

VOL. 3

NO. 50

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD  
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.  
MONDAY, JUNE 1, 1981

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I just want to inform the House that either last Thursday or Friday there was a decision in the Supreme Court of Canada which had certain effects on landlord/tenant relations and legislation affecting landlord/tenant relations, particularly with respect to eviction notices and jurisdiction over eviction notices. We have a copy of the judgement coming by, I think it is called air letter, or whatever, which is due to arrive this evening or tomorrow morning and when the Department of Justice has that we will then be drafting new legislation to deal with the problem of mass evictions. In other words, we will not be proceeding with Bill 59, but will be introducing new legislation which will deal with the problem of mass evictions and that should be later this week. But we cannot do that until we have actually seen the Supreme Court case.

I should point out too, so that people affected know, that the legislation will be retroactive in the context that those who have received notices— a number already have for vacancy or eviction by the 30th. of May or the 31st. of May, whatever the date is— will be protected and, indeed, any who may receive such notices up to the enactment of the legislation.

MR. SPEAKER: Further statements by ministers?

The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated sometime earlier, I would like to table at this time the capital works programmes of the Department of Transportation.

MR. NEARY: They have been all announced by Tory members now anyway.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Further statements by ministers?

MR. STIRLING: In replying to that statement,

Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Leader of the  
Opposition has about five seconds.

MR. STIRLING: Well, I think it is typical  
of the arrogance, Mr. Speaker, that there was a question in  
this House of Assembly asking the minister when he was going  
to table the information and asking specifically some questions.

MR. NEARY: The government (inaudible) now.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, at the time that he  
answered the question he gave the impression that he would not  
be tabling it until today, and the kind of lack of respect that  
he has for this House of Assembly, Mr. Speaker, is that every  
PC member has been out all weekend announcing those statements.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: That is an indication of a lack  
of respect. And they may be in great glory and joy right now,  
Mr. Speaker, but eventually they will pay the price.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. member  
for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: I was not out all weekend announcing  
what highways were going to be done in my district. So if the  
Leader of the Opposition is going to make these blanket -

MR. NEARY: City Council did your work for you.

MR. CARTER: - these blanket accusations -

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the hon. member. I do not  
believe there is a point of order really. I do not believe  
there is any. There is no point of order really.

MR. SPEAKER: I would like hon. members to join me now  
in welcoming to the Speaker's Gallery today

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

the newly appointed British Consul to the Atlantic Provinces,  
Mr. Michael Collins.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Leader of the  
Opposition.

MR. STIRLING:

Mr. Speaker, on the assumption  
that the Premier is out escorting our banker, the Premier of  
Alberta, on the assumption that he considers that more  
important -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. STIRLING:

Mr. Speaker, I have to go  
back to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Dinn)-a question that  
I would like to ask the Premier and of course I cannot  
because the Premier is not here, and the President of the  
Council is already supporting him - in view of the fact  
that this morning the Newfoundland and Labrador Building  
and Construction Trades Council unanimously passed a  
resolution at its regular weekly meeting calling for the  
immediate resignation of Jerome Dinn as Minister of Labour,  
and in view of the fact that the Council represents fourteen  
international building trades unions in the Province of  
Newfoundland and Labrador, will the minister now do the  
honourable thing?

MR. WARREN:

For the sake of Newfoundlander.

MR. STIRLING:

To stop embarrassing  
the government every day that he stays there, will he now  
do the honourable thing and resign?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of  
Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition can rest assured that the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) will always do honourable things, but with respect to resigning, he has no intention whatsoever of resigning.

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this latest request by this council, the Newfoundland and Labrador Council, asking for the minister's resignation, this, Mr. Speaker, combined with the IBEW, CUPE and the Fishermen's Union, what is the minister saying to all of this? This must represent a large group in this Province, a large unit. What is the minister's reaction to all of this?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: The Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) is not reacting to anything. The fact of the matter is, the Minister of Labour and Manpower did his job, is proud of having done his job and will continue to do his job in the best interests of the people of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. LUSH: A supplementary Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, we have all of these unions that I named earlier, and I will name them again for the minister's benefit,

MR. LUSH: the IBEW, the Fishermen's Union, CUPE and now the Newfoundland and Labrador Building and Contracting Council, all of these people feel that the minister interfered with the decision of the Labour Relations Board; and the Labour Relations Board itself certainly told the minister that he interfered with their decision.

So in view of the fact that all these people, all of these unions, have indicated that the minister has interfered with the Labour Relations Board and the Labour Relations Board itself has said as much, is the minister saying now that the Labour Relations Board and all of these other groups are wrong and that he is the only one right?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, the minister is saying that with respect to what the minister has done in writing a letter to the Labour Relations Board, yes, he was absolutely 100 per cent correct. With respect to interpretations by any other second or third or fourth party, they are entitled to interpret a letter that I write in whatever way they want to interpret it, but the fact of the matter is that I wrote a letter, and that letter stands on the record, and that letter I am proud of. The fact that there is a possibility that somebody misinterpreted that letter is the problem of the people who interpreted it, not my problem certainly. And I contend and will always contend that I will work in the best interests of the people of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. LUSH: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, again, all of these unions, the IBEW and CUPE, the Fishermen's Union and now

MR. LUSH:                   the Newfoundland and Labrador Building and Construction Trades Council have all felt that the minister in his letter to the Labour Relations Board came down on the side of management and came down against labour. Can the minister indicate why that is so - what reason that he may have given all of these unions and now the Newfoundland and Labrador Building and Construction Trades Council? Can the minister indicate what reason these people may have to feel that he is against labour and are they justified in thinking that?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no justifications for anyone thinking that I am for labour or against labour, for management or against management. I have always maintained my position of neutrality and, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that I have to serve the best interests of the people of the Province. That always has to be foremost in my mind, not to kowtow to any particular individual or group, but to serve the interests of the people of the Province and that is what I have done in this instance and that is what I will continue to do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Premier and in view of - and we will get back to this subject later on, you can relax for the rest of the day.

MR. DINN: (Inaudible) every time you ask a question.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Premier and in view of the fact that we have visiting Newfoundland the Premier of Alberta, I wonder if the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) would use this opportunity to tell the Premier of Alberta that this policy of holding up the people of Canada to ransom by doing what the OPEC countries do - cut back on production - to force us to import -

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

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

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman is asking a question that is not within the -

MR. HANCOCK: (Inaudible) Lougheed

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I would like to hear the point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: - jurisdiction of this House or any minister of this House. It is, you know, a question that the hon. gentleman, you know, the hon. gentleman surely to heavens can find plenty of things to ask about the affairs of this Province without having to get us to get involved - now we are very competent, Mr. Speaker, but we do not purport or wish to get involved in the management of the affairs of Alberta or any other province. And I think that that type of question, Mr. Speaker, is entirely out of order and the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) should know better.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

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

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, there is no point of order, it is just the usual delaying tactic and I would ask the Speaker to rule. I had not finished my question.

MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, you are allowed to rule.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: The point of the matter is that I do not believe the hon. Leader of the Opposition has completed the question so I do not know if it is in order or out of order. I have to hear the question first.

If the hon. Leader would like to ask the question.

MR. STIRLING: A very specific question I can ask the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry). The acting Premier is upset that I did not ask him the question. Let me ask the question very specifically to the Minister of Mines and Energy. Does this government support the Loughheed position of holding up the people of Canada to ransom by cutting back on oil supplies? That is quite in order, does

June 1, 1981

Tape No. 1993

SD - 3

MR. STIRLING:

position?

this government support the Lougheed

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Energy.

The hon. Minister of Mines and

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to say that the people on this side of the House of Assembly believe in a long established tradition of Newfoundlanders which is to show hospitality to guests while they are in our Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the government of this Province, like the Government of Alberta and like, I am sure, most Canadians are sorry that federal/provincial relationships because of the inflexible position taken by the federal government of this country, had to fall to the depth that it has in the federal/provincial dispute over energy pricing.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that anybody who saw that television programme where the Prime Minister of Alberta got on in a very responsible, unemotional, logical, and sincere fashion and pointed out that Alberta, which had gone through the great depression, Mr. Speaker, having seen tremendous privation for its people, had very great concerns about the fact that it has a depleting resource, that it wishes to obtain a reasonable value for that depleting resource, that it is prepared to share with its fellow Canadians its benefits from the development of oil, but that it is not prepared to have the federal government unilaterally impose its will and take its depleting resource and leave it with nothing to fall back upon when-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: -the oil and gas is gone.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we support the Government of Alberta in its attempt to get a fair price for

MR. BARRY: its natural resources. And we do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Government of Alberta is holding up all Canadians, we believe the problem is due to the inflexibility of an arrogant Liberal government in Ottawa.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I take it then that the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) is saying that he does support his banker when the banker holds us up for ransom. Would the minister now tell us what price he feels

Newfoundlanders should be paying for this, what he calls reasonable price of oil, which a few years ago was set by OPEC as an unreasonable price? Everybody in the free world agreed they were being held up to ransom, are we now saying that the OPEC price is a reasonable price? When you say that we have to pay a reasonable price are you saying that we are joining that cartel and that we are going to ask Newfoundlanders and Labradorians to pay twice what we are presently paying? Is that the reasonable support of the Alberta position?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the people of this Province showed in the last provincial election that the government was not prepared to stick its collective head in the sand in the fashion that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) was requesting it to do. Our people were prepared to have courage in their own ability to compete, Mr. Speaker. They were prepared to show that they had the courage to meet the challenge of rising energy prices and they elected a government in this Province that set out the facts, Mr. Speaker. And one of those facts, that, it does not matter what rhetoric the Leader of the Opposition goes on with, cannot be ignored is that the world price for oil can be influenced by decisions of the Saudi Arabian government. The amount of oil which the government of that nation has and the price at which it can produce its oil, permits that single small country to have a tremendous influence upon the price because all it has to say is, 'If you want our oil you must pay world price'.

