Province.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Could the hon. gentleman tell the House when it will be appropriate? In his opinion, when is it appropriate to give the people of Newfoundland and Labrador information and to provide information to this House? When is that appropriate in the hon. gentleman's mind?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I guess, Mr. Speaker, when the talks have reached such a stage that we will not be jeopardizing the talks or jeopardizing the success of the talks. When exactly that will be - I do not have a crystal ball - depends on the talks and the details of the

PREMIER PECKFORD: talks, so that is a very difficult thing to be able to answer. I mean, how can I? I cannot predict that. It is a big matter and that is difficult to predict. We hope it is sooner rather than later, but that is just a hope on my part.

MR. NEARY: A final supplementary on this matter, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Could the hon. gentleman assure the House that all the details -the correspondence, the proposals, the reports and results of discussions-will be tabled in this House, that there will be nothing held back from the people of this Province as the administration has been doing for the last couple of years, that there be

MR. NEARY: no secrets, that the people of this Province and this House will be given all information in connection with these negotiations?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, unlike the administration that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) was a part of, when they did not even have a Question Period or sufficient time for the Opposition of the day to ask questions and to get information, unlike the administration of that day, which gave very few details, we pride ourselves, on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, and I guess it is one reason why we are on this side of the House, for being a straightforward, open administration and obviously in all our dealings we will be providing the people of Newfoundland and the Opposition with the information.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we might have a Question Period but what we need in this House is an Answer Period, as we can see from the answer they just got from the hon. gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, let me ask the hon. gentleman - I will change the subject for a moment - about one other matter dealing with Marpro in Dildo. Could the hon. gentleman tell us the stage of the negotiations now with that company to reactivate Marpro in Dildo?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: First of all, Mr. Speaker, just let me respond to the preliminary comments by the Leader of the Opposition about getting answers. We amended the rules of this House not only for Question Period but all to have a Late Show on Thursday afternoons, if I am not

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, if they are afraid to ask us questions and to use the time available to them on Thursday afternoons? As it relates to his question, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) has the information on that, Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, on the question regarding Marpro, the company at Dildo, some time ago the English bankers who financed that company placed the company in receivership and the company, Peat, Marwick was appointed as the receiver. Since that time a group of employees and a company representative came to the government looking for financial assistance. That application was given close scrutiny and analysis by three officials of three different departments, Development, Fisheries, and Finance, and a report is now being made, in fact, to the whole government, the Cabinet, and a decision is forthcoming in the next number of days.

I will say on that matter, though, that it is important to note that the same company applied to the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation, a very reputable company or corporation in making financial assistance available to different sectors of our economy, including the fishery, and that corporation decided that the operation at Dildo was just not viable, would never be profitable, and would not qualify for financial assistance. So that factor I want to throw in to give some light on the overall situation at Marpro.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. NEARY: I note that the hon. the Premier is awfully testy again today, Mr. Speaker, I think the message is getting through to the people that all we are doing in this House is using the time of the House to talk about trivial matters, legislation to put the boots to people who do not pay their school tax and so forth and so on. And I believe the message is getting through to them, that is why he is so testy today. Now let me come back to the hon. gentleman's answer. Am I right in assuming from what the hon. gentleman said - he is talking out of both corners of his mouth, by the way; he is saying on the one hand that there is a proposal before Cabinet and then he tells us about one that was turned down by the Newfoundland Development Loan Corporation - 'So I would not hold out much hope,' is that what the hon. gentleman is saying, that based on the previous applications to the Newfoundland Development Loan Corporation he does not hold out much hope for the proposal that is on the table to reactivate Marpro in Dildo? Could the hon. gentleman give us some indication what the proposal entails and when the people of Dildo and area can expect a decision from the Cabinet on this matter, because this matter has been outstanding for some considerable period of time? The receivers are in Marpro. They have been there for the last couple of weeks. Now could the hon. gentleman tell us when the people in that area can expect a decision?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, may I comment on his preamble of the supplementary? It seems like the Opposition these days are more determined in maybe a losing cause of regaining the seat in Terra Nova. Most of the members are out there campaigning moreso than being in the House debating the issues the last few days.

Mr. Speaker, the situation in Marpro has not been ongoing that long. About three weeks ago they came to us with an application for assistance and we do not just casually just pass out the taxpayers' money to any company that comes through our doors looking for it. We have to make sure we are going to wisely spend the taxpayers' dollars and we have to closely scrutinize any application for financial assistance. And we are not just going to pour money into any company if we are not convinced that company can be a viable operation in the future. Based on that it takes some time to do the government analysis.

Now, Mr. Speaker, may I say again - and I said so in the House of Assembly when the application was made and in answering questions on the same company - that company came in with outside dollars and left the impression with this minister and the government that there was no problem in financing, there was no problem in marketing, there was no problem in operation and suddenly, in a matter of a week or ten days after opening, we found they had no markets, their prices had dropped drastically, they had a problem with their financing, they had a problem getting operations going and, above all that, suddenly we found out they owed unsecured creditors in our Province \$950,000. Not one bill had been paid by that company and that does not sit very well with me as minister. All I can say,

MR. MORGAN: again without giving information as to what the decision of government will be, is the fact that we gave the application every consideration, we are taking all these factors I just mentioned into consideration, and the decision will be forthcoming in the next number of days.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if I could a question or two of the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) with trepitation as one of the questions deals with the situation in Terra Nova. As the minister knows, the ferry between St. Chads and the island of St. Brendan's has been out of service since, I believe it is last Sunday. We understand a part had broken, it is on its way in from the Mainland and is due to arrive today. I wonder if the minister could give us a report and hopefully assure us that the ferry - what is she called? The Green Bay Transport I believe is the name of the boat - will be back in service today, tomorrow or when? Can the minister bring us up to date, please?

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

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of the changes that this government has made in the ferry system around the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DAWE: Over the past two year, Mr. Speaker, tremendous changes have been made, very positive changes. The response from the people on the Islands around the Province that are serviced by our ferry system is nothing only glowing reports these days. We have also instituted a programme of maintenance as it relates to the ferry vessels and the process of hiring staff with expertise in marine engineering. These are strategically placed around the Province. The part in question was under some delay and I understand that it will be forthcoming within the next twenty-four hour period and, in fact, the vessel should be in operation within the next two or three days. It is very difficult to pinpoint it, but as quickly as possible.

MR. ROBERTS: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to enter into the kind of silly little dialogue that the minister did in an attempt to justify himself. But surely it is worth noting that his vast scheme led to a situation where the people of St. Brendan's have had no ferry service since last Sunday and so much for maintenance and so much for whatever. What I wish to ask the minister is why, given his much vaunted reforms which have cost this Province several millions of dollars, the people of St. Brendan's have been deprived of a substitute ferry service since the Green Bay Transport packed it in last Sunday or whenever she did?

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

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, one of the inherited problems we took over from the federal government was the fact that there was not what is known in the business as a swing vessel to take care of such emergencies. And we have been working very diligently not only to provide an adequate service, but also to try and institute a swing vessel into the existing service around the Province so that situations similar to the one that is occurring now will be alleviated as a temporary measure until repairs are made. We have not been able to do this as yet but we are still working on that particular matter. We will return the service, the fine service that the people of St. Brendan's have been having over the past number of months, we will return it as soon as possible. Some things, Mr. Speaker, are just physically impossible to do. You cannot go out and hire a second ferry boat like you would a used car. Some inconvenience must be expected if you are operating on an Island and we are addressing ourselves to it and we will have the service returned as quickly as possible.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. ROBERTS: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Sir. So much for the much vaunted efficiency

MR. ROBERTS:

of this new reform. Let me go to another topic which I am sure the minister would be willing to give us some information on. Two provinces, Nova Scotia and British Columbia, have announced that they intend to restore mileages as well as kilometers to their highway signs, I guess both to distance signs and the speed control signs. Could the minister tell us whether the administration intend to change the policy here and adopt the policy similar to that which, we understand, is to be put into effect in Nova Scotia and British Columbia?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, I am really surprised that the hon. gentleman, who gets up from time to time and advocates at some point in time a waste of expenditures on the part of this administration, to ever suggest that this Province may be considering changing over a signage policy which we have put in place over the past couple of years. In fact, all our signs in this Province are now in kilometers. I have never, Mr. Speaker, received a complaint from a driver on our road system, either our own residents of this Province or in fact people who come in from outside to visit our Province. I have never received a single, not one written, not one verbal concern that we should in fact think about or even contemplate changing our signs to incorporate both mileage and kilometers. We have a good signage system and most Newfoundlanders, for the benefit of the hon. member opposite, are a lot smarter than the Mainlanders and we do conversion very quickly in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. gentleman. I agree with his comment about Newfoundlanders being smarter than Mainlanders. Only somebody as atypical as he is could possibly have read into my question an advocacy that we should revert to a situation which apparently is going to come in Nova Scotia and British Columbia, which is stupid as well as expensive, so I will leave the hon. gentleman that. Since we are on signs, perhaps this time he could listen to the question and not try to twist it. If he is trying to be nasty, I will say to him he cannot be nearly as nasty as many of his colleagues opposite, and if he is trying to run for the leadership, too many of his colleagues are there ahead of him. His seat mate, his soul-mate from Grand Falls is there erupting in the backbenches in the hope that he will project himself into the front benches. Mr. Speaker, the question I want to ask of the minister is how far we are with the policy of providing signs throughout the Province? And I would say that because, as the minister is aware, there are quite a number of signs in my district that are not there - that is a bit of a logical inconsistency - there are a number of signs that are needed but have not yet been supplied. Can the minister indicate to us when the sign introduction policy will be completed? Obviously it takes some time. Can he give us some figures?

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

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, there is an ongoing programme for the erection of signs around the Province, both as it relates to distance and indicating where communities are and the distance they are from a particular point.

MR. SIMMS: Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE: There is also a programme that we have to institute, because of our climatic conditions, of replacing signs in the Spring of the year, ones that have been damaged during the Winter months for various reasons. We are replacing signs that are torn down or broken down through vandalism. There is an ongoing signage policy; as a matter of fact, the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) and myself a number of months ago announced a new signage policy as it relates to indicating to the travelling public where they may receive services on the sides of the various roadways in our Province.

MR. WINDSOR: A model for the rest of Canada.

MR. SIMMS: A positive move forward.

MR. DAWE: This has met with some very positive approval, not only from the residents of this Province but again, Mr. Speaker, from people visiting our Province. And this is one area where the Minister of Development and myself have both received complimentary letters from visitors from all over North America, complimenting this Province on the way it has kept billboards and nuisance signs off our roadways. The estheticness of the signs that we have in place now are well received across the country and within the Province.

MR. DAWE: So we are addressing a number of signage problems and we are attacking it as quickly as we can.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE: The member from the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) must appreciate the fact as well that I think it costs in the vicinity of some \$100 to \$150 to erect just a single stop sign. It is a very costly operation, it is labour intensive, it requires paint, materials, men, to put up the signs, gravel and a whole bunch of things. It is not the kind of thing that can be done very quickly and we are again, Mr. Speaker, addressing it, I think, very effectively. We have a ways to go but we will be doing it as quickly as we can.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Before I recognize the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), I would like to just take a moment to welcome to the galleries the Deputy Mayor of Labrador City, Mr. Alec Snow.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: I would also like to welcome to the galleries twenty-six students from St. Edward's Elementary School, Brigus, Port de Grave district, and their teacher, Mr. Raymond Fowler.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan).

Roughly ten days ago we debated a resolution in the House concerning overpayment of UIC benefits to fishermen in my district.

MR. WARREN: I would think probably the minister might have seen a letter that was in the paper this morning from the Director General of the Newfoundland region of Employment and Immigration. Mr. Wallace says that the Provincial Department of Fisheries did not make an offer to pay those fishermen. I am just wondering if the minister has anything new to offer to the House concerning the over-payments of those fishermen.

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure what the hon. gentleman is referring to. I think he mentioned a letter in this morning's paper or something, I did not see that letter. But if any official is now trying to finagle out of the mess they got the fishermen in in Labrador by refusing to listen to the advice of the Provincial Department of Fisheries, that is regrettable and unfortunate because the fact is they were the guilty ones. They would not listen to reason. They would not listen to reason from the Member of Parliament, Mr. Rompkey, who was their Minister, in fact, of Revenue. They would not listen to reason from the Provincial Department of Fisheries' officials. I was not involved directly myself, the deputy minister was and other officials. If they are now trying to finagle their way out of the mess because of the consequences the fishermen have found themselves in and the circumstances because of, as I said before, their inhumane manners in refusing to accept a reasonable proposal from the Newfoundland Department of Fisheries, that is indeed unfortunate. Because as a result of the hon. gentleman's resolution to the House, which he put it forward in a very sincere way and we debated in a very sincere way, I arranged to have the deputy minister - the new deputy minister now of course, Mr. Ray Andrews, who was not involved up until then, that was last

MR. MORGAN: week - I asked him to arrange a meeting with the senior official in Newfoundland responsible for the Unemployment Insurance Commission, in this case a Mr. Douglas.

MR. NEARY: Wallace.

MR. MORGAN: Wallace, I am sorry, a Mr. Wallace, And Mr. Wallace met with Mr. Andrews and the officials from the Department of Fisheries who deal with and carry out - are responsible for, in fact - the Labrador plant operations for my department. They sat down and discussed it and we have asked them to give us all details with regards to names of the individual fishermen-whom they have collected from, those they are trying to collect from, those who have filed their appeal-to give us the complete picture. Our position still stands.

MR. MORGAN: The offer we made to them - that was what? - a year and a half ago still stands. We will do everything possible, even reimburse the fishermen - which we tried to do then and they would not accept - we will do everything possible to relieve the burden on the individual fisherman. And I am hoping now Mr. Wallace will come around. Apparently the meeting was a very good one. I am hoping he will listen to reason, but he may not be able to because of the regulations. He may want to, both as a local official and a senior official in the federal department, as Mr. Rompkey, who brought the matter forward as a member of Parliament and as a minister in the Cabinet, wrote to his colleague, because of Unemployment Insurance Commission regulations, nobody could repay the overpayment except the individual fisherman.

MR. WARREN: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I understand that the cases of those fishermen will be going to the Tax Court in February. If the Tax Court still holds the fishermen liable, will the minister stand by his word? Would the minister assure the hon. House now that if the Tax Court turns down the request for the fishermen to be paid back that his department will stand by the words that he said today and repay the fishermen?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier we have dealt with the problem that was brought forward to the House last week in a resolution in a very sincere way. The deputy minister is on top of it, he has already had one meeting with Mr. Wallace. He intends to pursue it involving

MR. MORGAN: the officials responsible for the operations of Labrador plants. And if at all possible in any way at all, no stone will be left unturned to remove this burden placed on the fishermen on the Northern part of our Coast.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Supplementary, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) answered a question in connection with film that was done for the Tory Party and paid for out of public funds. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman did some pretty fancy stickhandling in that answer. Now let me ask the hon. gentleman if my interpretation of the statement that he made is correct, that what they did was they traded off interests that McConnell was claiming for outstanding bills, they traded off the interest for the amount of the films? Mr. Speaker, that is what happened. Now could the hon. gentleman tell us if there is a law in this Province that says that interest is enforceable or was it done through mutual agreement? Did the administration have to accept the fact that they had to pay interest to McConnell? Is that the law of this Province? Or could they have told McConnell to go leap off the end of the wharf down in Baird's Cove, Mr. Speaker? So in actual fact what I am saying is that the arrangement, in our opinion, was not satisfactory. Perhaps the

MR. NEARY: hon. gentleman could answers that I put to him because we only have a very limited time left.

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows that I was not in my present position, in the Finance portfolio, when all this matter transpired so I would really have to look up and look at the laws of things. There is, as he knows, a law in place at the present time in regard to arrears that government has on invoice payments.

MR. ROBERTS: That is not a law, it is a policy.

DR. COLLINS: It was a policy brought in but it is within the legal framework. Our legal framework in this Province allows us to do that and we brought that in some time ago. Now whether there was a similar policy, and therefore within the legal framework, in 1978 or 1979, whenever this incident occurred, I am not too sure. I would have to look that up and find out.

MR. NEARY: You let them off the hook and your party, too.

DR. COLLINS: On the other matter, if I understood the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) correctly, he was saying that we deducted from interest payments the amount that was billed to us for this particular film. I do not know how the Leader of the Opposition interprets that. The point is that there was a payment made to McConnells for that film. In other words, an invoice came in, it was processed, it was considered to be an invoice that government owed the firm and the invoice was paid. Subsequently it came to light that this particular invoice pertained to a certain matter, which, on looking into it, was not a matter that was properly invoiceable, shall we say, to government. And we went back to the company over that and ultimately they accepted our position that government had been

DR. COLLINS: invoiced incorrectly for this particular activity and therefore that amount was given to government. Now in making the final assessment of need to pay, that consideration was taken into account and the net amount paid did make allowance for the remission to government of an incorrect payment to McConnell for that particular service.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, what the hon. gentleman is saying is that the government traded off something that McConnell had no right to collect in the first place, and the government gave them credit - is this what the minister is saying? - that the government gave McConnell credit for something that the government did not owe, they did not owe the interest, Mr. Speaker? So would the hon. gentleman undertake to look at that particular aspect of this case because this is a very serious matter and the government cannot in a sly and devious way just sweep it under the rug.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. the President of the Council on a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman has had, as the Premier indicated today, Late Shows on Thursday for every week that the Session has been opened, including yesterday, and what he is doing now is he is trying to do what he should have done yesterday.

MR. MARSHALL: In addition to that, he is making a speech and he is out of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) was into the realm of debate, but that is a little academic now, I suppose, because the time for Question Period has expired.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Sir.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I have answered the question appearing on the Order Paper of November 9th in the name of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, enquiring as to details of all claims against Newfoundland Hydro in connection with the Cat Arm and Upper Salmon hydroelectric projects, and they are detailed here.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Before we go to Orders, I wonder if the House might by unanimous consent agree to send a message of congratulations, which I assume would come from Your Honour or from our Clerk, to a constituent of mine, Mr. James Short of St. Anthony, who, as I am sure every member is aware, was selected by the Jaycees as the first recipient of the Outstanding Fisherman of the Year award. We have in the House from time to time, I think, noted this type of achievement by people in the Province and

MR. ROBERTS: I think it would be appropriate. I do not propose to consume the time of the House by repeating what has already been well covered in the press, namely, Jim Short's accomplishments. Let me simply say that in my view the selection was an admirable one and well-founded in every way. I think Jim Short is not only an outstanding fisherman but is an example to all of us in this Province of what can be done with the fishing industry. If hon. gentlemen and ladies would agree, perhaps we could do that by unanimous consent, Sir.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, we would certainly agree with that motion, because we would like to convey our congratulations to Mr. Short, as well as to the Chamber itself, for instituting this particular award which is a very imaginative one and, I think, one that deserves the commendation of the House as well. So we would certainly agree with associating all members of the House with that commendation.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. MARSHALL: Order 22, Bill No. 6.

MR. SPEAKER: Order 22, Bill No. 6.

The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) adjourned the debate.

MR. ROBERTS: Before I carry on, I wonder if I could ask the Clerk if she would indicate how many of my precious thirty minutes have been used up? I have twelve used so I have eighteen left. Do all hon. gentlemen wish to leave? I see my friend from St. John's North (Mr. Carter) is in his accustomed place.

MR. ROBERTS:

Each of us, Mr. Speaker, has
to shine in his own peculiar way. Some are

MR. ROBERTS: certainly more peculiar than others and that, of course, includes my friend for St. John's North (Mr. Carter).

Mr. Speaker, I shall not need very long to say what I have to say about this bill. The points which I made yesterday I will repeat quite briefly. The first is that we on this side feel that it is a terrible waste of time of the Legislature, given the problems which confront the Province today, to require the House to deal with this kind of legislation. This, in our view, ought to be extremely low on any list of legislative priorities. We ought to be having the kind of discussions which should centre about, for example, the statement made by the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power) this morning, dealing with the budworm situation, a problem which cuts very deep into the resources of this Province and which will have immense effects for many years to come.

We have to deal, however, with what the government brings forward. They are the masters of the time of this House on four days of the week and, despite the silly little games the Premier was playing this morning, the record is quite clear that the government have chosen to develop this session to nothing more or less important than this kind of legislative trash, legislative tripe, an absolute waste of time. And, indeed, if hon. gentlemen opposite were free to vote as they wish instead of following the party line, I have no hesitation in saying this bill would never get through the House.

The school tax is an unfair, inequitable and thus greatly resented tax. The issue is not where do we get the money? The issue is rather how are we to

MR. ROBERTS: pay for the public services which we wish to have. There is nobody in this Province who feels that education has too much money being provided to it, In fact, anybody who is at all aware of what is going on in our educational systems knows that the amount of money being provided to these school boards, to enable them to operate their schools, and to the DEC's, inasmuch as their role is the key one, to enable them to continue to provide the services which are their lot to provide, the amount of money being provided is completely inadequate. It is equally inadequate in the health care field and in the municipal field and in one hundred and four other areas of government activity that we could name. But the issue, though, is how we raise the money and from whence it comes.

The government have chosen to perpetuate a School Tax Act. It has been in effect in one form or another for a number of years, but it has become, of course, much more extensive in the last six or eight years. In fact, I suspect there is no large part of the Province now that is not covered by a School Tax Authority, there is no large area where people are not required to pay school tax. Up until six or seven years ago there were very large areas that had no recourse to this.

Mr. Speaker, we do not have in this Province a hospital tax; we do have some user fees, but they will be knocked down. The Government of Canada will ensure that the Government of the Province are forced to withdraw these user fees.

DR. COLLINS:

No, we have an agreement.

MR. ROBERTS: The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) says we have an agreement. I do not know what he is talking about and I suspect he does not either. Would he care to tell us?

DR. COLLINS: No.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, all right. I suspect he does not know.

There are all sorts of agreements in the health field, but the new Canada Health Act, we are told, will require, or will make it most desirable in economic terms for the provinces not to levy user fees. And that is what I said, that the Government of Canada are going to take steps to ensure that there are no user fees, that health care is provided out of the general tax burden, the general revenues of the Province.

We do not have a police tax in this Province. We do not have a roads tax. We do not have an archives tax, we do not have a tax to support the Minister of Finance or the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall). It is only the education field, only in school taxes do we single out any one area of government activity and say that people there must pay over and above their general tax revenues. That, Mr. Speaker, in our view,

MR. ROBERTS:

is wrong, and that is why the school tax should be abolished, and that is why, if I have anything to do with it, it will be abolished. The school tax ought not to exist. If we in this Province want educational facilities, want educational services, we should pay for it out of the general tax revenues and we should use the proper and appropriate tax methods. There are no free lunches, Mr. Speaker. We get what we pay for. And that is why, Mr. Speaker, the school tax ought to go.

I heard the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) quoted this morning on one of the radio newscasts - I think it was probably CBC, but one of the radio shows this morning - as saying that school taxes were a good thing because it meant that the school boards would spend their money more carefully. I have never heard a more gratuitous slam against every school board in the Province. But let us for a moment take her principle; perhaps we should then immediately levy a hospital tax, solve all the Minister of Finance's (Dr. Collins) problems, and all the Minister of Health's (Mr. House) problems, we will have a hospital tax. We have thirty-odd hospital boards throughout this Province; we will give them the power now to levy a tax, or we will set up the hospital tax authority and you will pay an extra \$200 or \$300 or \$400 or \$500 a year for your hospitals, and that will make the hospital boards more responsible? What nonsense! What sheer economic and philosophical and political nonsense. Why do we not have perhaps a roads tax? Maybe that would make the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) a little more responsible if he had to have a special tax. Maybe we should levy a tax on - well, we have one on gasoline, we have the highest in Canada, but that is not a road tax. The Minister of Finance would be the very first, even the Minister of Finance with all his obtuseness, would be the very first to say that the money being raised by the gasoline tax

MR. ROBERTS: goes into the general revenues, and the government roads programme is not directly related to the gasoline tax. In fact, we collect a great deal more on the gasoline tax than we put back into roads. There would be a lot of people, including my constituents who are being subjected to the deliberate policy of being punished for daring to vote for the Liberal Party, a lot of people would be pleased if the government would devote to roads as much money as they collect from the gasoline tax. Even the Minister of Finance has not come to the point, surely, where he will say that was a roads tax. We do not have a roads tax. Maybe we could have tolls, maybe we should say, 'We will put a charge out now, we will have a toll gate on the Trans-Canada Highway.'

MR. MARSHALL: Mile by mile.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I have no doubt the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), who advocates the mile by mile policy, would not pay any money because he has never been West of the overpass in his life, except to fly on to Montreal or to fly on to England or wherever. But the hon. gentleman has never driven. He would not have to pay any mile by mile tax.

MR. WALSH: He did once.

MR. WARREN: The gasoline tax would really be a good one to build roads.

MR. ROBERTS: My friend from Labrador West, from the district of Menihek (Mr. Walsh), says that the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) did once go West of the overpass, and I would think that when people West of the Overpass got to see him that is the reason why he will never go West again.

Mr. Speaker, the school tax is inequitable, iniquitous, unfair, irrational and wrong in every sense of the word.

DR. COLLINS: Do you like it?

MR. ROBERTS:

Do I like it? I

like it just as much as I like the minister, and I have as much regard for it as I have for the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), and I have as much respect for its efficiency as I do for the Minister of Finance. The Minister of Finance is the only man I know who cannot even estimate within \$20 million what his own sales tax is going to bring in. His officials can, his officials did, but the minister tampered with the books, he toiled with his budget to produce a false impression and, of course, he got hoisted on his own petard, He has been hoisted again and again and he is hoisting himself still. I mean, I, with my own little calculator, the \$3.95 Sharpe calculator, figured out more precisely than did the Minister of Finance how much the sales tax yield would be. I was within \$500,000, he was \$20 million out.