Now, if other nations of the world, Mr. Speaker, are recognizing that they are competing internationally and they are saying, 'If we are going to keep our people warm, if we are going to keep homes heated in our country, we have to pay the price necessary to get oil and gas', what is it that makes Canada different, Mr. Speaker? The one thing that could make us different is if we are able to develop self-sufficiency in oil. Unfortunately, again, the stupid, I reiterate 'stupid' energy policies of an arrogant, inflexible Liberal government are going to destroy the possibility of this country being self-sufficient.

MR. L. BARRY: Now, Mr. Speaker, it is the policy of this government to see that our Province, that our Province becomes self-sufficient with respect to oil and then we will control our own destiny as far as oil pricing is concerned.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. L. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. L. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, if you cut out the three quarters of that, which was rhetoric and an attempt to cloud the real issue - the minister has said that he now supports world prices, the Saudi Arabia prices, would he now confirm that he feels that Alberta is right and they are supporting Alberta and he thinks that the Newfoundlanders and Labradorians should be paying world prices, a simple 'yes' or 'no'?

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, neither the government of this Province nor the Government of Alberta have ever suggested that the people of Canada should pay world prices. The Government of Alberta has come out and said that, 'We believe that the price within Canada should be 75 per cent of the Chicago price.' They have come out and have said, Mr. Speaker, also, that this rise up to 75 per cent of world price should be a gradual and a phased increase.

Mr. Speaker, it is the policy of this government that the price within Canada should not rise to world prices - I say again, should not rise to world prices, Mr. Speaker. Maybe the Leader of the Opposition would get it if I said it once again - shall not rise to world prices. But, Mr. Speaker, we support the concept of not trying to bury our heads in the sand, of recognizing that the price of oil is going up and will continue to go up, and if we are going to be able to buy it on world markets we have to be prepared to pay the prices that foreign suppliers of oil request. But we say that within Canada the increase in price should be phased in gradually, that our lower income people or people on fixed income should be protected from the impact by straight subsidization by governments wherever they may be within Canada, Mr. Speaker; that they be be protected from the impact of rising energy prices, that it be phased in, that it not go to world prices, that it go to 75 per cent maximum of world prices.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, that information that

MR. STIRLING: we were just given is inconsistent with the information in their documented, printed Five Year Plan, completely inconsistent. Their Five Year Plan says, 'It is this government's view that the world market prices should set the' - 'and whatever the prices should rise to is in' - and I tell the minister that it is in the Five Year Plan, and he either has not read it or they have changed their policy.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Well, I do not believe that was a question.

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, apart from a little course in petroleum economics, maybe the Leader of the Opposition should have a course in how to read as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, let me ask the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy if he thinks that it is in the best interests of the negotiations that were just reopened between the Prime Minister of this country and the Premier of this Province, for the minister to be blaspheming and blackguarding the Prime Minister and the Government of Canada by making such statements -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: - as 'stupid and arrogant Liberal Government' or 'We will sit on the oil until hell

MR. DINN:

You will back down.

MR. NEARY:

- until hell freezes over!

MR. HANCOCK:

You do not know when you are well off, boy.

MR. NEARY:

Does the hon. gentleman feel that these inflammatory statements are in the best interests of the -

MR. HANCOCK:

What an attitude for a government to have.

MR. NEARY:

- of the negotiations that have just been resumed between the Premier of this Province and the Prime Minister of Canada? Will it do Newfoundland any good for the minister to be making these off-the-cuff, impulsive, inflammatory statements?

MR. J. MORGAN:

Go up and (inaudible) Florida.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I think we have come upon the nub, we have come upon the nub of the philosophy of the party on the other side. We are blaspheming the Prime Minister of Canada. Now, Mr. Speaker, I always understood that blasphemy was an act directed at the Divine Creator, at God.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

So I think we have revealed to us, Mr. Speaker, the position which that party sees itself in vis a vis the leader of the federal party in Ottawa.

Now, Mr. Speaker, on the second point, the reference to my statement that the people of this Province will support our government in leaving the petroleum out there until hell freezes over provided we do not see a properly negotiated agreement on revenue sharing, and on joint management, and Mr. Speaker -

MR. STIRLING:

Oh, that is a change.

MR. BARRY: Well, Mr. Speaker, obviously the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has done what he often does, and obviously what the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) has done, and that is just read the headlines and not read the story under the headlines. And if they had read the story under the headlines, Mr. Speaker, and I might note it was interesting to compare the headlines in The Daily News and the headlines in The Evening Telegram, the same story on the same speech, given the same day, both reporters present at the same time, and the headline in The Evening Telegram dealt with the very positive reaction of this government to a reasonable attempt at negotiation -

MR. NEARY: That is because you told them to.

MR. BARRY: - in response to what we take to be the Prime Minister of Canada's sincere indication that he is willing to listen. To a fair revenue sharing and joint management in offshore petroleum development, we take a very positive attitude. Now The Evening Telegram's headline appeared to indicate that we were being conciliatory and positive and The Daily News' headline plucked out the only thing that could be considered in any way negative. And, Mr. Speaker, it was not in the context of the story, if anybody had taken the time to read, and the member opposite obviously did not take the time to read the newspaper story, it would have been clear that we were very, very eager and very sincere in our hope that the Prime Minister of Canada will follow through with, in some communication to this government, what he has indicated publicly in the media, and that is revenue sharing, to treat this Province

MR. BARRY: the same as the Province of Alberta will be treated from a resource on land and secondly, with true joint management. And if that is the case, Mr. Speaker, we can see early and co-operative development of oil and gas.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary. The hon. member for Lapoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman can blame the newspapers and try to distinguish between the newspapers all he likes but we all have ears in this House and we just heard the hon. gentleman make a vicious attack on the government of this nation -

MR. HANCOCK: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: - just a few moments. We can all hear it. And the hon. gentleman cannot come in tomorrow and say he is being misquoted. And if he wants to talk about God, the hon. gentleman genuflects to him every day right there to his immediate right.

MR. MORGAN: Ask the question.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker -

MR. HANCOCK: You are hitting a nerve again.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman seems now to be enunciating or articulating a change of policy. The provincial government seems to have changed its policy now as far as offshore ownership is concerned and they are now talking about a properly negotiated revenue from the oil and joint management. Now that is a complete change of policy. Would the hon. gentleman elaborate on those two points, just what he means by a properly negotiated settlement as far as the revenue is concerned and joint management? Is that now the position of this government?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY: First of all with reference to attacking newspapers, I want to make it very clear, Mr. Speaker, I compliment both reporters in both papers for - and I am really sincere about this, I underline - for the accuracy of the general story that was written. My criticism, Mr. Speaker, has to do with the headline labelers, whoever they might be in the respective papers. The headlines from time to time in both papers, I think, fail to accurately represent the content of either my story or stories from any and I would -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: - suspect even stories relating to some of the remarks made by the hon. members opposite when they do get (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: I never complain.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, with respect to joint management the members opposite have taken about two years longer than everybody else in the Province after the Hibernia discovery to become a little interested in what the proper oil and gas policy should be. And maybe that tardiness reflects the fact that they have not yet come to realize that this government has never changed from the position that we put to the federal government as early as 1973 -1974 and in formal submission in 1975, Mr. Speaker, where there was a provision for joint management submitted to the Prime Minister of Canada and he sent it back with a statement that, 'It will never happen, you better go to court.' Now I am hoping that the federal government - and indications are that he has moved from his

MR. L. BARRY:

position. And the transcript of his remarks which I have says that he accepts the notion of joint management and now we want to see what the details of that will be. We hope, and I expect that he will be communicating with the Premier shortly to confirm the position he took publicly, and I am very hopeful that we will be able to see a negotiated settlement to this very difficult problem.

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

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

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is something we have been saying in this House and the hon. gentleman just put it almost in our words. We have been saying for the last ten years, 'They are going to sit on the Lower Churchill until hell freezes over, they are going to sit on the offshore oil until hell freezes over, they are going to sit on all the other resources in this Province until hell freezes over' and everybody will be starving to death, unemployed, will not be able to cope with the cost of living in this Province. But now apparently the government are beginning to see the error of their ways. And they are seeing it for a very good reason, Mr. Speaker, that they are worried about the oil glut in the world, and the price of oil is escalating and the price of development of the offshore is escalating. They have already put the Lower Churchill out of reach of development in this century -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member has a question?

MR. S. NEARY: -and they are afraid the same thing might happen to the offshore oil. Well, let me ask the hon. gentleman, when we are talking about prices per barrel for oil, first of all, let me ask the hon. gentleman if the glut of oil in the world at the present time will have any

MR. S. NEARY: bearing on the development of the offshore oil out of Hibernia? And when the hon. gentleman answers that question perhaps he could also tell the House what price per barrel we are talking about for Hibernia oil? The Saudi Arabians the other day negotiated thirty-two dollar a barrel oil. What is the price per barrel we are talking about, Hibernia oil, is it thirty-two dollars? Is it thirty-five dollars? Is it forty dollars? Or is it even higher than forty dollars? What is the price per barrel for Hibernia oil we are talking about?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I understand that members opposite participated in a little function over the weekend where one of the issues was energy. The label of the party, I believe, was 'The Liberal Party Listens'. Well, I assume that next week or next month there is going to be another such conference, Mr. Speaker, and they will call this one, 'The Liberal Party Understands'. But that might be too much to hope for.

MR. STIRLING: That is not a bad slogan.

MR. L. BARRY: If you like that one you can use it.

Mr. Speaker, the price per barrel

MR. BARRY: for Hibernia - I assume the member was asking, what is the price that it will be necessary to obtain in order to make commercial development possible offshore?

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. BARRY: Well, Mr. Speaker, unlike previous Liberal administrations which were able, such as in the case of remember the old slogans, 'One mil power', 'power for Newfoundland at one mil', unlimited supplies of power at one mil' - unlike these slogans which were drawn out of the air by some form of sorcery, this government believes, Mr. Speaker, in establishing prices when all the information is in. And there will be a development plan, an approval process, Mr. Speaker, whereby the public of this Province and the people of Newfoundland will have an input into the type of development, into how the development will take place.