DR. COLLINS:

You should clear up some

things with the government so they will tell the Province -

MR. ROBERTS:

Now let us talk about

the federal government's estimates? Let us talk about the minister's statement, speaking of the need for school tax revenues, Mr. Speaker, where he comes in and he says, 'A terrible thing has happened. We have only had 1 per cent real growth this year and therefore our tax yields are down.' Yet his budget speech predicted the real growth as being 1 per cent. So exactly what he predicted is what happened, for once he took the accurate figures. Mr. Speaker, the school tax in our opinion - and I realize that here we are casting pearls before swine, I realize here that the hon. gentlemen opposite are not going to support this, the party Whips are on -

MR. ROBERTS: but, Mr. Speaker, the school tax ought to be abolished. Whatever the money that this Province wants to put into education, the people of this Province should be required to pay through the general tax system, through the fair and equitable tax systems that we have evolved. In my view the progressive income tax is by far and away the fairest. The sales tax is inherently unfair. It has now come to the point of no return and so the taxes on liquor. Does Your Honour know that liquor sales are down in the Province over last year on a unit basis?

MR. HOUSE: Proper thing!

MR. ROBERTS: Well, it may be the proper thing. I am sure the Minister of Health (Mr. House) has done nothing to contribute to a growth in liquor sales and I admire him for that. But, Mr. Speaker, the fact remains that we have come to a point of diminishing returns in the liquor taxes now and the government have succeeded where generations of temperance advocates have failed. The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), it turns out, is the Carrie Nation of our time, he has succeeded in driving down the unit consumption. I am told it is down by as much as 10 per cent. The dollar yields may be up.

DR. COLLINS: There is an element of confusion there. There is an element of praise, so you are confusing me.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, it is no trouble to confuse the minister. He is self confused, he is innately confused, he was born confused, he lives confused and, I fear, he will die confused.

MR. NEARY: He will self-destruct.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, he has self-destructed.

MR. ROBERTS: Nobody takes the Finance Minister (Dr. Collins) seriously, including his own colleagues.

MR. NEARY: Could you imagine the logic in that McConnell thing?

MR. ROBERTS: There is no magic in the McConnell thing; it is defending the indefensible trying to account for the unaccountable. But it is the same logic as the Minister of Finance trying to come in and pretend that his budget estimates were his best shot. If they were his best shot he should perhaps be selling refrigerators to the eskimos and polar bars to the Inuit.

MR. NEARY: Boy, he would not run a bull's-eye shop,

MR. ROBERTS: He could not run a bull's-eye shop. He should be back tending children for Medicare instead of looking after the children who are his colleagues, his childish colleagues.

MR. NEARY: Little slaps on the bottom.

MS. VERGE:

That is nasty personal abuse.

MR. ROBERTS:

It is not nasty personal abuse.

The Minister of Education (Ms. Verge), now that she has returned to the House to take part in the debate on the bill, if she were here would know the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) has been constantly, continuously interrupting me. It flatters him. I think he probably has a masochistic streak in him. But I welcome back the Minister of Education, we are always delighted to see her, particularly when it is her bill that is coming before the House. It is downright decent of her, Sir, to be here during the debate. And let me then make the point to her, which I made in her absence since she was not in the Chamber when the bill was called: I heard her quoted on the radio this morning - I assume she was quoted correctly, but that I do not know; if she was not she can tell us so - as saying that she liked the school tax, she felt we had to have it because it meant that the school boards were more responsible. I cannot think of a more comprehensive slam against every school board in the Province than that one. What she is saying is that unless they are given the authority to raise this money, everything they spend will be spent foolishly. That, Mr. Speaker, is wrong. And, equally, I assume the minister is now going to be getting up advocating a hospital tax in this Province - \$400 or \$500 a year is what we will pay; if we get \$500 per capita on 600,000 people that is - what? - \$30 million, something in that order unless I have lost a zero somewhere in there, and that would come close even to wiping out the present Finance Minister's (Dr. Collins) deficit on current account, except he has not told us yet what it is.

MR. NEARY:

Do not be putting bad thoughts

in his mind.

MR. CARTER:

Marvellous!

MR. ROBERTS:

Well, Mr. Speaker, my friend the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) has once again confirmed my arithmetic.

MR. NEARY:

Do not put bad thoughts in the minister's mind.

MR. ROBERTS:

Bad thoughts in whose mind?

MR. NEARY:

The Minister of Finance's.

MR. ROBERTS:

I am not worried about putting -

MR. NEARY:

He is likely to put on the police tax and the toll tax.

MR. ROBERTS:

I will say to my friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is now scrapping not the bottom of the barrel, he is scrapping the outside of the bottom of the barrel in his search for tax yields and we will see what this year's budget brings.

DR. COLLINS:

I have already thought of everything.

MR. ROBERTS:

I have no doubt the Minister of Finance has thought of every conceivable tax and I fear that many of his unconceivable, inconceivable thoughts will yet come to reality. Most of what the Minister of Finance has done has been inconceivable as well as unbelievable.

MR. WARREN:

I say he is going to reduce the sales tax.

MR. NEARY:

He should resign.

MR. ROBERTS:

Mr. Speaker, to come back to the local school tax act, we are against the bill, as the minister may have devined. The minister will, of course, insist that it go through, and it will go through.

MR. CARTER:

Are you going to be voting for it or against it?

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. gentleman from St. John's North (Mr. Carter) will be well advised to stick around and find out and then he will know. Unlike him, we tend to vote the courage of our convictions. If it were a free vote, if this were not a Party vote, it would be interesting to see, given the comments that hon. gentlemen opposite have made to me behind the curtain from time to time about school taxes.

MR. NEARY: You will not get your package of savory this year.

MR. ROBERTS: My friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) says that I am going to be cut off from my package of savory. The member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) would not do that to me, would he?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: He would not cut off my package of savory. How I look forward every year to getting from the hon. gentleman for St. John's North a package of savory, a stuff-a-turkey. It is entirely appropriate that a turkey should send me the stuff with which to stuff a turkey.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: But I do look forward, Mr. Speaker, very much to getting the package of savory each year together with the hon. gentleman's best wishes. He sends it every year and I receive them in the same spirit in which he sends them, and I reciprocate them in the same spirit in which he sends them.

Mr. Speaker, we are against the bill. We are against it because it is wrong in principle, we are against it because the school tax is wrong in principle, we ought not to have a school tax in the Province. Now having said that, I will

MR. ROBERTS: Let the minister get up, or maybe hon. gentlemen opposite will get up now and carry us on all morning. We will gladly participate in the rest of the debate on that basis.

DR. COLLINS: Why pick on the school tax?

MR. ROBERTS: Why pick on the school tax? I do not. It is the school tax bill that happens to be before us and there is a rule of relevancy, I would say to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). That is why. He does not know it but that is why I am talking about the school tax. If he wants to bring in any other kind of economic bills we will deal with those as well. I do not think there should be a school tax, never thought there should be one, and it has spread like a virus throughout the province, it should be abolished. And if we need the money in our system, as I believe we do, then I think we should raise it from the general tax revenues and not this kind of methodology at all. It is a backdoor way of raising taxes, it is a backhanded way and it is a wrong way in principle as well as in application. Thank you, Sir.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: Before the minister rises to close the debate, there are a few points that should be made. The member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) has given us one of his two speeches, He has two basic speeches in this House, one, how great his forebears are, and the other, how great he is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CARTER: So he has given us one of those two speeches, I am not sure yet which one of those it was, but since he only has two it had to be one of them.

MR. CARTER: He suggested some possible taxes; I would like to suggest some alternate sources: A tax on Liberals but then of course it would not yield very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CARTER: Now this bill is a very simple, ordinary bill. It merely insists or tries to force those who have been convicted of not paying a school tax of having to pay it in addition to any penalty that may be imposed. And as a person who was before the courts myself in that connection, I think I should set the record straight and have a few comments on the bill.

In 1968, I believe it was, the glorious Mr. Smallwood got up and said, 'Education is free. Education will not cost anything. It is absolutely free. Not only is it free at the secondary and primary levels, but we will pay students at the post-secondary level, a salary to go to school, to go to college.' He said, 'It is absolutely free.' Now, of course, reality reared its ugly head and he found that there were not sufficient funds. But he had already said that there would be no school tax, and he did not want to break his word, he was such an honourable man, so he thought up this device, or one of his skivvies thought up this device, 'We will bring in not a school tax, but a school assessment and this will be used for capital purposes and it will be about ten dollars a month.' So a number of us came to the conclusion that if free education costs you ten dollars a month, how much would it be if you had to pay for it?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CARTER: So I started getting the bills and getting the bills, and I let it pile up to something over \$100. The Credit Bureau got after me and I spoke with a

MR. CARTER: chap down there and I said, 'Let it go to court because I want to make something of this.' And it went to court. I was summoned and I noticed on the notice that they had charged me under an act that had been repealed. Because from time to time, especially in the Department of Education and probably in the Department of Health, certainly in the Department of Highways, the number of amendments become so great that the act itself becomes cluttered and the House from time to time repeals the entire act and brings in what they call a consolidation. It is very easy to do now because most acts are on word processors, but in the old days, the legislative assistants tell me, that they used to have to find a large empty room and get a sharp pair of scissors and cut out pieces of the various acts and lay them out on the floor and then put together a consolidation which then would be passed by the House quite perfunctorily. The minister would get up and say, 'This is just a consolidation of existing acts and I move that it be passed.' And frequently, in my experience,

MR. CARTER: it has been passed almost without debate, Now this had happened to the Education Act. So the 1968 Act had been repealed and replaced by the 1969 consolidation, and of course an Act that has been repealed is no longer in force and I was charged under the wrong Act. I pointed this out to the court and, of course, the case was dismissed. And before they could bring in an amended charge, I paid by bill, because I realized then, as I realize now, and I think every hon. gentleman realizes schools cannot run on air, not even on hot air. So I paid the bill and that was the end of it and I have continued to pay my school tax or school assessment or whatever ever since then. But I think I made the point, and I am glad I made the point, and if I had to I would make the point again, that it was the hypocrisy of the school assessment that I was fighting against.

And we have two members in this House of Assembly, two of the original toadies who put together and supported this particular bill. Now there are certain diseases that if you suffer from them they are chronic diseases. There is no way that you can be cured, you can merely control them. One that springs to mind is a thyroid deficiency, and a person who suffers from that has to take a pill every day for the rest of his or her life. Now I suppose the two hon. toadies over there found themselves in the same position, that unless they took their daily dose of subservience they were not able to continue as members of the Liberal Party. And, of course, I well remember one hon. gentleman, I think he used to sit behind the former, former Premier, and the former, former Premier had the habit of snapping his fingers, and every time he did that you would see the hon. gentleman shake and shudder as he would run to see what his

MR. CARTER:

master wanted.

Anyway I find it very surprising that the hon. gentlemen would choose this particular bill to launch a diatribe against the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) or against the government in general, because the rules of relevancy are so broad by usage in this House, and the whole concept of education is so broad that under this umbrella almost anything may be mentioned. And there is a whole host of constructive criticisms that could be made of the Department of Education and of the government, and it is a pity that the hon. gentlemen did not use their creative talents, which I think they have in some measure, to contribute something to this debate. But as I pointed out when I got up, the hon. gentleman who just sat down gave one of his two speeches.

Now the only thing I would suggest in closing is that the Minister of Education should, either do it herself or cause to have done special classes for the members of the Opposition, so that if they wish to get up and say something they will be able to say something relevant. Now I realize that this is a long, uphill battle, but we did have a programme of French instruction here some years ago and it was very, very good, and I think perhaps if the Minister of Education were to set up a class like this it might do some good. Because the Opposition constantly talk about, oh, you must not bring in this tax, just tack it on the income tax or tack it on the sales tax, but you must not raise the sales tax, you must not raise taxes at all, but you still must add to them, so it does not make any sense. I keep thinking of the new Liberal doll that is on the market; you wind it up and then you turn its head and it deficits.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CARTER:

Hon. gentleman, if they ever got into power, every time they turned around I think they would deficit, and it would be an awful mess to have to clean up.

MR. CARTER:

So with those few words

I will sit down and say that I support this bill, however
much it may be unpleasant to have to talk about further taxes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who just took his seat talks about the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) having two speeches. That is at least one more than the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) has, because he has the same one, talking about Liberals and nothing else.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as it happens, I have here a problem on which I am supposed to do some checking for a constituent who now lives in my district but at one time, about six or seven or eight years ago, happened to live in St. John's because her husband was working, I think, on the waterfront with steel and this lady went to work in a corner store for three or four weeks. She has not worked since. But anyway, she got her bill from the St. John's School Tax Authority. That goes back about six years. She was not liable to pay then and, of course, is not liable to pay at any time, and here, this bill now indicates to her that the arrears is \$426.25, arrears for somebody who never was liable to pay the school tax in the first place.