MR. NEARY: Hogwash!

MR. BARRY: Once it is known how the development will take place, it will then be possible to put a trace on, or a cost on that development, and once the cost is on that development, Mr. Speaker, it will then be possible to establish clearly what the exact price per barrel will be needed in order to pay for that development. I can say, however, Mr. Speaker, that the economic analysis of Hibernia, the report which is being published, and which I assume all members opposite read nightly -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. BARRY: - indicates that the price that will be necessary will be fairly close to the

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: world price for Hibernia in order to justify production. And, Mr. Speaker, this is not out of line with -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!  
I must tell the hon. member now that the time for Oral Questions has expired.

MR. BARRY: Yes. I would just like to say this is not out of line with the price that is allowed by the federal government for the oil sands.

o o o

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

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

MR. STIRLING: In the Question Period the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) suggested that I was not reading properly an item on page 75 of the Five Year Plan in which he says, 'Allowing prices to rise to a free market level is their policy.' Now, Mr. Speaker, he gave the impression -

MR. BARRY: Did you read it?

MR. STIRLING: Yes.

MR. BARRY: Did you read (inaudible).

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

MR. STIRLING: 'Allowing prices to rise to a free market level is the most effective policy available to combat independence on foreign oil supplies.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STIRLING: This is the government's policy and it is completely contrary to what he just said a minute ago, Mr. Speaker, and he was suggesting that I was not quoting the correct information and I have now corrected it.

MR. BARRY: You were not (inaudible) you have just shown.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Well, obviously it is not a point of order, it is a difference of opinion, I believe, between two hon. members.

MR. NEARY: It is a good point, Mr. Speaker.  
An excellent point.

MR. BARRY: Oh!

NOTICES OF MOTIONS

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I have to announce on behalf of the government two resignations. Those resignations,

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, are from the Public Accounts Committee. The hon. the member for St. John's West (Mr. Barrett) and the hon. member for Menihek (Mr. Walsh), both having laboured valiantly and contributed greatly to the Public Accounts Committee, have now decided to rotate in accordance with the policy of the government on committees. So I would move, and I have already mentioned to the Deputy Deputy House Leader of the Opposition this, that the hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) and the hon. member for Harbour Main - Bell Island (Mr. Doyle) serve on the Public Accounts Committee in the places of the hon. member for St. John's West and the hon. member for Menihek.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I think that it is significant and not in fun as the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) had indicated when he got up and created the impression that he was now going to announce a tragic thing, the resignation of two members. If we ever get the truth, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say on this side - having served on that committee with those two gentlemen, I can say, Mr. Speaker, that they served with distinction -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. STIRLING: - and with fairness and they gave a report which was unanimous, Mr. Speaker, a unanimous report that found that a member of the Cabinet had knowingly contravened the Public Tendering Act.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, they were also unanimous and fearless in presenting their most recent report which was also unanimous. Well, Mr. Speaker, neither are the first or the second have been given the respect that those hon. members due, all the members of the Public Accounts Committee, in having that report debated in this House of

MR. STIRLING:                   Assembl<sup>y</sup>. And there is no doubt that when the Premier answered questions here, when we were discussing it in debate, that       he       has no intention of paying any attention to reports coming in from the Public Accounts Committee, -

MR. WARREN:                   Hear, hear.

MR. STIRLING:                   - that he will go through the motions. And, Mr. Speaker, maybe we should find out why it is that two of the members on the government side decided to resign from the Public Accounts Committee -

MR. WARREN:                   Forced, forced.

MR. STIRLING:                   - because, Mr. Speaker, we have had just very, very short notice, like today, I believe, that these two members were to be replaced. And, Mr. Speaker, I think that we have seen now that we have - I hope that the two new members coming in on the committee will show the same determination as -

MR. WARREN:                   I am doubtful about one of them.

MR. STIRLING:

the two members who resigned - maybe they resigned because they were being ineffective and they were being insulted by the government by not handling it properly.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this is maybe a day that people should ask these members why they are leaving. Maybe the government should - maybe they are announcing a new policy and maybe that is going to be the policy that they are going to use, because they have been giving the Province only the thirty second political answer. Maybe tomorrow the Premier will be announcing, in accordance with his policy, that he is going to rotate the Cabinet and one of the persons who is going to be spun out in the rotation is the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STIRLING: And maybe that is the way we are going to hear about the resignation of the Minister of Labour and Manpower.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): You have heard the motion.

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the Leader of the Opposition -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CARTER: By what right does he speak?

MR. NEARY: By what right? By the right that

I was elected to this hon. House by a group of voters in LaPoile district. That is my right and my privilege to speak in this House.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: That is the right by which I speak in case the hon. gentleman is concerned. I do not have to

MR. NEARY: ask permission of the St. John's East cocktail set. I can speak here by right. It is my right. And, Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the Leader of the Opposition in expressing a bit of praise for the two hon. members of the Committee who are resigning.

MR. CALLAN: Forced.

MR. NEARY: No. I do not know if they are forced. or not, but they are resigning from the Committee. They may have their own personal reasons for resigning, we do not know. The hon. gentlemen can only tell us themselves, they can only stand in their places in this House and say, 'No, due to pressure of business' or due to the fact that they want to get interested in some other aspect of the House of Assembly, but it is entirely up to them. They can stand in the House - as hon. members know, this is a debatable motion and I would expect both hon. gentlemen to get up and tell us why they felt they had to resign at this particular time. If they do not want to do it, well, they cannot be forced to do it, it is entirely up to themselves. But I do want to say, Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Public Accounts Committee, that I felt very comfortable and felt that these two members on the Public Accounts Committee did a very worthwhile job.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: I always found both hon. gentlemen -  
I have to

MR. NEARY:

say this as far as the Public Accounts Committee is concerned now, and that is all I am talking about, but I have found them to be straight and honest and decent in every way, shape and form otherwise, Mr. Speaker, if that was not the case, if both sides did not co-operate, you would not have seen three Public Accounts Committee reports come into this House where the decision was unanimous.

MR. HISCOCK:

That is why they are being removed.

MR. NEARY:

Well I do not know if that is

why they are being removed or not, that only remains to be seen. But I am very concerned about the replacements.

Having congratulated the hon. gentlemen for the work that they have done on the Public Accounts Committee, and I say this, Mr. Speaker, in all sincerity, I think as a result of their co-operation and their desire to get at the facts, their

desire to get at the truth and their desire to see that justice was done at the most corrupt time in Newfoundland's history, and we are talking about the period from 1972 up to March 17, 1979, the most corrupt period in Newfoundland's history. And I must say that these two members who are resigning, Mr. Speaker, did not shirk their responsibilities. As a matter of fact, there were occasions when I was amazed and I was rather pleasantly surprised that we had two hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who wanted to see that justice was done, who wanted to see the facts brought into the light of day. And one of the hon. gentlemen who is resigning was Vice Chairman of the Committee. I must say I did not always agree with his decision on the other committees, but in this particular instance I thought the gentleman was pretty fair. But I am very concerned, Mr. Speaker, about the new appointments to the committee.

MR. NEARY: Now the government has the right to name their own members to that committee but I am very concerned that one of the nominees happens to be the Executive Assistant to the Premier. Now, Mr. Speaker, is that done deliberately?

MR. HISCOCK: Conflict of interest.

MR. NEARY: I would suspect there is a bit of conflict of interest there, Mr. Speaker. I have a feeling that that is deliberate unless, of course, the government is down -

MR. HANCOCK: To an all time low.

MR. NEARY: - no, it is down now so low in manpower that they have to duplicate positions. I know they are low on manpower as far as bringing people into the Cabinet is concerned, there are no heavies over there, no heavies at all. The Premier must have many a restless night trying to figure out who he is going to bring into his Cabinet when the Minister of Manpower and Labour (Mr. Dinn) gets the flick. It is a big problem. They have a big problem with manpower. They are very, very low on people to put on committees and people to put into the Cabinet. But having said that, Mr. Speaker,

MR. NEARY:

I am sure that the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) would have been very happy to serve on the Public Accounts Committee.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: The member for Bay of Islands does not have any extra responsibilities. The hon. member for Bay of Islands is beholding to nobody, is obligated to nobody. The member for Harbour Main - Bell Island (Mr. Doyle) is beholding to the Premier, and obligated to the Premier, and has to kiss the hem of the Premier's garment every time he lifts his little finger.

MR. WOODROW: A loyal man.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman is getting his extra compensation via the fact that he is Executive Assistant in the Premier's Office.

AN HON. MEMBER: A man loyal to the party.

MR. NEARY: And he will toe the party line and he will toe whatever line the government wants him to toe and whatever way the Premier wants him to jump when he pulls the string, that is the way the hon. gentleman will jump. And that is a very dangerous precedent, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) will tell us that the member for Harbour Main - Bell Island is going to resign from the Premier's Office and serve on the Public Accounts Committee, deal with that exclusively. The hon. gentleman cannot serve two masters. And, Mr. Speaker, I am terribly concerned, I am awfully worried about that appointment and I doubt if it will be very easy in the foreseeable future to get a unanimous report of the Public Accounts Committee. And then, of course, to set the devil in everybody they went and also put on a man who betrayed his party. One of the lowest things that you can do in political life is to betray your own party.

MR. LUSH: A personal attack.

MR. NEARY:  
gentleman who -

So the other member is a

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is not so.

MR. HISCOCK:  
and dance to the Premier's tune.

Who wants to get in the Cabinet

MR. NEARY:  
in the Cabinet they should have put him in the Cabinet.

Well, if they wanted to put him

MR. HANCOCK:  
toe the line a bit further.