MR. WARREN:

And this is what the minister is trying to do now.

MR. CALLAN:

And this is what the minister is trying to do now. In addition to paying school tax which you do not owe in the first place, now you have to pay a penalty because you did not pay it in the first place; in other words, you pay a fine and the tax as well.

Mr. Speaker, from time to time we hear about how highly this Province is taxed. This particular tax - if the minister had got up in the Legislature

MR. CALLAN: and said, 'We are abolishing School Tax Authorities throughout this Province,' then, Mr. Speaker, it would have been a good bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN: Because, Mr. Speaker, I was downstairs earlier this morning trying to get up here for the Question Period and for some debates, but I could not get off the phone long enough to make it to the Legislature because of phone calls and visits and letters like this particular complaint here which is based on nothing. And it shows you the incompetence that exists in the way that these people run these School Tax Authorities. I mean, I know people in my own home town who have been working there for five or six years and to date they have not received a bill for school tax. They have not received one yet. Others who probably went to work for two or three weeks five or six years ago and then that was it, are continuing to receive the same bills. Why this happens, Mr. Speaker, I do not know but there must be a fair degree of incompetence, almost as much incompetence, I would say, as exists in this particular government.

MR. WARREN: Hear, hear! Well said.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, as I was between phone calls and as I could overhear the House of Assembly from my office on the fifth floor earlier this morning, I heard the incredible statement made by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) regarding Marpro. And I know the complete story about Marpro.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): On a point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: We are now debating a bill with respect to an amendment to the School Tax Authority and

MR. MARSHALL: the conferring of authority on the court with respect to delinquents. It has no relevance whatsoever to what the hon. gentleman is mentioning. The fact he might have been downstairs and he was absent from the House - and he may have had good reason to be, but there are other periods of time when he can bring this matter up if he wishes.

MR. CALLAN: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): To that point of order, the hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, the point I am trying to make, of course, is the degree of incompetency that exists in the School Tax Authorities. What I was doing was comparing it with the degree of

MR. CALLAN:

what I was doing was comparing it with the degree of incompetency that exists in this administration.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think the line of thought is -

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

To that point of order

I rule that there is a point of order. The hon. member was mentioning some things that happened in Question Period today. We are discussing the local school tax, Bill No. 6, and I would ask him to refer his remarks to the school tax.

The hon. member for

Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

So, Mr. Speaker, that is

the stand of those of us on this side, at least it is my stand. Let us get rid of these foolish and bureaucratic school tax authorities around this Province. All it does is pile one degree of bureaucracy on top of another. And as for the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) wondering, "Well, how would the school boards and how would the government get their money if we did not have this particular sort of tax?" The answer to that question, Mr. Speaker, is quite simple, all we need is some activity in this Province rather than the stalemate and the procrastination and the do nothing attitude which exists, Mr. Speaker, and has existed for twelve years.

Mr. Speaker, when the Liberal

Party that the member for St. John's North refers to went out of power in 1972 this Province was booming; Construction jobs were plentiful - nothing has happened since, Mr. Speaker. And that is why we have taxes, some of them very evident like this one here, the school tax and the 12 per cent sales tax, but many, many others,

MR. CALLAN: which are not so evident are being imposed on people almost in a secret way. For example, Mr. Speaker, I can draw another comparison. I was talking to a gentleman yesterday in my own district who has been trying to straighten up a piece of Crown land for years and now the law firm in Clarendville writes the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power) and says, "We want a consent of assignment."

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

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): A point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: If the hon. gentleman, you know, wishes to -

MR. WARREN: He was comparing your incompetence.

MR. MARSHALL: - to compare, you can compare this bill to anything and you can become irrelevant in your comparisons. And this is what the hon. gentleman is doing.

MR. MARSHALL: He is departing again from the principle of the bill, Mr. Speaker. The fact of the matter is there is a procedure here, we are debating an amendment to the bill, members are supposed to -

MR. CALLAN: Well why do you not call the Speech from the Throne and then we could debate anything?

MR. MARSHALL: Well, why was the hon. gentleman not in his seat yesterday when he could have brought up matters in the Late Show, if he wanted to do it -

MR. CALLAN: I was very busy.

MR. MARSHALL: - instead of trying to take the House on his back like the hon. gentleman is trying to do. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is being irrelevant to the principle of the bill.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): To that point of order, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if there is anybody taking the House on their back we saw a classic example yesterday with the attitude of this administration, the dictatorial attitude that they are displaying. Even the public servants now, they think they own the House, even the public servants are coming in on the floor of the House, ask no questions just come tearing in through the door. It is the attitude of the administration that is causing that sort of thing to happen.

MR. WARREN: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: They think they own the House. They do not own the House, Mr. Speaker. We have a referee, Your Honour, the Speaker, and Your Honour will decide

MR. NEARY: whether or not the rules of the House are being followed, not the hon. gentleman who is trying to influence the Chair every possible way. My colleague was making a comparison there that I thought was very valid to this bill and, Mr. Speaker, he was not straying. In my opinion, there is no point of order, merely a difference of opinion between -

MR. MARSHALL: I am sure Crown land has a lot to do with this bill.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, how can you debate a tax bill, a money bill, a tax bill, without making comparisons? And I submit to Your Honour that you not be influenced by that sort of rhetoric on the part of the hon. gentleman, who is continuously trying to influence the Speaker, and the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please! To that point of order. I rule once again that there is a point of order. It is very hard for the Chair to determine the rule of relevancy until he hears what the hon. member is saying. I was about to interrupt the hon. member and instruct him to refer his remarks to Bill No. 6, because I cannot see how an individual Crown lands problem would have any relation to the school tax authority.

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, what I was about to say before I was so rudely interrupted by the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) was that, you know, another new tax was introduced into that department not too long ago, a \$50 tax. And it goes on and on and on, Mr. Speaker.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion let me go on record as saying that I think that the

MR. CALLAN: school tax authorities should be abolished and that the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) should bring in a sensible bill, a bill which will abolish all school tax authorities in this Province. And instead of wasting our time, Mr. Speaker, on little frivolous bills such as this one here, what the administration should be up to is bringing in legislation here that will create jobs and will get the Premier and his administration doing things that are long overdue, trying to develop the natural resources of this Province and, of course, in particular the latest one, the offshore oil, where a stalemate has existed for years and years and all we get is rhetoric and nothing else, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will not be supporting this bill. And as an earlier speaker said, I have a feeling that if it was put to a free vote rather than a party vote that the results would be surprising indeed.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):
now she will close the debate.

If the hon. minister speaks

The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE:
I am glad to be able to speak to close the debate because I think that more than enough has been said on this very simple, straightforward amendment to The Local School Tax Act which is based on common sense, which is desired by the people charged with the responsibility of financing education, paying for the cost of operating our schools.

Of course, far more than that was said by members opposite that had absolutely nothing to do with this common-sense amendment. Mr. Speaker, I think there are two issues arising out of this proposal to change The Local School Tax Act. The first has to do with the administration of school taxation; the second has to do with the larger question of financing education and raises a comparison of the present arrangement of split financing, a split between a provincial government which provides block operating grants to school boards, and the local school boards and their agents, the tax authorities, which raise money locally through school taxes, and an alternative of 100 per cent provincial government financing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to divide my remarks which will close the debate into treatment of those two issues. First, administration of local school taxation. This amendment, which is the subject of the bill being debated, is, I repeat, based on common sense. It certainly does not make any sense to have a tax, to require most people of the Province to pay the tax, but to let others

MS. VERGE: shirk their responsibility,
be brought before court and convicted of failing to pay the
tax and then simply fined an amount less than the amount of the
tax arrears and not ordered to pay the amount of the outstanding
taxes. For example, Mr. Speaker, I am sure the citizens
of the city of St. John's would be appalled at the prospect
of after their paying \$105 a year by way of poll tax to the
St. John's School Tax Authority, their neighbour gets away without
paying the tax, gets brought before court and convicted of
failing to pay the tax, and then gets off with a fine of just
\$25, and is not required to pay the \$105 school tax arrears.
That situation which has happened in many instances across the
Province is ludicrous, it is patently ludicrous.

And the principle of this
bill is an amendment which will end such ridiculous situations
by requiring courts to order payment

MS. VERGE:

of the back taxes at the same time as a finding of failure to pay tax and imposition of a fine. This change has been requested by the local School Tax Authorities and their principals, the school boards. As far as I know, Mr. Speaker, it is favoured by the churches, to whom the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) so frequently alluded in his speeches this week. Mr. Speaker, it is a measure which is parallel to the provisions of the Municipalities Act and the Cities of St. John's and Corner Brook Acts which all along have provided that when residents of municipalities are brought to court for failure to pay municipal taxes courts, upon convicting them, order them to pay the back taxes.

So, Mr. Speaker, this measure is obviously going to improve the administration of local school taxation in this Province. It will boost the collection rate, it will reduce the rate of bad accounts, or rate of delinquent taxpayers, and all in all, Mr. Speaker, makes good sense that cannot be denied.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn to the second issue, the larger question of financing education. This is the issue which was identified by the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts). And, Mr. Speaker, as that hon. gentleman pointed out and of course he, by no means, is the first person to point out the obvious, there are two basic approaches to paying for schools, to financing education and, Mr. Speaker, under either approach -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MS. VERGE:

Oh, Mr. Speaker, I have to digress by applauding the new Leader of the Opposition, the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MS. VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, under either approach the citizens of the Province have to shell out. The citizens of the Province as individual residents and as operators of businesses, are the generators of wealth, are the sustainers of public services, including schools, and, Mr. Speaker, no matter what system of financing education we endorse and operate, the money has to come from the taxpayers of the Province and the country. But there are two broad approaches, the one now in force which splits financing between the provincial government and local authorities, which are school boards and their tax authorities. Other provinces have the same type of split but employ municipalities as the local taxing agents on behalf of school boards. But the principle of a split between the central provincial government and the regional or local authority is the same in this Province and most other provinces of Canada.

MS. VERGE: A main alternative to that split arrangement would take away from the local or regional authorities the power to raise revenue to help finance education, and would centralize that power with the provincial government. Mr. Speaker, this is contrary to the arrangement espoused by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) when he spoke two days ago abhorring any shift in the balance of powers and responsibilities for education in this Province between the churches and their church school boards and the Minister of Education. But, Mr. Speaker, the other general arrangement for financing education would strip the local authorities of any power or right to raise revenue and would consolidate and centralize that power with the provincial government and/or the Minister of Education, and would place all the onus for paying for the operation of schools with the provincial government.

Mr. Speaker, within the past couple of years, the administration of which I am honoured to be a part spent quite a bit of time and effort looking at the pros and cons of these two broad approaches to financing education. I do not claim that either system is perfect, I do not claim that there are not positives and negatives to be argued for each, but, Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied, after an exhaustive review, that the present arrangement of sharing responsibility for paying for the operation of schools between the central provincial government, in our case based in St. John's, and the regional or local school boards and their tax authorities is the better approach.

Mr. Speaker, I will enumerate several reasons for my preference and for the policy and practice of this government, an arrangement, I might add, which was instituted by the Liberal administration of former, former Premier Joseph Smallwood, with the Corner Brook School Tax Authority being set up under provincial legislative

MS. VERGE: sanction about twenty-seven or twenty-eight years ago, in the mid '50s. Mr. Speaker, the shared approach to financing education gives school boards a fair amount of autonomy, certainly a lot more autonomy than they would have if they were stripped of any power to raise revenue for financing their own operations.

Mr. Speaker, school boards themselves

MS VERGE:

want to keep the power to raise revenue through their tax authorities, and this is an important reason why they like the discretion they now enjoy, they like the type of autonomy they now have, and they have let it be known in no uncertain terms, most recently through a comprehensive report on Financing Education in the 1980s, that they favour retention of the present shared arrangement for financing education which gives themselves some powers to raise money. Mr. Speaker, as a corollary to this, school boards enjoy a fair latitude of flexibility in offering programmes, certainly more latitude and flexibility than they would have if they did not have any power to raise money on their own and instead were forced to come to the central provincial government for all their money. Mr. Speaker, a third argument in favour of the present arrangement which I think is quite significant, especially in these difficult economic times, is that by allowing school boards the right to raise money on their own and requiring them to assume some responsibility for sharing the cost of bus transportation, of paying salaries of support staff and for educational materials and supplies they, I believe, are more careful managers of public funds. When school boards have some power to raise money and have an obligation by law to, for example, in the case of bus transportation, pay 10 per cent of the cost, I believe school boards have a powerful incentive to be frugal and to be wise stewards of public funds. Were they to be stripped of all powers to raise money on their own and instead forced to come to the provincial government with their hands out looking for

MS VERGE: 100 per cent of the cost of everything to do with operating schools, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the demands would escalate, the incentives for careful management would be lessened, and, Mr. Speaker, I believe the bottom line, as they say, would be a larger tax bill for the residents of the Province. Mr. Speaker, the fourth argument in favour of the present arrangement, including local school taxation which I think flows from the last one I stated, is that there is, overall, less burden on the taxpayers of the Province, and overall less of a burden on the provincial revenue. Mr. Speaker, not only, I believe, would the provincial government have to pay more to school boards were the provincial government to assume 100 per cent of the responsibility of financing education, because school boards would escalate their demands, human nature being what it is, but I believe the Department of Education would have to increase our compliment of civil servants so that we could go around the Province and police the thirty-five different school boards to try to verify their legitimate needs so that we could second-guess their budget requests, since we would, under this changed arrangement, have to bear 100 per cent of the cost of financing their operations.

MS VERGE: Not only would we have to have an increased bureaucracy which would be a drain on public coffers, but we would have to institute measures to try to determine whether or not different districts should not get more than they are getting already from local school taxation. Some areas have chosen, for various reasons, to have lower rates of taxation than others. For example, Port aux Basques, the area represented by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), has a relatively low school tax poll rate, something like \$65 a year, whereas Gander and St. John's have an annual rate of \$105. Now, Mr. Speaker, if those local school tax authorities were to be dissolved and the local people stripped of their power to raise revenue on their own then, Mr. Speaker, it is likely that the people in Port aux Basques would no longer be content with having a lower revenue arrangement than the people in St. John's, which means the provincial government is going to have to pay that much more.

Mr. Speaker, if the provincial government were to assume responsibility for making up funds which are now derived through local school taxation and then to get more funds because of the effects that I described, the provincial government is going to have to look at increasing our provincially imposed taxes, income tax on individuals, income tax on corporations, sales tax. And, Mr. Speaker, the provincial government tax rate is already among the highest, if not the highest in Canada, and there is not that much available room for jacking up those taxes.

So, Mr. Speaker, for various reasons that I enumerated, five that I have outlined in some detail, I believe quite firmly - and I confess, Mr. Speaker, that I was not always personally convinced of this - but

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, I am now quite confident that the present arrangement of sharing responsibility between the provincial government and the local authorities is much preferable to a changed arrangement whereby the local people would be stripped of any right to raise money on their own, and the provincial government would have 100 per cent of the responsibility for paying for the operation of schools. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the efforts of members of this administration, and members of the Department of Education, now have to be concentrated on improving the administration of local school taxation under this split arrangement, and that is exactly what we have been doing. And the purpose of the amendment now before hon. members is to improve administration of local school taxation by boosting the collection rate.

Mr. Speaker, finally, I would like to remind hon. members that local school taxation across the Province is now turning over to school boards, net of administrative and overhead costs, over \$17 million a year, and that is a very significant chunk of the cost of running schools. It is about one-third of the cost of operating schools overall when teacher salaries are excluded, teacher salaries, of course, being paid centrally by the Department of Education through school boards.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Education this year gave school boards block operating grants of something over \$35 million, and school boards derived from their various tax authorities over \$17 million. So school taxation revenue is a very significant percentage of the cost of operating schools. School boards and churches themselves like the present arrangement and this administration is committed to maintaining local school taxation, but we are pledging our efforts to

MS. VERGE:

improving the administration of the system so that the collection rate is boosted, and so that overall there is more equity for the taxpayers of the Province.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Local School Tax Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. Minister of Environment to introduce a bill, "An Act To Control And Regulate The Distribution And Use Of Pesticides," carried. (Bill No. 72).

On motion, Bill No. 72 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Revise The Law Respecting Limited Partnerships," carried. (Bill No. 69).

On motion, Bill No. 69 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Revise The Law Respecting Dentistry And Dental Surgery In The Province", read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 26).

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Accident And Sickness Insurance Act, 1971," read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 14).

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Ratify, Confirm And Adopt An Agreement Entered Into Between The Government Of The Province And The Government Of Canada Respecting The Restructuring Of The Newfoundland Fishery," read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 88).

On motion, a bill,

"An Act To Give Effect To The Convention On The Civil Aspects Of International Child Abduction," read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 63)

On motion, a bill,

"An Act Respecting Reciprocal Enforcement Of Custody And Access Orders," read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper . (Bill No. 64).

On Motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Public Utilities Act", read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 28).

On motion, a bill, "An Act Respecting Pension Benefits", read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 7).

On motion, a bill, "An Act Respecting The Provincial Archives And The Management Of Public Records", read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 31).

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Criminal Injuries Compensation Act", read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 13).

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Fire Prevention Act", read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 12).

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Education (Teacher Training) Act." (Bill No. 42).

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to move second reading of this bill, An Act To Amend The Education (Teacher Training) Act, which is very simple and straightforward. I thought all the bills that I have spoken on this week have been simple and straightforward but, much to my surprise, I provoked all manner of abuse and exaggeration from members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, this bill seeks to amend provincial legislation to accord with the existing

MS. VERGE: provisions of the teachers collective agreement. The substance of the change is to provide that teachers' certificates or licences specifying teachers' status for purposes of classification and pay shall have effect from the first day of the month when the teachers actually earned their academic and professional qualifications, as opposed to the time when the teachers actually formally apply to the Department of Education for designation of their status for salary purposes. This measure, Mr. Speaker, was sought by the Newfoundland Teachers' Association on behalf of their member teachers and seems to be

MS. VERGE:

universally popular, so I cannot imagine that it is going to provoke any opposition from the people opposite.

MR. RIDEOUT:

But you never know.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) has finally introduced a bill that we are going to support on this side of the House. Mr. Speaker, in supporting this bill we feel that we should extend our congratulations to the many teachers throughout this Province who are continuously upgrading their qualifications. I am surprised that the hon. minister did not do that in introducing this bill.

These teachers, Mr. Speaker, upgrade themselves at tremendous inconvenience and expense to themselves, sometimes having to travel on ferries and drive long distances to upgrade their qualifications and improve their teaching abilities, Mr. Speaker. We acknowledge on this side of the House that this is done, sometimes under tremendous hardship, and we commend these teachers and congratulate the teachers and we congratulate the NTA for encouraging teachers to upgrade their status, their qualifications.

MR. SIMMS:

The school boards demand now.

MR. NEARY:

The school boards demand it the hon. gentleman says. The school boards may demand it, Mr. Speaker, but that is not the point. They hire, I presume, according to a teacher's qualifications, and it is up to a teacher's self if they want to move up through the system.

MR. SIMMS:

Were you a teacher?

MR. CALLAN:

One of the best.

MR. SIMMS:

They made an exception in your case.

MR. NEARY:

Pardon?

MR. CALLAN: He asked me if I was a teacher, and I told him one of the best.

MR. NEARY: Of course my hon. colleague was. We have a number of teachers on this side of the House, we have the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan), and, by the way, the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) was also in the early stages of his career a teacher, and the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock),

MR. CALLAN: And a preacher.

MR. NEARY: And the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) is a teacher. So we are well endowed on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to advice as far as the education system is concerned in this Province.

MR. SIMMS: What was that again?

MR. CALLAN: Imagine, a former Speaker. I am surprised that he does not get up on a point of order.

MR. NEARY: So we are going to support this bill, Mr. Speaker. Our only concern is, with the teachers upgrading themselves and getting their qualifications, improving their status and so forth, the way they are treated by this minister and by the administration.

MR. NEARY: Teachers are one group in this Province who had been ridiculed and, Mr. Speaker, have been slurred by the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge). They had been ridiculed by the minister who thumbed her nose at the teachers a year or so ago, and that is one of the reasons why the teachers have ordered 4,000 bumper stickers to pass out in various parts of the Province to put on the bumpers of their cars, and have friends put stickers on the bumpers of their cars saying 'We will remember'.

Now, the hon. gentlemen can sneer all they want over there -

MR. CALLAN: And squirt their poison.

MR. NEARY: - they can ridicule the teachers all they want as they follow the example of the Minister of Education who is the laughing stock - the Minister of Health (Mr. House) who was previously Minister of Education had very little credibility in that department, but the present minister has less and that is saying something, Mr. Speaker. Not only does the minister have no credibility with the teachers but none with the people who are knowledgeable in educational matters in this Province, the people who operate the system. The minister has no credibility, no stature at all, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we are not down to Feathers, or down to Friends, or down to any other of the dives downtown, we are in the House of Assembly and I would ask the Speaker if he would enforce the rules. They are taking the House on their backs over there, Day in and day out they take the House on their backs, Mr. Speaker. Could I be heard in silence, please?

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

I would remind hon. members that the person speaking in this House of Assembly does have the

MR. NEARY: right to be heard in
silence.

The hon. Leader of the
Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a feeling
that the teachers will remember. This administration now have
belittled the public service employees, the hospital employees,
the construction workers, people on social assistance, sick
people, and the teachers.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): A point of order, the hon.
President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker,
the hon. gentleman just gets off on this because he cannot see a bill
passed but somebody has to get up on a point of order. He is
again straying when he is talking about areas other than
the teaching area, and I think he should become relevant to
the bill. If the hon. gentleman wants to support a bill he
has a queer way of doing it, he supports, tears down, but I
suppose we have to suffer that. But at least, Mr. Speaker, he
has to be relevant.

MR. NEARY: To the point of order, Mr.
Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would submit
to the Chair

MR. NEARY:

that what the hon. gentleman is doing under the disguise of a point of order is trying to squirt another little bit of his poison, he is trying to use up some of the time, Mr. Speaker, that we have at our disposal in this House, but, above all, the hon. gentleman is trying to avoid criticism of the administration. One thing they cannot stand is criticism. And, Mr. Speaker, I have a feeling that my comment could be put under the heading of fair comment, and I hope that the Chair will not be influenced in any way, shape or form by the rhetoric of the hon. Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) who spends his whole time in this House trying to dominate the House and trying to be nasty and trying to influence the Chair. That is the thing that concerns us, Mr. Speaker, the way the Government House Leader tries to influence the Chair, aided and abetted by a former Speaker sitting behind him who whispers little sweet nothings in his ear. But I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the Chair will not be swayed by the hon. gentleman, that the same rules in this House will apply to both sides of the House.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

To that point of order, I would remind the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) that we are discussing "An Act To Amend The Education (Teacher Training) Act", Bill No. 42, and also state, as I have already today, that the rule of relevancy is hard to define. I have to hear what the hon. member is saying in order to enforce it. But I would remind hon. members that we are discussing Bill No. 42 and I would ask the Leader of the Opposition to direct his remarks to this Act.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am glad to see that these silly, silly points of order by the hon. gentleman designed to sway the Chair, to influence the Chair, are not working, that we can get fair decisions from the Chair in this House.

MR. SIMMS: You should not make a sound now. You are not allowed to comment on it.

MR. NEARY: Well, I just did comment on it.

MR. SIMMS: Well, you were out of order again.

MR. NEARY: Is that so? Now, the hon. gentleman, if he wants to be Speaker he should have stayed in the Chair. If he wants to be a minister, then let him sit over there and be a minister and follow the rules of the House the same as we have to do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (AYLWARD): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, these interruptions have to stop. They are not downtown in the Sea Breeze or down in Friends somewhere. Mr. Speaker, let them remember that they are here in the House of Assembly.

MR. WARREN: Where is the Sea Breeze?

MR. DINN: The Sea Breeze is in Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I would like to remind hon. members once again that the person speaking in this House has a right to be heard in silence. I would ask that all hon. members respect this right.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to delay the passage of this amendment. We would be remiss in our duties and our responsibilities if we allowed it to go through without heaping some praise on the teachers in this Province who are continuously trying to upgrade themselves, to improve their qualifications.

MR. PATTERSON: They are fine people.

MR. NEARY: They are fine people and it is too bad that they were so badly ridiculed by the administration a year ago when they were fighting for their rights and fighting for items in their contract. When the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) started to strip the contract, and the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and Treasury Board started to strip the contract, Mr. Speaker,

MR. NEARY: they stood up to this administration. They stood up to them. And we are rather proud of that. The only thing that I can say, Mr. Speaker, is that the teachers will remember. And the hon. Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) will rue the day, will regret the day that she heaped scorn and contempt on the teachers of this Province. Every day, Mr. Speaker, I have one in my pocket right now I will just quote from it—

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Make sure you table it.

MR. NEARY: No, I will not table it. Well, let me put it this way, Mr. Speaker, we get letters every day from teachers that say, "I was a former Tory, I have torn up my membership card. As a former supporter of the Tory Party here is how I feel about this, here is how I feel about that, here is my position on this. As a former supporter of the Tory Party, as a member of a PC district association, I have torn up my card." Every day, if we do not get letters we get phone calls, Mr. Speaker. And I have no doubt that we will see more activity like the bumper stickers.

MR. SIMMS: You hope.

MR. NEARY: I do not hope, I regret it very much that educators - I have four teenage children going to school and I am rather proud of them, and I am very concerned about the educational system in this Province, Mr. Speaker. And the four of them are either at university or in high school at the moment.