A little bit of pressure,

MR. NEARY:  
worried about that. But only time will tell. Mr. Speaker, only time will tell whether or not the Committee now will be able to function as it has in the past. I would think that the Public Accounts Committee, up to now, is a model for any Public Accounts Committee across Canada. As a matter of fact, probably a model for a Public Accounts Committee in a good many parts of the British Empire, mainly because there have been harmonious relations, good will, and a feeling of co-operation between all hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House up to the present time. And only time, Mr. Speaker, will tell whether or not the government wishes the Public Accounts Committee

MR. NEARY: to continue in a free, unimpeded non-interference and carry on in a comfortable way without anybody running every time we hold a meeting, running with stories to the Premier or to the Tory caucus. Reports that reach our ears, Mr. Speaker, indicate that on a number of occasions - and that is why I admire the two hon. gentlemen who are resigning, the reports reaching us, whether they are right or wrong, reports reaching our ears tell us that on one or two occasions in the Tory caucus there was quite a fuss about the government members on the Public Accounts Committee being too hard on the government, being too hard on the former Premier and the ministers.-

AN HON. MEMBER: That is your opinion.

MR. NEARY: - suggesting to the members that they should watch it, that they should not come down hard on the government or come down hard on the former Premier or the ministers in that administration, and some of whom are now members of the present administration. Do not ever forget, Mr. Speaker, that eleven or twelve ministers, in that corrupt government are now members of the present administration.

MR. FLIGHT: Of this corrupt government.

MR. NEARY: And you cannot help, when you are carrying out your investigation, you cannot help their names coming up in connection with wrongdoing and improper spending of public funds and misuse of public funds and impropriety. It cannot help but come up. And I can understand the ministers being sore with their colleagues, Mr. Speaker, about embarrassing them. But that was their job and they did it well. And I am very pleased to have been associated with these two gentlemen as members of the Public Accounts Committee.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: And as I say, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to see them go. Even though we were not always 100 per cent, I am sorry to see them go. They did a magnificent job as members of the Public Accounts Committee. I cannot speak for any other committee because I have not been on the committee with them. But I have been on the Public Accounts Committee now for some time and I can tell hon. members of the House this, that both gentlemen had no problem at all in asking penetrating questions, in trying to get at the truth and bring the facts of what happened during that era, from 1972 up to 1979, bringing the facts up into the light of day and letting the taxpayers of this Province know precisely what went on.

I congratulate both hon. gentlemen for doing a good job, a very worthwhile job and, as I say, only time will tell whether or not the Public Accounts Committee will be able to function in a free-wheeling, democratic way in future. And I hope, Mr. Speaker, that in a short while my fears will be allayed, that the two new appointees to the Public Accounts Committee will show beyond any doubt that not only will justice be done in this Province but justice will appear to be done, that they will make their contribution to the Committee in an impartial, unbiased fashion, and that we will be able to carry on with the good work that the Public Accounts Committee has been doing in this Province in the last couple of years.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simm): You have heard the motion.  
The hon. member for St. John's West.

MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, I think I would be remiss if I missed the opportunity to acknowledge and respond to the gentleman opposite for such kind words, one does not

MR. BARRETT: normally hear them in his own lifetime.  
But I must say it has been quite an interesting situation,  
representing this hon. House on this particular Committee.  
And I would like to assure those members opposite who have  
some concerns, that my decision to leave the Committee at this  
particular point in time was not one which was

MR. H. BARRETT: asked of me by anybody else but one which I initiated on my own. In accepting the position some two years ago, it was on the basis and on the understanding that it would be for a specified period of time. And I think it is probably a reflection in keeping with this government's view of having as many people make a contribution wherever possible to the various committees of government without having it probably handled on a continuous basis by the same people.

I acknowledge the sentiments expressed by hon. gentlemen opposite who served with me on this committee and I can assure them that I will make whatever ongoing contribution I can to support the ongoing philosophies of that group. One of the reasons, of course, why this Public Accounts Committee has been successful during the past couple of years is possibly the approach that the Committee has been given by this particular administration. There has been absolutely no interference into this Committee by any members of the government. We have all been able to operate quite openly, without any cause of any suggestion of curtailment of inquiry.

MR. L. STIRLING: Neither have they taken any action.

MR. H. BARRETT: I am sorry but I have to disagree with that point. There has been a great deal of action taken as a result of the initiations that have been uncovered by this Committee. A great number of changes have been brought about in various departments of government, and I think constructive changes, and, I think, as a result of the work and the probing by this Committee.

One of the things that one of my friends opposite brought up, unfortunately, was the inference of the problems that might have existed in the previous administration and the corruption that might have been present at that particular time. But one can only observe that we

MR. H. BARRETT: have nothing by which we can judge as to how corrupt the government was in relation to any other government because in a previous administration to that, a Public Accounts Committee was not allowed to function so, therefore, there was no opportunity to have a public inquiry into the various departments of government that existed at that particular time. So without wanting to become a very negative person in relation to my response, I can only say that we have nothing to which we can compare.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. gentlemen opposite for their sincere - I trust - expressions on behalf of my colleague and myself and can assure them - and I certainly feel that those people who have been appointed in our steads are very reputable, honourable gentlemen who will have no problem in following in our footsteps. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): You have heard the motion. Those in favour, 'aye', contrary 'nay', carried.

Any further Notices of Motion?

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Speaker, in answer to a question from the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) the last Question Period to table a letter from the Labour Relations Board, 30th. April 1981, I will not only table the letter but I will read it. 'I have received your letter - as a result of the letter I sent, as a matter of fact, to the Chairman of the Labour Relations Board, I received this letter back: 'I have received your letter of

MR. J. DINN: 20th. April 1981 concerning the recent certification of the office and technical employees of Newfoundland Light and Power Company Limited. Unfortunately your letter did not come to my attention until after the board meeting of 22nd. April 1981. However, I will discuss the matter with the Board at its next meeting and give you a reply following that meeting'.

MR. HISCOCK: (Inaudible) reply was.

MR. J. DINN: The reply has already been tabled in the House. And he did not seem to be overly - the tone of this letter -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. J. DINN: - is not one that makes me think that the Chairman of the Labour Relations Board is overly perturbed about my letter.

MR. SPEAKER: Any further Answers to Questions?  
The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the answer to an oral question asked by the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) May 26th. with respect to the Chairmanship of the St. John's and Eastern Residential Tenancies Board.

MR. SPEAKER: Any further Answers to Questions?

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: The concurrence debates, Social Services.

MR. SPEAKER: Concurrence debates. Did you say Government Services?

MR. MARSHALL: The Chairman of Committee will - this is Order 3 and it is the Social Services Committee report. The Head -

MR. SPEAKER: I can give the Heads if the hon. member would like.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Yes, the Speaker has them, he can give them.

But, Mr. Speaker, can I just ask the House - just for the guidance of the House, last year during the concurrence debates it was agreed that each member would be allowed to speak for ten minutes and then he would have to yield to another member but he may get up again.

MR. S. NEARY: The same rules as Committee of the Whole.

MR. MARSHALL: In other words, the same rules as Committee of the Whole. Without us agreeing to that beforehand, the regular rules with respect to debate in the House of Assembly would have effect and I would suggest to the House and move that this be the procedure that we implement again this year in connection with it.

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

MR. STIRLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, when these rules were agreed to some time ago, it was agreed to be tried on a trial basis and I think it is the judgement on this side that the government gave up trying to co-operate by scheduling these committee meetings one after the other. But the other point that was asked last year, and I presume that the President of the Council is now agreeing to it, is that we would also follow the committee rules, the ten minute/ten minute that you would have the ministers, therefore, questioned and comment so that we were not just making comments that were not relevant to the specific areas being discussed. And if the minister was not here, the purpose of the debate in this concurrence debate would get lost so I presume that the President is prepared to have the ministers here to answer questions that come out in these debates.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, look, the ministers were at the committee hearings.

AN HON. MEMBER: We want them here also.

MR. MARSHALL: As many of the ministers who can be here will be here and are here right now. But the purpose of this debate is to whether the report of the committee is to be concurred with. And as far as the ministers are concerned, the ministers were at committee hearings and I say as many of them who can be here are. Now, when I make a

MR. MARSHALL: proposal in a positive fashion, I think it is rather unfortunate but the hon. gentleman seems today - I do not know, but he must have had an awful disappointment at the falldown of the policy conference in Corner Brook because he seems to be bristling and a little bit negative here today. But that is the situation and that is the answer to the hon. member.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Well, with respect the rules for debate would normally be thirty minutes debate. If there is agreement for such a suggestion, then there would have to be unanimous agreement. Is there unanimous agreement? Do the same rules that apply during committee which are ten minutes/ten minutes - I think everybody knows what we are talking about - is there agreement for that?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could we have the heads we are doing under this?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, I can advise hon. members under the Social Services Committee Report you have the heads of the Departments of Justice, Health, Education, Environment, Social Services, Culture, Recreation and Youth. That is correct, I believe.

The hon. member for St.

John's North.

Mr. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I rise to begin the concurrence debates and I notice with some pleasure that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is present in the chamber. Unfortunately the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) is not and I rather wish it were the other way around, because every time the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) opens his mouth he -

MR. STIRLING: A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A point of order has been raised by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: I think we might just as well get a ruling from the Chair. It has been battered around many times, and I think it is now time to get a ruling from the Chair, that a member cannot refer to the absence of another member. That has been battered around a number of times and I would just as soon- because a member may be away for any number of reasons and the rules in Beauchesne are there for a specific purpose. The member obviously is not here and if you get into that kind of situation the whole time of the House will be taken by each person getting up to debate and explain why it is that he is not present in the House and why he was not on a specific day. So, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Speaker to give a ruling, because it has gotten to be a habit now. The Premier used it the other day, the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) is doing it constantly. I think we might as well get that matter straightened away.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Let us quote authority. The hon. gentleman, what he was doing, he was not criticizing anybody, he was just purely making an observation.

MR. STIRLING: You are not allowed to  
(Inaudible)

MR. MARSHALL: And you know what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. In his own little way, insipid little way, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition was on his feet a few moments ago trying to draw to attention that certain ministers were not here and these ministers are about public business out in Corner Brook signing DREE agreements. So you cannot have it both ways.

June 1, 1981

Tape No. 2007

AH-4

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): With respect to the point of order, I will bring the appropriate reference to the attention of all hon. members and hope that they will pay heed to it. Beauchesne's fifth edition, paragraph

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): 316, page 103 says, "Besides the prohibitions contained in Standing Order 35' which relates to the House of Commons 'it has been sanctioned by usage that a Member, while speaking, must not:' - and I refer to subsection (c) - 'refer to the presence or absence of specific Members;'. So it is there for everybody to see and I draw it to everybody's attention.

MR. CARTER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CARTER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is a great pleasure to know that the rules of this House are in such competent hands.

The Heads that were considered were Health, Environment, Recreation, Culture and Youth, Social Services, Justice and Education, and some thirty hours were used in that particular debate. There was time for more debate, but by agreement from both sides, thirty hours were sufficient. Something like twelve hours, by the way, were used on Education and I do not think any member can complain that there was not sufficient time given for every legitimate and even some questionable questions. Anything they wanted to bring up was brought up. And I might add that the spirit of debate in Committee was far better and much more generous than the spirit in this House. There was not a cross word, there was not even a split infinitive or a dangling participle, just a few misplaced modifiers, that was all. And I would say, Mr. Speaker, that this type of debate, although it may not save any money directly, I would say the knowledge that such a thorough-going scrutiny of a minister's department is taking place serves to make the minister and his staff all that much more careful when they are putting together their estimates. And I would say that the cumulative effect of

MR. CARTER: this particular procedure is very great indeed.

It is also interesting to note that the total amount of money that was passed in these Committees was approximately \$926 million, and certainly, if you save a million here and a million there, it soon mounts up. But \$926 million, this is the amount of money that these six departments use. But by going through the figures as presented in the budget, the Government of Newfoundland or the people of Newfoundland pay directly to Ottawa out of their own pockets some \$1 billion. Now, this is not money that you might have gotten, that you otherwise would have gotten, this is money that rested for some short time in hon. members' pockets, and this money goes from their pockets directly to the government in Ottawa. It is a very interesting sum. And I am getting these figures from our own budgetary figures. No one has questioned these figures. Members opposite may or may not like the budget, but they have not disputed any of the figures that are in the budget. And a very small amount of effort, a little bit of 'back of the envelope' arithmetic can produce at least \$1 billion that leaves the pockets of Newfoundlanders -

MR. STIRLING: Read it into the record (inaudible).

MR. CARTER: - and goes to Ottawa. It is very interesting. I will just go through it very quickly for members' consideration.

The retail sales tax the Newfoundland Government takes in, according to its own figures this year, \$286 million, which is 11 per cent.

MR. WARREN: Eleven per cent, highest in Canada.

MR. CARTER: But not everything is subject to 11 per cent, some things are exempt.

MR. STIRLING: Gasoline is subjected to 22 per cent.

MR. CARTER:

I am coming to that.

There is also a federal sales tax which is about 11 per cent. It is calculated on the wholesale price so it would effectively be somewhat less, but there are practically no exceptions to that. So I think it is very safe to assume that something of the order of \$300 million goes directly to Ottawa on the basis of federal sales tax.

The personal income tax, according to the figures right here, is \$196 million. It is 58 per cent of the federal income tax. That is -

MR. CARTER: of every \$1.58 that you spend in your income tax, one dollar goes to the federal government, fifty-eight cents to the provincial government. So since the figure here is \$196 million, a very quick calculation brings out another \$300 million in income tax that goes to the federal government. This is right out of your pocket and into the pocket of Ottawa. That is three and three - \$600 million.

The gasoline tax is something of the order of \$55 million but by the same token there is also a federal tax on gasoline and it is not quite as much as the provincial one but I think it is safe to say that something of the order of \$50 million goes to the federal government in gasoline and fuel taxes.

Corporate income tax - our share is \$41 million but that is only 14 per cent. The federal corporation tax is 50 per cent for large businesses, 25 per cent for small businesses. So I am just trying to relate for the hon. gentleman's information that something of the order - since \$926 million were used up in our six headings, something of the same amount goes directly to Ottawa.

MR. STIRLING: (Inaudible) UIC.

MR. CARTER: The corporate income tax is \$41 million but I would suggest that our federal share -

MR. NEARY: MCP, unemployment insurance.

MR. CARTER: The MCP, as the hon. gentleman knows - I am looking at page 34 of the Budget - comes in under Established Programmes Financing Grant - and I am coming to that.

The tobacco and liquor tax together bring in something like \$150 million to the federal government. So the gasoline tax roughly \$50 million - these are dollar amounts that can be calculated that come into our pockets to go to Ottawa. This comes to nearly \$1 billion. Now by the same token there are other amounts like foreign sales - practically all our minerals are exported - they bring

MR. CARTER: in foreign currency. There are purchases -

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. HANCOCK: Mr. Speaker, it is bad enough to have a minister who will not resign.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is supposed to be moving a concurrence debate on the estimates of the Department of Education, Justice, Health, Environment, Culture, Recreation and Youth and Social Services. Now did the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, when he stood in his place, did he move concurrence of the Committee Report? No, he has not done it to this moment.

AN HON. MEMBER: He has not had a chance.

MR. NEARY: As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, he gave the House, in his few brief remarks before he started to give us a lecture on high financing, before the hon. gentleman became an instant expert on the economy and on financing in this Province, gave us all the reason in the world for voting against this Committee Report.

Now, Mr. Speaker, hon. members know that I have strongly objected to moving the estimates off the floor of this House. This year again it has been proven beyond any doubt that the system that we had of debating estimates on the floor of this hon. House is far superior to the one that was forced down the throats of the Opposition by the government, far superior.

Mr. Speaker, you are almost giving the government a free ride -

MR. STAGG: Unanimous approval.

MR. NEARY: - giving the government-unanimous approval, Mr. Speaker, was given by the former Leader of this Party on the provision, proviso that it be tried out for a year

MR. NEARY: and if it did not work that the rules be changed back to where they were originally. The government have reneged on that, the government have refused to budge. It works like a charm the hon. gentleman says and ministers, I am sure, think it works like a charm, and the Premier, who tells us it is the greatest reform since Newfoundland was discovered for the simple reason that they get a free ride on the estimates. That is why it is working like a charm. They come down, Mr. Speaker - I remember I was filling in, I would have boycotted the meetings altogether but I was asked to fill in for one of my colleagues and I went to a meeting and the Chairman of

MR. NEARY:

the Committee would not even allow us to refer to estimates passed in this House several years back. We were told that we had to deal with this year's estimates only, and that was it. And then I came up to another Committee meeting here in the House to fill in for one of my colleagues and I was told something completely opposite, I was told by the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) that we could have a wide-ranging debate, the same as we used to have in the House of Assembly. Two members sitting on the same side of the House giving two different interpretations of the rules of this House. One trying to stifle debate, muzzle debate, and the other letting her go as we are entitled to do under the rules of the House.

So, Mr. Speaker, the government has managed to get a free ride now for the last couple of years. You have committees meeting helter-skelter all over the place. A committee meeting going on here, a committee meeting going on there, members running around like roosters with their heads cut off trying to attend more than one meeting. The press unable to cover the meetings, Mr. Speaker, it is wrong and the estimates should be restored, brought back to the floor of this House where they rightfully belong. I can see, according to the smirk and the grin on the face of the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) that that is not going to happen, that they are delighted with the arrangement that they got, they are absolutely charmed about the way they were able to con the Opposition there a couple of years ago. They were going to give the Opposition all kinds of perks, they would all have their own offices, they would all have their own private secretary, and we would have research grants, and the committees would not all meet at the same time, and all this sort of thing, but now they refuse to budge. They managed to get the two-thirds majority they need to change the rules and now they are

June 1, 1981

Tape No. 2010

NM - 2

MR. NEARY: going to stick by it. Whether  
it is in the interest of the people of this Province or not,  
they are going to force the House to carry on with

MR. NEARY: this foolish system that they now have.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not see the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) in his seat, but I want to swing for a moment to one of the Heads under this Committee, Justice. I want to talk a few moments to the Minister of Justice about the ever-increasing vandalism and crime in this Province. Mr. Speaker, every time we raise this matter, and we have raised it in the last couple of years in this hon. House, we are told by the Minister of Justice that vandalism and crime in this Province is not increasing. I remember the hon. gentleman's predecessor scolding us, telling us that anybody who advocates or makes a statement that vandalism and crime is on the increase in Newfoundland is a traitor to his Province. Yet every day you turn on your television and your radio and you read the newspapers you see examples of armed robbery, gas stations being held up, the corner grocery store being held up, senior citizens, ladies having their handbags snatched, crime that we never heard of in this Province a few years ago now taking place. But yet the minister seems to bury his head in the sand. And I cannot see a finger being lifted by the administration to do anything about the increasing vandalism and crime in this Province.

Now it is hitting the parks!

Over the weekend the worst vandalism in the history of Newfoundland took place down in Bowring Park. Last week, on the May 24 weekend, we heard about it in the provincial parks. And, Mr. Speaker, it is getting out of hand, getting out of control. And I would like now, while we are on these estimates, for the minister to stand in this House and tell the people of this Province, reassure the people of this Province

June 1, 1981

Tape 2011

PK - 2

MR. NEARY:                   that something is being done about the ever-increasing vandalism and crime in this Province, and something positive is being done. And I am not talking about building jails all over Newfoundland. That is not the answer to our crime rate, Mr. Speaker, building jails and filling them up with people who run afoul of the law. That is not the answer.

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, I think we are entitled to have a statement from the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) that will tell the people of this Province that the authorities have no intention of surrendering to the criminals in this Province as they have done, that we are going to try to bring rape and crime under control, that we are going to see that justice is done in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman may treat this subject rather lightly, but it is a very serious matter in Newfoundland. Only a few years ago in this Province you could leave home without locking your door, but you cannot do it today.

MR. CARTER: It is the bad example that you are setting.

MR. NEARY: I am setting a bad example? In what way?

MR. CARTER: (Inaudible) the intellectual rape of this House

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, there is the contempt and there is the arrogance. That is typical of the attitude of this government.