DR. COLLINS: Can you not remember which?

MR. WARREN: He does not have any flat tires.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned. When the morale of teachers is affected by the attitude and the policies of that administration, I become very concerned. The teachers were very demoralized a year or so ago by the administration. They were ridiculed.

MR. BAIRD: You should have been out in Gander to see how many teachers were at our convention.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes. That is right.

MR. BAIRD: More than the whole Liberal convention put together.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman talks about a telephone booth.

MR. SIMMS: He did not say anything about a telephone booth.

MR. NEARY: No, he keeps talking about Liberal meetings, they would fit into a telephone booth. Well, the number of teachers at that convention would fit into a telephone booth.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No. No.

MR. RIDEOUT: There were six there from my district alone.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, they may have themselves convinced, as the minister said at the time, that this will all blow over. That is what the minister said at the time. "We are not concerned about this," the minister said, "we are not worrying about it in the slightest, it will all blow over. When the next election rolls around, it will all be forgotten." That is what the minister said and no doubt there are members there opposite who believe that. No doubt in their caucus meetings, when they are talking about the teachers, they say, "Well, do not worry about that, because the Premier will call an election, it will not be for another couple of years and by that time so many things

MR. NEARY: will have happened, so much water will have gone under the bridge, it will be forgotten.

And the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) told us this, 'it is just going to blow over.' It is just going to blow over' And the Premier just sent out a picture of himself posed under a group of trees, Mr. Speaker, he did not even put the candidate's picture or name on it, saying, "We are not going to have an election for another three years," sent it out to all the residents of Terra Nova.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

I wish to remind the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) of our rule of relevancy once more and that we are discussing the "Act To Amend The Education (Teacher Training) Act", Bill No. 42.

MR. NEARY: Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I will end up by saying that what I think the administration did to the teachers a year ago, they are now doing to hospital workers and public servants and nurses in this Province, and other professional groups. I think it was shameful and an indication, Mr. Speaker, of the contempt that the Minister of Education (Ms Verge) and her colleagues have for a professional group like the teachers in this Province. The minister can get up now in her cute little way and say, 'Oh, we on this side of the House have great respect and great regard for the teachers.' No doubt the minister will attempt to do that. No doubt, Mr. Speaker, the minister, with a straight face, in her cute little way will get up and say, 'The Leader of the Opposition is wrong again, because we have a great deal of respect and regard for teachers.' Well, it is too bad, I would say, that the minister did not show that a year ago when the teachers of this Province were having problems and difficulties, and did not treat them with with such contempt. It was beneath contempt what the minister did. It is all going to blow over. Nonchalantly, in a casual way, 'Oh, it is all going to blow over and everything will be alright when the Emperor calls the election,' whenever that is.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the way the administration treated the teachers and tried to take away their rights by stripping their contract and then refusing to bargain in good faith. Mr. Speaker, the teachers of this Province are well aware that what made the NTA was the checkoff, and that was a great Liberal reform, it was the checkoff of their monthly dues. The teachers are well aware of that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we brought into this House a piece of legislation that gave the NTA the checkoff and that was the beginning of what made the NTA and the teachers' groups of this Province so strong.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: You know, Mr. Speaker, I have to say that they over there react like there were twenty or thirty of us over here. You know, they are so vicious and treacherous over there and they are so super-sensitive that they react -

MR. DAWE: Tell us about the overpass in Glovertown. Come on. I went through all yesterday and I never heard about the overpass in Glovertown.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman should tell us about the causeway he is going to build to Bell Island, Mr. Speaker. They went over there and had a Cabinet meeting and the hon. gentleman promised them a causeway. And I am getting calls every day now wanting to know when the causeway is going to be built.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR.SPEAKER (Aylward):

I

would like to remind hon. members that the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr.Neary) has the right to be heard in silence. And I would like to remind the hon. Leader of the Opposition that the causeway on Bell Island does not relate to the Education (Teacher Training) Act.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR.NEARY:

And, Mr. Speaker, the member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr.Rideout) the other day in this House took his own little dig at Mr. Noseworthy, a gentleman who was not in the House to defend himself, in a cowardly way, in his usual typical cowardly way took a little dig at an hon. gentleman outside the House who was not here to defend himself and that same gentleman then talks about somebody being publicity hungry. We all remember what the hon. member for Baie Verte did when he went slithering across the House.

SOME HON.MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR.NEARY:

When we had him in the caucus he could not be trusted, slithering, made three or four attempts before he left.

MR.ANDREWS: He could not do much over there. Over here he can stand up like a man.

MR.SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR.NEARY:

If I were that hon.

gentleman, Mr. Speaker, I would have a very low profile in this Province indeed, a very low profile.

MR.SIMMS:

Why do you not clue up? Clue up.

MR.NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I would

have clued up seven minutes ago if these interruptions had not been coming across the House.

MR.DINN:

Obey the rules of the House.

MR.NEARY:

Obey

the rules of the House? You have already been told a half

MR.NEARY: dozen times by the Speaker to follow the rules of the House.

MR. DINN: You too.
You are after breaking every rule in the book.

MR.NEARY: Is that so? When you break the rules of the House the Speaker has the right to discipline you, and I have not been disciplined yet.

MR. DINN: You have done it continuously.

MR. NEARY: He has?

MR.DINN: Yes.

MR.SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR.NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I ask Your Honour to ask the Minister of Labour (Mr. Dinn) to obey the rules of the House.

MR.SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR.NEARY: Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I think I have made my point as far as this bill is concerned. We are delighted that the change is being made to conform with the teacher's agreement. We are delighted about that and we will, on this side of the House, accommodate in any way we can and in every way we can the teachers of this Province who have the responsibility of educating our children. In my humble opinion, and I have argued this with people and I have been told that teachers are not the most important professional group in society.

AN HON.MEMBER: Who told you that?

MR.NEARY: It has been argued with me. I have had discussions over it. Mr. Speaker, in my humble opinion they are the most, they are the number one professional group in our society.

MR. NEARY: They take your children from kindergarten right on up through post-secondary education and they shape their minds. Mr. Speaker, they shape the minds of your children and my children and they are the most important group. Where would the doctors come from and the lawyers and the engineers and the computer science experts? I think some times members take too much for granted. Where would the airline pilots come from if they did not get that start, and were not brought on through the system by one of the most dedicated groups in our society?

So, Mr. Speaker, I place great emphasis on this bill and I am delighted and pleased to see that the teachers are upgrading themselves, upgrading their qualifications. I hope that they will always continue to do that, because we are living in a kind of society today where there is a problem in keeping abreast of things. You almost have to go to a post-secondary education institution now year-around to keep abreast of what is happening in the world in the field of high technology, so many changes are taking place. And I am delighted that the teachers are doing that. I regret very much and I am very concerned about the attitude of the administration towards the teachers, and the arrogance they displayed last year and the contempt that they showed for the teachers.

I will end up by saying, Mr. Speaker, that it is regrettable that relations between the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) and the teachers of this Province are so strained. It is regrettable indeed that relations should be so bad, that there should be bad blood between the Minister of Education, the administration and the teachers of this Province, the most important group in our society today, Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned.

MR. NEARY: Now, the hon. the gentleman from Exploits (Dr. Twomey) who is a professional man, or the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) who is a learned gentleman, they may say they are the most important professional group in society. But where would they be without the teachers? Where would any of us be without the teachers?

AN HON. MEMBER: Did you go to school?

MR. NEARY: I certainly did go to school, Mr. Speaker. There were nine of us in the family. I did not have the opportunity to carry on to post-secondary education, I did not have that opportunity. That was a privilege and a right that was given by a Liberal administration in this Province. It was a Liberal policy that educated half of the crowd on that side House and then they went and turned - you talk about biting the hand that feeds you - and then they turned on the Liberal administration that educated half of them over there, who would be nothing if it was not for a policy that was brought in by a Liberal administration, 'free education'. And not only that, there was a point when you were paid to go to school, paid to go to university, paid to go to the vocational schools. And they are gradually chipping away at that and doing away with it, and the next thing, Mr. Speaker, if they continue on the policy they are on now, they will destroy the educational system and it will be no longer a right and privilege of people. No matter what their status was in life, no matter what the financial status of their families was, they could get an education previously, but now it is getting harder all the time because they are whittling

MR. NEARY:

away and stripping away that right that was brought in by a Liberal Administration in this Province, a right to a university education; if you had the ability and the qualification, you did not need the money. Now we are getting back to the position where it will be for the privileged few.

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

MR. HOUSE: Are there not more in university now than there ever were before?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I said it is getting more difficult, it is getting harder all of the time and they are in debt up to their ears by the time they get through university.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! The hon. President of the Council, on a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: The principle of this bill relates, Mr. Speaker, to a teacher's certificate or licence. It is strictly confined to that. The hon. gentleman under that is not allowed to debate general policies, overall policies of the government, that is for the Throne Speech or the Question Period, or for other times. Similarly, Mr. Speaker, he is now debating the general overall education history of the Province, not the policy of a teacher's certificate or licence to which this principle applies and, therefore, he is out of order. If he supports the bill, why does not the hon. gentleman instead of just continuing on as he is trying to do, just filling up time with non sequiturs, really, and irrelevancies, why does he not just make his points and sit down and let any other member who wishes to speak speak, or the minister close the debate, and we will get on with other business.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the Opposition, to that point of order.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am well aware that the hon. gentleman would like for me to sit down and not say anything, that they could come into this House and just ram things through, they have forty-four, we have seven. I can understand his feelings; he cannot stand criticism. But, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about teachers qualifications and that is the topic that I am on, And Your Honour being an academic, an intellect and a school teacher himself is well aware of the importance of teachers improving their status and their qualifications and their way of life, and that is precisely what we are talking about under this bill. And I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that with Your Honour's education you are not going to allow yourself to be swayed by the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) who is continuously trying to browbeat the Chair in this House.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!
To that point of order the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) appears to have gotten carried away a little bit in the heat of debate with the principle of this bill and perhaps he should be a little more relevant than he was.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, when I go to Lewisporte this evening I will see if I can be easy on Your Honour, when we get down to that great fund raising dinner tonight in the district of Lewisporte, when the National Leader of the Liberal Party of Canada will be in Your Honour's district tonight.

MR. SIMMS: Is Wayne Noseworthy going out to that one too?

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, do you hear that? That is another slur. You know, you would not expect -

MR. SIMMS: No, I read in the paper that he was going out to the meeting.

MR. NEARY: You would not expect that kind of a slur.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, apart from everything else I have to note that the hon. gentleman considers it a slur if anyone identifies himself with the Liberal Party. It is quite obvious from what the hon. gentleman says The hon. minister suggested that somebody might be going out to the Eiberal meeting tonight and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) gets up and says 'That is a slur.' And that may be a slur, Mr. Speaker, it quite possibly is. But , you know, the meeting in Lewisporte is not germane to the bill, the by-election in Terra Nova is not germane to the bill. The fact that in Terra Nova the Liberal Party could not hold a nominating convention and had to drag in a twice-defeated candidate from a neighbouring district is not germane to the bill, we are talking about teachers licences, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: I do not blame Your Honour for wanting to get up to that, because you talk about squirting poison.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): What is going on in Lewisporte tonight is not of great importance to me, not as much as the principle of this bill.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, now to conclude and finish I want to say how delighted we are that the teachers are upgrading themselves, are taking advantage of teacher training every opportunity they get. But I have a feeling, Mr. Speaker, that they will never forget the way they were treated by the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) and by the President of the Treasury Board (Dr. Collins). And I remember when the controversy was raging, in the height of the controversy the Minister of Education used to try to worm her way out of it by saying, 'Well, I am not handling the negotiations, that is Treasury Board'. She used to try to slither and slip and slide her way out, Mr. Speaker, by saying, 'Well, it is my colleague the Minister of Finance who is handling it'.

MR. BARRETT: And he handled it very well, too.

MR. NEARY: The hon. minister surely did not think that people were that stunned, that here you have a minister - it is bad enough for a backbencher opposite to say that, but a minister who is a part of the decision making in this Province, you do not put on your hat one day and say, 'Look, I am not a minister today', and then tomorrow put it back on and say, 'I am a minister'. Once you are sworn in as a minister you are a part of that administration.

MR. DINN: Does that have anything to do with the bill?

MR. NEARY: It has a lot to do with the bill. It has a lot to do with the attitude towards the teachers, the attitude the minister has towards the teachers of this Province. I regret very much that this attitude of the minister has upset the teachers so much in this Province.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a feeling that the teachers will remember for a long time to come.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): If the hon. minister speaks now she closes the debate.