MR. HANCOCK: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: The arrogance and the contempt - we see it in the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn), we see it in the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), we see it in the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry), we see it in the backbenches, nothing but arrogance and contempt for the ordinary people of this Province. And all people have to do who sit in the galleries of this House is just listen to the remarks that come across the floor of this House. They do not seem to take anything seriously. I never saw so much concern and discontent in Newfoundlanders as there is today.

MR. HANCOCK: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: We have about four major problems. We have the highest cost of living in Canada, we have the highest taxes in the Canadian nation, we have the second highest unemployment in Canada and we have vandalism and crime that is out of control.

MR. HANCOCK: And it was not heard tell of until five years ago.

MR. NEARY: And up to three or four or five years ago, Mr. Speaker, we never heard - we used to read about it and probably hear about it on television, about all the crime that was taking place in the United States and on the mainland of Canada. Armed robberies, robberies of violence, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. gentlemen sit over there and make jokes, make snide remarks about it.

Well, I am quite serious, and I hope the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) will take me seriously and make a statement of policy of what the government intends to do about this ever-increasing vandalism and crime wave that seems to have hit Newfoundland.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HANCOCK: The galoot is up again.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, if the rules of Committee apply to this debate by a unanimous agreement then obviously we would each have ten minutes. I was not given a chance to finish my few remarks because of the stream of poison as it came from opposite. I wanted to go through each department or spend a few moments in each department but, of course, the hon. gentlemen opposite are only interested in chaos so it is going to be very difficult, I suppose, to get through. However, I will try.

In the Department of Health estimates we found that the Department of Health budget is increasing

MR. CARTER: at a very great rate. In fact, it is now the second largest heading in the provincial government. Education is the largest, Health is second and Social Services third; Justice is fourth and Environment, Recreation, Culture and Youth. Justice, by the way, has increased its consumption of our resources market'ately and it would be

MR. CARTER:

very interesting to hear from the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer), he would have some comments on that.

I would also like to hear from the Minister of Justice on the mounted police contract that has yet to be signed. I understand the federal government wants us to pay seventy-five per cent, do it on a seventy-five/twenty-five basis, whereas I believe our proposal is for sixty/fifty. It used to be fifty/fifty. That is something that might be very worthwhile debating in this House.

But it is very hard to have good debates in this House because whereas we try and deal with issues all we get opposite is - all they are interested in dealing with is personalities. And I think it is most unfortunate that the time of this House is wasted so badly.

I think the Department of Education was particularly - the debate was particularly good. Because the minister brought in more information than had ever been brought into this House, and, in fact, there was no piece of information requested that was refused. And that is something - I realize that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) -

MR. NEARY:

(Inaudible) in my life.

MR. CARTER:

- I admit that the member for LaPoile would like to have the debate all in this House and I would like to assure him that the morbid desire to have your name and face in the press is not a strange perversion. It is one of your regular ones. It is not a queer one. It is a recognized perversion. But however recognized it is, it should not be pandered to. The hon. gentleman, all he wants is headlines, preferably on Thursday and Friday. It is unusual to hear too much to hear from him on a Monday. However, on a Thursday and Friday we do hear a lot from him. And I would like to assure him that it is perfectly normal for him to look for those kinds of headlines. There is nothing strange about it. It does not

MR. CARTER: mean that he is losing his grip but ,nevertheless, it is very disruptive to this House and we would rather that he kept a more civil tongue in his head.

MR. HANCOCK: What heading are you on now?

MR. NEARY: Who is attacking who personally now? Who is the smearer artist now?

MR. WARREN: Shame!

MR. NEARY: Who is bringing the personalities in?

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. CARTER: See, Mr. Speaker, what one has to put up with.

MR. NEARY: Sit down, boy, and do not be making a fool of yourself.

MR. HANCOCK: You must be on your own heading now because your head is big enough,

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CARTER: Another point I wanted to make before sitting down is that there are- you know, it is not my intention to suggest that we pay more to Ottawa than we receive.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CARTER: It was not my intention to make the point that we pay more to Ottawa than we receive. On balance I think we do receive more from Ottawa but it would be a very interesting sum to do for each of the years of Confederation, and I would suggest that, some of the earlier years of Confederation, we paid considerably more for the privilege of being part of Canada than we actually received. And that is one of the reasons why I bridle so easily when anybody on the other side has the tinerity to praise the former, former Premier who presided over the Confederation debauch, and it makes me very, very angry to think

MR. CARTER: of a person like that getting any praise whatsoever for bringing in Confederation when it is perfectly obvious to anyone who cares to look at that period, that that gentleman delayed Confederation. Had he not been around we probably would have had Confederation earlier. However, be that as it may.

MR. HANCOCK: What are you talking about now?

MR. CARTER: I am talking about the hon. gentleman's hero, the person he worships,

MR. J. CARTER: the person that he cannot wait to worship.

MR. D. HANCOCK: If it were not for him, you would not have a sports jacket on today.

MR. S. NEARY: No, and he would not have the savory patch up there either, only for him.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I believe I have the right to be heard in silence. Now, I do not mind a certain amount of interruption but the interruption is of an ignorant nature and I do not wish to put up with it. I would not mind if they had something intelligent to say but it does not help the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!  
The hon. member has the right to be heard in silence.

MR. J. CARTER: So there it is, Mr. Speaker, those six Heads are the biggest - certainly four of them are the biggest Heads in the provincial government expenditure. The six of - the Social Services, the pure social services, those of health, education and welfare consume something like sixty per cent of the disposable income of this provincial government and, in fact, they compose something over fifty per cent of the disposable incomes of all the states and provinces and countries of the Western world. It is a good question as to whether this is the best way to spend our resources. It might be that if we were able to spend more on the other Headings our incomes would be higher and we would be able to spend even more in these particular Headings. But they are certainly the giants of the provincial Budget.

MR. J. CARTER: So not having had an opportunity to have moved the concurrence of these Headings during my first few remarks, and although I realize it is not absolutely necessary, still I think it is a good idea at some point or another in the debate for the person who had the honour of chairing these debates to, at least, say that he wishes they would be moved. So I move that these Headings be concurred in that the passage they received in Committee be concurred with in this House. I think the debate went very well. Hon. gentlemen may not like this government, they may not like the personages, they may not like the ministers but certainly they cannot say that they did not have a good debate or ample opportunity to bring up anything they wanted.

MR. S. NEARY: (Inaudible) muzzled.

MR. J. CARTER: The hon. gentleman for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) will cry muzzle every time his face or his name is not on the front page of every newspaper on the Island or in Canada. The hon. gentleman is only happy and only silent when he is being noisy. He is only happy when he is making others sad. The hon. gentleman is a paradox and I think a disgrace to this House.

So I move the concurrence.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) never ceases to amaze members on this side of the House when he gets up and alleges that members on this side are carrying out personality attacks and then -

MR. HANCOCK: Why do you not get Hansard and read it some time. You will never speak again.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

June 1, 1981

Tape No. 2014

DW - 3

MR. F. ROWE: he alleges that members on  
this side of the House carry out

MR. F. B. ROWE:

personality attacks on members opposite -

MR. NEARY: And then proceeds to attack members-

MR. F. ROWE: And then proceeds immediately, within the splitsecond, to carry out his own little personality attacks on the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and on the Father of Confederation for this Province, a man who should be worshipped and given all sorts of credit for the great contribution that he has made during that period, instead of getting a knife in at a man who is in his active retirement.

MR. CARTER: (Inaudible) when he had the Liberal Reform Party, remember that?

MR. F. B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I myself concur 100 per cent with the member for LaPoile -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please! Order, please!  
I have difficulty hearing the hon. member.

MR. F. B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I concur 100 per cent with the member for LaPoile and others who will probably speak in the same vein when they suggest that the committees are not working the way that we had hoped they would work in the consideration of the estimates.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. F. B. ROWE: They are simply not working.  
Now this particular year I missed a fair amount of the committee meetings because of illness, but last year I attended all of the committee meetings, and at the meetings that I did attend this year, I saw the same sort of thing happening again this year as last year. Number one, Mr. Speaker, the most people you get actually

MR. F. B. ROWE: attending these committee meetings are the actual members of the committees themselves. You do not get too many members who are not actually serving on the committees coming to these meetings to ask questions, and the reason is obvious; there are two or three meetings every morning or in the nights or in the evenings at the same time that the House of Assembly may be in session or may not be in session. And at the same time the press finds it just about nigh impossible to attend all of the committee meetings, the House of Assembly and everything that goes on in the Confederation Building at the same time. So you do not get the kind of exposure to the press that one would hope that you would get if you had the situation happening in the House of Assembly.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the other aspect of this, and people should remember this, is that there was a gentleman's agreement -

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. F. ROWE: - there was a gentleman's agreement, at the time these committees were set up, that we would try them for one year and then we would look and see and analyze the activity of the committees and see whether any changes should be made, whether we should continue on with these committee meetings or what have you. And, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that the committees have now been set up, they are supposedly active,

MR. CARTER: They work like charms.

MR. F. B. ROWE: They work like charms for the government, Mr. Speaker, Charming for the government.

MR. CARTER: (Inaudible).

MR. F. ROWE: Because the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, you do not have the same exposure under the committee

MR. F. ROWE: system as you do in the House of Assembly with the Committee of the House of Assembly and I will leave it simply as that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I can turn to the Department of Education for a few moments. We had a very serious situation developing in this Province over the last few months, Mr. Speaker, we had a situation where the teachers in this Province were without a new contract, they were still working under the old contract for almost one solid year and we came to the very brink

MR. F. ROWE : of a teacher's strike in this Province, Mr. Speaker, that would have been devastating, particularly for the high school students in this Province.

MR. WARREN: And all they do is talk, all they do is talk.