The hon. Minister of Education.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MS. VERGE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the teachers remember for a long time to come what happened in 1983. Do you know what happened in 1983? There were 500 more teaching jobs created and funded by the Peckford administration. That is what happened in 1983.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, in this year the government of which I am a member lowered the pupil/teacher ratio to an all-time low which resulted in the creation of 500 more teaching jobs. Last year we had 8,000 teachers for Kindergarten through senior high school, right now we have 8,500 teachers for those grades. Mr. Speaker, these are jobs with an average salary of \$30,000, that is 500 new jobs at \$30,000 each, that adds up to an extra amount on the teachers' payroll of \$15 million, Mr. Speaker, this tremendous growth in personnel for primary, elementary and secondary education at a time of great economic difficulty. When jobs were being lost in the private sector all across Canada, when it was tremendously difficult for the government of this Province, which has been inflicted damage by centralist policies of the friends in Ottawa of the members opposite, and which was badly battered

MS. VERGE: which was badly battered by the spill-over of the recession experienced in all Western industrialized countries, at that difficult time we went the extra mile for education by lowering the pupil/teacher ratio and bringing on stream 500 more teaching jobs. The people should remember the 500 extra jobs that were created in 1983.

And, Mr. Speaker, a second tremendous accomplishment in 1983 that teachers, parents and others in the Province will remember, is that this was the year of record-high, all-time-high, enrollment in higher education, Mr. Speaker, when you take into account Grade XII, which was brought on stream this Fall, when you look at what happened with participation at the university. Memorial University now has more students in its first-year classes than the university itself expected.

The colleges, the College of Fisheries, the College of Trades and Technology, the Bay St. George Community College, in total have more students now than they did last year. The vocational schools enrollments are up in some cases; up in Corner Brook, 50 more students in Corner Brook than there were last year. Overall, Mr. Speaker, there is now record-high participation on the part of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians in higher education.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope teachers remember what happened this year. This is the year there were 500 more jobs added, and this is the year of record-high enrollment in post-secondary education.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to belabour these points. I will say that I hope people across the Province remember them and, Mr. Speaker, I will close the debate by reiterating that the amendment to the Education

MS. VERGE: (Teacher Training) Act contained in Bill No. 42 simply makes the legislation accord with the present teachers' collective agreement so that teachers get credit for their academic and professional qualifications from the start of the month when they actually earn those qualifications, and not the time they make application to the Registrar of Teacher Certification in the Department of Education for purposes of their classification and pay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: 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 on tomorrow. (Bill No. 42)

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act Respecting The Conferring Of Titles And Degrees By Queen's College." (Bill No. 35)

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

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to move second reading of this bill which is an act called The Queen's College Conferring of Degrees Act, 1983. Mr. Speaker, the provisions of this bill have been recommended to government by the good people at Queen's College and by the people of their principles in the Anglican Church of Canada. The act would note the changes in the constitutional arrangement of the Anglican Church which now has three administrative or ecclesiastical units in the Province, Eastern, Central and Western -

MR. ROBERTS: They are called dioceses.

MS. VERGE:

- as the member opposite says, called dioceses and, Mr. Speaker, the act would give Queen's College powers to confer more degrees and honours than the college now enjoys under present legislation. Mr. Speaker, these provisions, I am sure, will be supported by all hon. members, considering that they have been recommended to government, and are sound, by the people at Queen's College and the people in the Anglican church.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, we support the bill and we are very pleased to see that Queen's College has been once more reactivated to train men and women for the ministry in this Province. Queen's, as hon. members know, is a venerable institution in our Island's past and we take great -

MR. ROBERTS:

It is probably the oldest higher - education institution in the Province.

MR. NEARY:

That is right. Certainly it is senior if not the oldest higher-education institution in the Province. It gives us great pleasure to support this bill, Mr. Speaker.

On motion, a bill, "An Act Respecting The Conferring Of Titles And Degrees By Queen's College," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House, on tomorrow. (Bill No. 85).

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act Regulating The Granting Of Degrees And Respecting The Operation Of Universities And Other Degree-Granting Institutions In The Province." (Bill No. 68).

MS. VERGE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Education.

The hon. the Minister of

MS. VERGE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In moving second reading of this bill, an act called The Degree Granting Act, I wish to note that the legislation was initially recommended to me by the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada. That body, comprising universities and post-secondary institutions across Canada, made similar recommendations to the governments of other provinces. Mr. Speaker, the principle of this bill is to regulate more strictly the granting of degrees by educational institutions in this Province, specifically by post-secondary institutions. The bill provides that no institution shall directly or indirectly grant degrees or provide programmes of post-secondary study leading to degrees, or hold themselves out as doing such unless the institution is authorized to grant degrees by an act of this Assembly, is authorized by an act of a legislature of another province, or is designated as a degree-granting institution by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. Mr. Speaker, the point of these changes is to provide greater protection to the public, to give greater assurance to the citizens of our Province that degrees mean something and that they are preceded by programmes of quality. The bill is designed to thwart the efforts of some unscrupulous people, or perhaps misguided people who have circulated throughout North America and have attempted to set themselves up as pseudo universities and grant degrees which really mean nothing, and, in some cases perhaps, to defraud the public by selling bogus degrees. Mr. Speaker, the Association of Universities

MS. VERGE:

and Colleges of Canada has identified such cases of people attempting to create misleading impressions by falsely holding themselves out as universities or as being capable of awarding degrees. Evidentially, there was an attempt of this nature not so long ago in the Province of Prince Edward Island. And, Mr. Speaker, I understand that most of the other provinces are moving, or have moved to enact legislation the same in substance as that now before us. Mr. Speaker, this measure has the support of Memorial University of Newfoundland which, of course, is a member of the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, and I trust that it will get the support of all hon. members.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we support the bill. I only have a couple of questions that I would like to ask the minister. Number one, have any of these people whom she describes as unscrupulous, misguided people who issue bogus degrees, have any of them found their way into Newfoundland? And if so, would she tell us where and if they are still functioning in this Province or not? Number two, which is probably more important, would the hon. minister tell the House how this act affects degrees granted by universities outside the Province which offer correspondence courses? I would like to have the minister clarify that situation, if, indeed, it will affect degrees that are granted through correspondence or if it will not. I think this matter should be cleared up before the bill goes through second reading and into Committee of the Whole of this House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. minister speaks now she will close the debate.

The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I will be glad to try to answer the two questions posed by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary).

With respect to his first question, to my knowledge no unscrupulous or misguided character attempting to misguide the people of Newfoundland and Labrador by offering for sale or otherwise university degrees has made his or her way to the boundaries of our Province.

The second question about the status of institutions offering correspondence courses and institutions outside our Province offering correspondence courses to people here and awarding degrees partly or solely on the basis of those courses, Mr. Speaker, I direct the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) to the provision of Section 3 of the bill which makes provision for the operation within Newfoundland and Labrador of institutions granting degrees or providing programmes leading to degrees or advertising such programmes of institutions which are authorized to grant degrees by acts of Legislatures of other provinces. So, Mr. Speaker, for example, if McGill University, based in the

MS VERGE:

Province of Quebec, which is authorized to grant degrees by legislation of that Province, were to offer correspondence courses to residents of Newfoundland and Labrador leading to degrees at McGill University, then that is quite acceptable and permissible under the provisions of this bill, since McGill is authorized by the Legislature of that province.

Mr. Speaker, as for institutions which are established outside of Canada, the only possibility for their being sanctioned to offer degrees here in our Province or, more particularly, to conduct programmes leading to those degrees here within our boundaries, would be for designation of those institutions by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council and that is provided for in the same section of the bill, which is Section 3.

Mr. Speaker, I trust I have answered the questions of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) and provided sufficient information about the purpose and thrust of this measure. To repeat myself in summing up to close the debate, the measure is basically designed to protect the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, to assure our citizens that university and college degrees mean something, that they are preceded by academic courses and programmes of substance and to frustrate and turn off the desires and efforts of any people who are trying to basically defraud the public by selling degrees that are meaningless. Mr. Speaker, this measure was recommended initially by the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada and has the full support of Memorial University of Newfoundland.

On motion, a bill, "An Act
Regulating The Granting Of Degrees And Respecting The

Operation Of Universities
And Other Degree-Granting Institutions In The Province,"
read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of
the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No. 68)

MR. MARSHALL: Order 49, Bill No. 86.

Motion, second reading of a bill,
"An Act To Amend The Memorial University Act," (Bill No. 86)

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

MS VERGE: Mr. Speaker, this bill,
called "An Act To Amend The Memorial University Act"
contains provisions again which were requested by
Memorial University to revise and update and accord
with current practice the composition of the Senate of
the University.

Mr. Speaker, among the
changes which have occurred within Memorial University,
which this bill belatedly recognizes, is the establish-
ment and successful operation of the Sir Wilfred Grenfell
College in Corner Brook. That campus has flourished and
is now due for an expansion of both facilities and programmes
and, Mr. Speaker, this bill reflects the reality of the
Sir Wilfred Grenfell College in the composition of the
administrative structure and the Senate of Memorial
University. And, Mr. Speaker, I mention that as just
one example of the changes that have occurred within the
university which this bill recognizes.

MS. VERGE: So, Mr. Speaker, I think it is fair to sum up by saying that this bill which changes The University Act is of a housekeeping nature to give formal legislative effect to current administrative structure and practice.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we support the bill. I only have one question for the minister, it has to do with the Chancellor of the University. Could the hon. minister tell the House for what period of time Chancellors are appointed? Is there any time limit on it? Are they appointed for life, or are they appointed at their own leisure, they can resign whenever they feel like it? You know, for what period of time are Chancellors appointed? And how, if you wanted to get rid of a Chancellor, and I am not saying that we do, but if for some reason they wanted to replace the Chancellor, I mean, what procedure is there to do it?

The present Chancellor of the University is a very well-known Canadian. They are usually appointed not because of their academic background but because of their financial background, and they are picked from anywhere in Canada; anywhere they can find a moneybag make him Chancellor of the university in anticipation of favours in the future, in a hope that the Chancellor will loosen up his moneybag and contribute substantially to the University. Now, Mr. Speaker, that to me is nauseating, that does not appeal to me at all. You know, you would expect the Chancellor of the university to be somebody of stature and not just shoved in their for ulterior motives, that they think they can get

MR. NEARY: their hand into the public chest. That may have been the old way of doing things, before universities were run by governments. Mr. Speaker, we in this Province, or in any other province where you have a government-run university, should not have to let that university go out and find a head for the university who is sitting on some kind of a chest that they hope to get opened up to get a few contributions to the university, or use his influence on his friends to get donations for the university, donations for this and that and the other thing. That does not appeal to me at all. Now maybe, Mr. Speaker, it is very hard and difficult to change old methods of doing things, it may be very difficult for the university especially to change its way, but, Mr. Speaker, in this day and age, we are living in a very enlightened age, and I would say that it is too bad, it is most unfortunate indeed that even some of the graduates of our university who have gone out into the world and who have done so well in the academic world because they do not have a pocketful or a wallet full of money could never under the present system, with the tradition, could never become the Chancellor of that university. I would say that is very regrettable and unfortunate indeed.

MR. NEARY: We have graduates of that university who are scattered throughout the world, Mr. Speaker, who have made names for themselves that you would not believe in this Province. I do not know if hon. members are aware of it or not but the programme on television 'War', 'War', that is produced and written by Gwynne Dyer. I do not know if hon. members are aware of it or not, but Gwynne Dyer is the son of George Dyer of St. John's Newfoundland, who used to be Deputy Minister of Labour, Gwynne Dyer a graduate of the university.

MR. DOYLE: There are Dyers on Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: I do not know if they are related or not, Gwynne Dyer, a son of a Newfoundlander retired now, George Dyer, a very good friend of mine, who was Deputy Minister of Labour, has gone out and - Mr. Speaker, I believe his column is picked up by over thirty major newspapers throughout the world. He is an international figure, well known in the field of journalism throughout the world.

Gwynne Dyer just produced the series on TV, 'War', a magnificent series which has won several awards, I might add. And so I am always a little bit bewildered myself when the Premier of the Province wants to curry a little favour, or when the hierarchy of the university want to solicit a little favour, Mr. Speaker, that they go out and grab the moneybags. The present chancellor of the university was appointed, I believe - well, it is done by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. I would assume. The last one, I believe, was probably recommended by the former Premier of this Province.

MR. NEARY:

Good connections,
good connections, probably heads up the most powerful
corporation in Canada. Mr. Speaker, I do not know if
it has done the university any good to have a chancellor
who represents the most powerful corporation in Canada.
I do not know if it has done any good or not. Perhaps
the minister can tell us what contribution that
gentleman has made to the university.

MR. NEARY: There is something immoral about placing the emphasis on hard, cold cash when we have so many graduates of that university in all parts of the world, as the hon. Premier knows, who have made an outstanding contribution to the literary and social and economic well-being of their country and of other countries throughout the world, and yet they may never have a chance to be appointed chancellor of that university because they do not have the do ra me, they do not have a wallet full or a bag full of money. I think there is something immoral about that. I think that university will survive if we get away from that policy of just appointing people because they are powerful and influential in the business world. I would urge the administration, Mr. Speaker, and the minister who is introducing this bill to take a good hard look at that policy.