MR. F. ROWE: And, Mr. Speaker, the government can thank their lucky stars that the teachers of this Province were-in spite of the fact that they were extremely angry over the arrogance of this government, they finally elected not to go on strike. But , Mr. Speaker, they are not a happy group of professionals in this Province this very day. The teachers of this Province are extremely unhappy. And the basis, Mr. Speaker, for the teachers being unhappy is that they have been dealing with a government for over a year which they perceive and feel has not been acting in good faith with that particular profession and have themselves - that is the government, and particularly the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge), have been arrogant towards the Newfoundland Teachers' Association in their dealings with them. The government, Mr. Speaker, without any consultation whatsoever interfered with the collective bargaining rights of the teachers by, without any consultation, striking out some 240 or 260 co-ordinating principals. Now, Mr. Speaker, the question is not whether or not these co-ordinating principals should have been eliminated as a category, that is not the question, the question is that the NTA wakes up one morning to hear that they have been eliminated without any consultation with that professional body. Now, Mr. Speaker, if that is not arrogance I would like to know what is? Not to mention, Mr. Speaker, in the whole business of the Grade XII and the revised high school programme and the wisdom of bringing it in, the Minister of Education (Ms Verge) herself made some very arrogant, some very distasteful statements with respect to teachers and how hard they should be working and the types of challenges

MR. F. ROWE: they should be willing to accept and that sort of thing. Also, Mr. Speaker, I know the Minister of Education (Ms Verge) was asked to attend the NTA annual meeting and at the time that she was asked she did not turn up. And she represented the Premier on another occasion and made about a ten seconds speech to a professional body such as the Newfoundland Teachers' Association. Mr. Speaker, that is not becoming of a Minister of Education when she cannot get herself up to the point where she can at least deliver a reasonable speech to a professional body of some 8000 people, although they obviously were not all at the convention. But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, and this is the most terrifying thing with respect to what may happen in the future, the fact of the matter is that the Minister of Education (Ms Verge) has lost the respect of the teaching profession in this Province. The Minister of Education, unfortunately, has also lost the confidence of the teaching profession in this Province as has, for example, the Minister of Manpower and Labour (Mr. Dinn), and what the teaching profession needs in this Province, Mr. Speaker, is a Minister of Education who stands up for the rights and the principles of teachers. And she does not give any indication, particularly when it comes to such a large body, that she is in any way antagonistic towards or arrogant or disrespectful of that particular profession. But that is the situation that we find ourselves in today, Mr. Speaker. Now the teachers are going to be going back to the bargaining table again very shortly

MR. F. ROWE: for a new contract, Mr. Speaker, very, very shortly. And the minister, having lost the confidence of that body and the respect of that body, wonders what is in store with respect to the basis and the working and the proper functioning of our educational system next year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have reached the conclusion, and many other people whom I have talked to in the area in field of education have reached one simple conclusion, that the only way that this administration can gain the confidence of the teachers and gain the respect of the teachers and hope to work along with teachers in a, there mutually satisfactory manner for the proper functioning of the whole system next year - the teaching profession - is simply for the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) to be shuffled to another department or at least get out of that particular post.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): I give the hon. gentleman one minute.

MR. F. ROWE: I would not go so far as to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. minister should resign and be thrown in the back benches. But is not much pickings in the back benches. But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that I feel that one way to restore the proper working relationship between the administration and the teaching profession in the coming months and year, is for the Minister of Education to simply resign that particular post and put another minister of the Crown, another person as the Minister of Education of that particular department. And I am not saying that as a personal opinion, Mr. Speaker, that is the sort of thing I am hearing from many, many people working within the profession of education at the university level, at the school level and at the parent level, at practically every level you mention throughout the Province today, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: They have no confidence.

MR. ROWE: That is right.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker -

MR. STIRLING: You mean we are not going to get a crack at you first?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: - well, I do not mind but I was thinking of you know, if we get on to education and a whole lot of things it can get confusing. But just to reply to matters brought up by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter), certainly, you know, the question of increasing vandalism - and there is obviously an increase in crime and most unfortunately, you know, incidents of violence which have occurred during the past year or two, whatever, which certainly are matters of concern; matters of concern to members of this House, matters of concern to the general public and certainly matters of concern to me, as Minister of Justice and to the police authorities. And it would not, I do not think, be fair to suggest that I or those who have responsibility in law enforcement are, you know, not concerned about that or burying our heads in the sand or that type of thing. No, it is obviously a matter of concern, we would be very derelict in our duty if it was not a matter of concern. And hon. members know as well, I mean, any vandalism is too much and any crime and any violence is too much, there is no doubt about that. Hon. members are aware, of course - and this does not excuse it, I am just putting it in perspective - that this is, you know, a social problem across Canada, across North America. We have always been fortunate in Newfoundland in that we have always been less than other places, it would be ideal if we could have none, we have always been less than the general trend, let us say, than other parts of North America and, I would say, we still are but, you know, there has been an increase. X

MR. OTTENHEIMER: It is a matter of concern.

It is a matter with which the law enforcement authorities obviously have to be, and to the best of my knowledge, are concerned about and are, you know, doing what they can.

I would point out as well - and I do not think there would be any disagreement with this - that, of course, those problems, particularly vandalism and juvenile illegal action or illegal behaviour, naturally a matter of concern and responsibility of the law enforcement authorities, also has a much broader social context throughout North America in terms of - a breakdown of authority would be to exaggerate it, but certainly an undermining and minimizing of authority and of certain values, and schools and families, and churches and volunteer organizations and youth organizations and all of these have a very important role to play there as well. I want to make a particular reference to two organizations but I am not limiting it to them, that is Neighbourhood Watch and Big Brothers, which are volunteer organizations. They work closely with the police departments and, you know, are doing an excellent job.

As hon. members are probably aware, we do have - and it has been operative now for the past approximately a year and a half, and it is the first time we have had that kind of a close - well, that kind of at least formal structured co-ordination, the Law Enforcement Review Committee, which brings in the Chief of Police and his deputies, the Chief Superintendent of the RCMP and his colleagues. I am chairman, the Deputy Minister of Justice and Deputy Attorney-General and the Associate Deputy Attorney-General are members and we meet on a regular basis to review all of these matters. Obviously those meetings are held in private and there are no statements or that after, but I do believe it is a worthwhile mechanism for monitoring

MR. OTTENHEIMER: and for co-ordination.

I would make some mention as well with respect to jails and the amount of money which is, you know, being expended this year in terms of our correction facilities. We do have a new facility at Clarenville housing twenty-four that will be onstream this Fall. In Central Newfoundland, construction commencing this year will be completed next year - \$100,000 is available for the site acquisition and planning for a facility in Labrador, in all probability located in the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area which seems to be the sensible place for it, and a new facility for women prisoners in Stephenville. These things obviously do cost money. But all I can say there is that, you know, within our system, society does have the right to deprive people of their freedom after conviction on certain offences. But I would point out as well, that society still has the obligation of protecting the lives of those people. The right to deprive them of their freedom of movement and mobility - not their internal freedom of thought, but freedom of mobility and movement, does not affect, annihilate society's obligation. These people must live in human, decent conditions and these facilities are necessary to give recognition to that responsibility that we have.

The hon. gentleman from St. John's North (Mr. Carter) asked for sort of an updating on the RCMP contract. As hon. members are probably aware, the former contract, the breakdown between provincial and federal cost sharing for provincial policing in the eight provinces, including Newfoundland, was 56 per cent provincial and 44 per cent federal.

During the negotiations, which are still in progress, the federal position was 'We wish now for the provinces to assume 75 per cent and the federal 25 per cent.'

June 1, 1981

Tape 2018

EC - 3

MR. OTTENHEIMER:           The position of the provinces,  
all of them, has been that the total amount that is going  
to be paid is obviously going to increase. The base

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: is obviously going to increase. That was four years ago, four and a half years ago. But there has not been justification for the increase in the percentage and we have asked for justification in terms of the percentage. Negotiations are ongoing, there is a meeting in approximately two weeks time of the provincial ministers followed by a meeting of the provincial ministers and the federal Solicitor General. So there is not a great deal more I can say about it because negotiations are still ongoing.

So I think I have covered the matters referred to and would only repeat by saying that certainly these problems of vandalism and crime are matters of deep concern. Actually, this morning when I got in the first thing I asked for was a report with respect to incidents reported at Bowring Park over the weekend. And I, you know, have a report on that. Obviously that is a -

MR. NEARY: Tell us what actually happened.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Actually, the report that I have was that there were three complaints made to the police; One was Friday afternoon of a truck illegally parked. That is not an awfully serious matter but anyway the owner was located and the truck moved and whether he was charged for illicit parking, I do not know. Then there was a complaint, approximately 4:30 p.m. Friday of drinking in cars. The police were called. Now, when they got there the only evidence was bottles around not - people presumably had either finished drinking what they had or whatever it was -

MR. S. NEARY: Would it be possible (inaudible) not to allow booze or beer in the parks?

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Yes, it is. I think that park is governed by municipal ordinance but certainly it would be possible and I am not sure that it is not illegal to be drinking in public parks quite apart from whether that is put in by a municipal by-law or not. But anyway the people were warned and there were no further complaints arising from that incident. At 8:30 p.m. on Saturday there was another complaint of drinking and two people were arrested and have been charged. So they are the incidents -

MR. S. NEARY: Why do we not bring in a law making it illegal for drinking -

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: It is now illegal to publicly consume alcoholic beverages in a public park.

MR. S. NEARY: Is it a (inaudible)

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Well, I mean, the fact that a thing is illegal does not mean that people do not do it. I mean, it is illegal and that is the only reason those two people could have been arrested. Because they were found drinking in Bowring Park, they were arrested and charged. So it is now illegal but naturally that, in itself, does not mean that it will not continue to happen. But certainly we intend to keep a close eye on the situation in Bowring Park and elsewhere.

MR. T. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. T. BENNETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You are a very kind man to recognize me after so much effort, indeed.