Old habits are hard to change, I understand that, Mr. Speaker, but I feel in 1983, and we are living in such an enlightened society, that a chancellor of a university should not be appointed because of his money, because he is a moneybag in our society. I think that is all I have to say on this matter, Mr. Speaker. We are supporting the bill, I do not know if my colleagues - I do not know if the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) who is so learned, who is so knowledgeable in these matters can add anything to what has been said.

MR. ROBERTS: I think my hon. friend said everything that needs to be said.

MR. NEARY: I thank my hon. colleague. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, if there is anything the hon. gentleman can add. Certainly I will be interested in hearing what the minister has to say in response to my few remarks in second reading of this bill, Mr. Speaker.

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

MS. VERGE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
I would like to speak briefly to answer some of the questions raised by the Leader of the Opposition. I will ignore the insults that he has inflicted on the hon. Chancellor of Memorial University.

Mr. Speaker, the Memorial University Act, which is proposed to be amended by this -

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I do not recall during my remarks casting any insults towards the present Chancellor of that university. I was merely talking about the principle, the policy of how a chancellor is chosen, Mr. Speaker, and I certainly did not at least intend to hurl any insults at the present chancellor of that university whatsoever.

MR. NEARY: Yes, if I did I apologize, because I did not do it.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): To that point of order, I rule that there is obviously a difference of opinion.

The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Memorial University Act provides that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council appoint the Chancellor of the university for a term of three years. Mr. Speaker, there have been several Chancellors of the university, I cannot remember all of them but I do know that Dr. Alain Frecker was Chancellor of the university for a number of years, from the mid to late '70s, and then, Mr. Speaker -

MR. ROBERTS: No, no, no. You were not in office.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I defer to the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) if he can correct my dates about the years when Dr. Frecker served as Chancellor of the university.

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible)

MS. VERGE: I see. At any rate, Mr. Speaker, it was in 1979 that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council appointed the present incumbent, Dr. Paul Desmarais, as Chancellor of Memorial University for a three-year term, and, Mr. Speaker, last year the Lieutenant-Governor in Council extended that appointment by re-appointing Dr. Desmarais for a second three-year term. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Desmarais brings to his role as Chancellor of Memorial University many attributes. He has discharged the responsibilities of Chancellor with grace and with every indication of sincere interest in the affairs of Memorial University. He has been a faithful and diligent attender of university convocation ceremonies, presiding at virtually

MS. VERGE: every session of every convocation in the four or five years that he has held the office of Chancellor. He has attended and hosted several ceremonial and social functions in the interest of the university. He is a strong and effective promoter of Memorial University within our own Province and far beyond our shores. And, Mr. Speaker, I know I can say for myself that Dr. Desmarais has earned the respect of people at Memorial University and people associated with the university. He has proven to be a very popular Chancellor, and I am sure he will make many more contributions to Memorial University before he ends his terms as Chancellor of the university.

Mr. Speaker, turning back to the bill at hand I wish to close the debate by reiterating that it of a housekeeping nature. It makes changes in the legislative composition of the senate of the university to reflect the present reality to take into account changes that have occurred within the university, not the least of

MS VERGE: which has been the establishment and successful operation of the Sir Wilfred Grenfell College in Corner Brook since the last legislative change.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. MARSHALL: Order 45, Bill No. 83.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Repeal The Ferries Act," (Bill No. 83)

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, this act is a simple procedure. It fits into line with what the Province, my department and this government have indicated they are going to do as it relates to the provision of ferry services to the people of this Province, in that all the ferry systems will come under the direction of the Department of Transportation, and the two methods that have been set up either are as direct ownership of the ferry vessels and the direct operation that will ultimately occur for the ownership of all the vessels. But the two methods of operating would be direct operation by the Province or through a management tender operation.

In 1954, an act was passed in this Legislature which provided that the Province could issue exclusive franchise to people to operate a ferry service in the Province. The present act is really redundant in that there was only one operation which was given that exclusive franchise.

MR. ROBERTS: The Bell Island one, was it not?

MR. DAWE: Yes.

MR. DAWE: This will repeal that particular act and place the operation of all the ferry systems in the Province under the management regime that was announced almost two years ago by this government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, carried away as we are by the eloquence and the rationale, the closely reasoned argument of the minister, we will, of course, support this major piece of legislation, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Ferries Act," another step forward in the war on poverty and ignorance in this Province.

Since we are forced to debate it, a few questions, not by any means of any lengthy debate. The minister has told us, and it came out again in Question Period this morning, that the government two or three years ago put into place a new policy under which in outline they assumed direct responsibility for operation of all of the intraprovincial as opposed to interprovincial ferries in the Province, and there are, I believe, six or seven of them. And there are two interprovincial ferry services, one is the Gulf service to Port aux Basques and to Argentea in the Summer months and the other, of course, is the one in my own district from St. Barbe across to Blanc Sablon in the Province of Quebec.

MR. ROBERTS: All of the other ferry services in the Province are run under this regime. I am not sure I could name all of them but the Burgeo ferry, the Gaultois ferry, the Bell Island ferry, with which my friend for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is so familiar, the St. Brendan's ferry, about which we spoke this morning, the Fogo Island ferry service, the Fogo Island/Change Islands serving up in Green Bay on to Long Island - is it?

AN HON. MEMBER: Little Bay Islands.

MR. ROBERTS: Little Bay Islands. Little Bay Islands and to Long Island, and I guess that is it. Is there another one? I may have missed one on the way through. I wonder if the minister could tell us in his response, in round numbers - I appreciate he might not have the exact figures - how much more it is costing the people of this Province to provide this service than it would have cost us, under the old regime? And two comments on that: I understand that the minister did not necessarily choose of his own volition, or his predecessor, whoever might have held the seals of office at the time the change came about, did not necessarily choose to make the change. The second comment, the old plan was a federal/provincial plan whereby the feds paid a portion of the cost. And, as I recall it, that started out as 50/50 and then there were endless negotiations and endless harangues, and as with so many federal/provincial matters since the present administration came into office, it fell apart. And I recall as well that the late unlamented Otto Lang - late in the sense that politically he is a dead figure - as Transport Minister for Canada had a hand in destroying a system which seemed to be working for all of its imperfections, and at the very least succeeded in bringing some money into the Province from the Government of Canada to help to defray the costs of these ferries. And they are all subsidized, they all have to

MR. ROBERTS: subsidized. There is no way in this world that any of these ferry services could be offered on a user pay or on an economically viable bases, they require substantial subsidies from the Public Treasury. And all that has happened now is whereas formally we were subsidizing private owners, whatever the merits or whatever the demerits of that system were, we have put that aside and gone to a system now whereby , as I understand it, the operators of these ferries are employees of the minister's department, they are public servants with all of the benefits and all of the privileges and all of the responsibilities that come with that status.

I understand we have chartered or leased the ferries. Perhaps the minister could tell us whether I am correct or whether we have, in fact, brought them. If so, if we did buy them from their previous owners, how were they acquired? Obviously it could not be a tender process, it had to be a negotiated process. What was the criterion by which the price was set? Was it done by negotiations? Was it done by some third party advising? Was it done by, I do not know, two independent values being set by people, or how was it done? I do not know who owns these ferries to this day. I suppose I could go and look it up down in the Registry the federal government maintains under the Canada Shipping Act, but have we acquired title? If so, how?

MR. ROBERTS:

If not, if we simply leased them or chartered them, to use a more precise term, how were the charter rights arrived at? Because, of course, Mr. Speaker, as we will all realize, in the long run Cape St. Mary's pays for all. And there is no real difference in the long run between a system whereby we go and borrow the money and buy a ferry and it becomes an asset of the Province on one hand, and on the other hand entering into a long-term charter which, in either way the owners if they are paid too much can get it out, and if they are being paid too little they will not get it out. So would the minister address those concerns? And finally, would he care to expand a little on the replacement system? He told us in Question Period that there was no replacement vessel available and that is why the people of St. Brendan's have not had a regular ferry service for about a week now. He said, 'There will always be breakdowns,' and he is correct, there will always be breakdowns, there may be more now that it is being run by the public service, because unlike the minister I have no faith in the ability of the government, a government, it does not matter whether it is this particular administration or another, to run this kind of operation. I think history has shown us dramatically - the Labrador Linerboard where about \$250 million was sunk by the pigheadedness of Mr. John Crosbie.

MR. CARTER:

Jealousy will get you nowhere.

MR. ROBERTS:

I am not jealous of that particular pigheadedness as I am not jealous of the hon. the member for St. John's North's (Mr. Carter) pigheadedness either. I mean, his pigheadedness is unique, but what I am saying is that the pigheadedness that cost us about \$250 million, which of course is on the provincial debt which the hon. member from St. John's North will help to pay off as will I, and as will children and

MR. ROBERTS: grandchildren and perhaps generations as yet unheard of let alone unborn. Mr. Speaker, the point is that we have now come to this policy, can the minister tell us when we will be getting a replacement vessel, because with all respect what he said this morning about the need for a replacement vessel and trying to locate one, I think it is fair to say it has been said by him or perhaps by his predecessors - I cannot keep up with the revolving door they have got going over there - for the last two years or more. We still do not have a replacement vessel; we have got these six or seven boats in service, they all must come out of service for about a month a year to have an annual refit done, we know about that, and then we can surely anticipate a number of breakdowns so there is a need for a replacement vessel. Where are we? When will we get one? Why have we not got one before now?

With these few brief comments, Mr. Speaker, it being 1:00 p.m. I will move the adjournment of the debate and then we can carry on from there.

MR. MARSHALL: The minister is not going to be here on Monday so if those were the only questions -

MR. ROBERTS: I am not sure if my friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) wants to speak.

MR. NEARY: I have some questions I would like to ask but I will not be here on Monday either. So perhaps the minister and I can get back at it on Tuesday.

MR. ROBERTS: Neither will I. All the important people will be gone.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): It has been noted that the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) has adjourned the debate.

MR. NEARY: What is coming up on Monday, do you know?

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
Council.

The hon. the President of the

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, on Monday we will be dealing with Supplementary Supply and certain of the finance bills that are on the Order Paper.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Monday, at 3:00 p.m. and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Monday, November 28, 1983, at 3:00 p.m..

INDEX

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

25 NOVEMBER 1983

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS APPEARING ON ORDER PAPER NOVEMBER 9, 1983
FROM THE HONOURABLE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION TO THE HONOURABLE
MINISTER OF ENERGY.

=====

QUESTION: Mr. Neary (Leader of the Opposition) to ask the Honourable Minister Responsible for Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

Details of all claims against Newfoundland Hydro which are over and above their contract costs for both the Cat Arm and Upper Salmon hydroelectric projects.

ANSWER: The following claims for additional compensation have been made on contracts associated with these hydroelectric projects as follows:

Upper Salmon Project

Status

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) Contract C02, Collavino Nfld. Ltd.:
Construction of the powerhouse,
intake and installation of penstock.
Amount - \$3,000,000. | Presently under review and assessment and recommendation by Acres Consulting will be made as soon as possible. |
| 2) Contracts C03 & C04, Sintra Viking Joint Venture:
Construction of dykes, dams, canals, etc.
Amount - \$7,400,000 | Presently under review along with most up-to-date information from Acres Consulting and contractor. Court action or final settlement will be decided upon as soon as possible. |

Cat Arm Project

Status

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1) Contract CA01, Lundrigan's:
Main access road.
Amount - \$7,600,000 | Settled in the amount of \$2,850,000. |
| 2) Contract CT01, R. Whiffen:
Survey of 230 KV transmission line, Section A, Alder Brook to Cat Arm.
Amount - \$30,070.50 | Presently under review and writ has been issued against Hydro although Court action has not begun. |

Cat Arm Project

Status

- | | |
|---|---|
| 3) Contract CT02, J.F. Wade:
Survey of 230 KV transmission line,
Section B, Alder Brook to Deer Lake.
Amount - \$43,802.42. | Presently under review
by Cat Arm Consultants
and assessment will be
made as soon as possible
regarding the impact of
accelerated work schedule. |
| 4) Contract CT03, J. F. Wade:
Survey of 230 KV transmission line,
Deer Lake to Massey Drive.
Amount - \$30,983.76. | Presently under review
and assessment of impact
of transmission line
routing will be made by
Cat Arm Consultants as
soon as possible. |
| 5) Contract CA04, McNamara:
Inland access road.
Amount - \$1,023,243. | Presently under review
although initial assessment
indicates assessment will
be largely unfavourable
to claim. |
| 6) Counterclaim - McNamara Corporation:
Power tunnel high pressure adit
contractor.
Amount - \$84,845.12. | Counterclaim filed by
Hydro against McNamara
for late access to
tunnel area. |
| 7) Contract CA26, Pinsent Construction:
Relocate trailer units.
Amount - \$30,232. | Presently under review
and more information
has been requested of
contractor to substantiate
his claim. |

November 23, 1983