The hon. gentleman from St. John's North (Mr. Carter), Mr. Speaker, in my - I would like to go back over a few of the things that were mentioned, and the hon. gentleman for St. John's North suggested that the people may not like the present govern-

MR. T. BENNETT:                   ment. I do not know if he was referring to the Opposition or to people at large. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think they have a very good reason not to like the government of the day. As a matter of fact, I do not think I would like any persons or a group of persons who had the legal right to put their hands in my pocket and take my money and go out and squander it and waste it while my family has got to do without decent education, decent boots on their feet, decent roads to travel over, decent schools to go to

MR. BENNETT: and all the rest of the things that are taken for granted by most of the hon. gentlemen who work in this House of Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, in the Social Services estimates here the minister says he is 'pleased to announce on behalf of the government effective May 1, 1981, social assistance rates will be increased by 10 per cent.' So we congratulate the minister on increasing social assistance to people who need it by 10 per cent. But on the other side of the ledger they take away more than 10 per cent with blatant increases in taxes and the escalating cost of living and no concern for the people who have to survive on what is less than subsistence.

I have on my desk today from a constituent of mine, who wishes me to make an inquiry to Social Services of why this allowance was reduced. And the person says his social assistance was reduced from \$185 to \$172, Mr. Speaker, and when I inquired as to why it was reduced, I was informed the reason it was reduced from \$185 to \$172, was because there was an increase in Canada Pension. Now, Mr. Speaker, for the same reason that a 10 per cent increase was given to our social service recipients in the Province, for the same reason as they were given a 10 per cent increase to assist them in educating their families and feeding them, for the same reason, so did the federal government give an increase by way of Canada Pension, because of the inflation.

And, hopefully, I shall be asking the minister in the next few days, if he would certainly reverse the position that this government has taken with regards to social service recipients in this respect.

Now undoubtedly, Mr. Speaker, everybody in this hon. House of Assembly has read the Royal Commission Report, The Commission of Inquiry,

June 1, 1981

Tape 2020

PK - 2

MR. BENNETT: by the hon. Mr. Justice John Mahoney.  
Undoubtedly this has been read and digested by everybody  
in this House of Assembly.

MR. BENNETT: I, myself, Mr. Speaker, feel that every taxpayer in the Province deserves the right and should, indeed, get the right and should get a copy of this report done by a Justice of the Province. If we turn to page 325 in this report - and please make a mental note of this and tonight when you go home take a look at it if you have not got it with you now - and in the report it says some of the figures invoked - and I want to say this, Mr. Speaker, so it ties in with the inability of this government to give people a decent standard of living and a decent way of life while at the same time they can so flagrantly abuse public spending, abuse the tax dollars, that they have the legal right to put their hands in my pocket, take the money out and go and flush it down the toilet - just abuse. Some of the figures, for example: One contract which went to public tender was awarded \$287,000 and, subsequently, in the performance of that contract, field orders or change orders, Mr. Speaker, - it was increased by \$136,000 without anybody being very much aware of what was going on. Another contract tender was awarded \$289,000 and extra change orders were granted so that that contract got to be \$491,000, some \$200,000 surplus for that particular job. This relates, Mr. Speaker, to the Health Sciences Complex and if we read this report - and I opened the book on this particular instance, this particular project - but this book of 500-odd pages is full of this kind of material, and I am surprised that there has not been more debate. Of course, we have had quite a busy debate in the House of Assembly and it is about time that every hon. gentleman in this House of Assembly took this Mahoney report, digested it and discussed it because I would not want to be part of any government that would be so abusive of public funds as this report

MR. BENNETT: reveals. As I go on down the list and I will not read them all, Mr. Speaker, because my ten minutes will run out on me, but I shall go on now a little bit further. Another contract tendered and awarded at \$1,952,621 had change orders issued later to the same contractor in relation to that contract in the amount of \$450,000.

MR. HANCOCK: Could we have a quorum call, Mr. Speaker, so the ministers can listen to the hon. member? We have not even got a quorum in the House. There are no ministers - there is one minister here.

MR. BENNETT: Another contract let -

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!  
We do not have a quorum.

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT): And some gentlemen are still not in their seats.

We have a quorum. The hon. member for St. Barbe.

MR. BENNETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I can easily understand why the hon. gentlemen opposite would not want to hear these figures but I really believe, Mr. Speaker, they should hear these figures. They should read this report and they should do, Mr. Speaker, the honourable thing, go to the people and display this report. They should go to the people in an election and display this report and see if they would get the privilege to serve the people of this Province again after the people understood what really has happened and what could very well still be happening because we are still dealing with the same people and the same government, with all of this corruption that took place just a few years ago. Well, I will carry on with some of the comparative figures.

Another contract let to public tender and awarded at \$573,700 had change orders issued in an amount of \$284,419. While yet another contract awarded at \$256,666, public tender, had change orders involved of another \$208,578. Another contract, public tender awarded for \$171,522, had change orders for an extra \$204,000. And many, many others went on. I will just skip a few and go on down to the last one here. Public tender awarded at \$1,652,762 for which contract change orders or extras were approved for \$1,233,442. Now, I am bringing these figures to the attention of the hon. House, Mr. Speaker, because of the things that turn up on my desk like the desire of people in my district and indeed the Province, to have sufficient support from the government when they are dependent on the government. And many people in this Province are dependent on government.

MR. BENNETT: Those who have the health and strength, Mr. Speaker, if they are unemployed can go out of the Province and seek employment. But those who are unfortunate enough not to be able to get work and indeed are not healthy enough and because of sickness, indeed, have to depend on government, when government abuses people's funding, money to the extent that this report reveals, it is no wonder that they can only give a 10 per cent increase with one hand to social service recipients and take it away through taxation with the other.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would certainly like to see more emphasis placed by the minister with the Social Services portfolio, because giving more money all the time to social service recipients, in my opinion, is not the total answer. I think, Mr. Speaker, it is about time that the government looked at the total scope of things and find a way - there has got to be a way, we were not always so dependent on government in social welfare benefits. At one time we had sufficient work to go around and there is no reason today why we should not have sufficient work again. I feel, myself, very strongly that this government should co-operate among themselves. I wonder if they fight among themselves to the extent that they fight with the rest of the provinces

MR. BENNETT: and Ottawa -

MR. WARREN: Yes boy, they are always at it.

MR. BENNETT: -if they fight among themselves and they cannot get their act in place so that they can provide decent education, provide decent employment opportunities through the methods that are normally the methods of creating employment, through roads, and through fish plants, and through education, the structure of educational facilities?

So, Mr. Speaker, I would certainly like to call upon the minister to take another look at his social services, the welfare position of the Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, adding to that, today the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) tabled in this hon. House of Assembly his roads programme for the year which is a disgrace to any government.

MR. WARREN: Shame.

MR. BENNETT: I am going to send copies of this to my district and I am not going to indicate which districts are Tory, I am going to ask them to send back to me and tell me what districts are Tory because you can read them all exactly.

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

I must remind the hon. member that that would really come up under another head and not under this particular Head.

MR. HANCOCK: Public health, Mr. Speaker, the health of the people are concerned here.

MR. SPEAKER: Having said that the hon. member has just a few seconds left.

MR. BENNETT: Well, I just want to clear up, Mr. Speaker, by tying it altogether with the flagrant abuse

MR. BENNETT: of public spending in this report. There is no money for roads,

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BENNETT: -there is no money for social services, there is no money for schools, there is no money for anything, and if this government -

MR. WARREN: There might be in Mount Scio though.

MR. BENNETT: - if this conflict is among themselves as with the rest of the provinces and with Canada, it is no wonder that they have such abuse as we have displayed here and the lack of planning -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BENNETT: - to support such things (inaudible) as we have here today.

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

MR. STIRLING: Have we beaten them into submission on the other side? Cannot even put up a speaker.

MR. HANCOCK: They have no ministers there to listen.

MR. STIRLING: Cannot even put up a speaker.

MR. HANCOCK: They have one minister in the House. (Inaudible).

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I find it a privilege to join in this concurrence debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, if ever there has been a disaster in the history of Newfoundland, the biggest disaster was on April 14 when the government brought down this Budget. That was the biggest disaster for the Province of Newfoundland.

MR. HANCOCK: No, the biggest disaster was when they got elected.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to refer to the Department of Health -

MR. HANCOCK: (Inaudible).

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

MR. BARRY: The same talent as (inaudible).

MR. HANCOCK: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I must ask the hon. member for St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. Hancock) to restrain himself.

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains has the floor.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I want to use up my ten minutes as constructively as I can, with that in mind, Mr. Speaker, I want to refer to the Department of Health.

MR. G. WARREN: Last week I had the opportunity to visit my district and in Davis Inlet, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. G. WARREN: I wish to let the members know that life in Davis Inlet is not as rosy as life in Stephenville or life in Pleasantville. Life in Davis Inlet is where we have the Indian people of this Province living in houses that are unfit for human habitation, houses that in any other part of this Province, the Department of Health would have the intestinal fortitude to lock the doors of. But in Davis Inlet the Department of Health - the minister has refused for the last two years to even instruct his health inspector to go into Davis Inlet and put locks on those doors, lock up twenty or thirty of those houses in Davis Inlet that the Indians are living in under conditions that are not fit for human habitation, Mr. Speaker. And I think when we have a government of the day that can see people in this Province living in conditions that you would not put any kind of an animal into, Mr. Speaker, but they are compelled, they are compelled to live in these conditions because - I will tell you why, Mr. Speaker, the reason is the Department of Health officials write their reports as a civil servant does, but those reports only get so far up the ladder and before they get to the proper authorities other officials cut them off and say, 'Look, we cannot bring that into government because there will be an uproar'.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it is a shame, a shame when we can hear a minister of the Crown asking someone else to come down and run against him in an election and see Indians in this Province being left in living conditions such as in Davis Inlet.

MR. G. WARREN: Also, Mr. Speaker, in Hopedale last year the Department of Environment - the town council in Hopedale wrote to the government and said, 'Look, we want to build walkways to throw our slops from our houses, to throw our slops out and the Department of Environment wrote back and said, 'No, you cannot do that. It is not healthy'. Now, what did they do? What did they do, Mr. Speaker? They did not do anything. But they said, 'You have to throw it out by your door'. The people in Hopedale wanted to throw it away from their houses, they wanted to build walkways so they could throw it away from their houses but no, the Department of Environment said, 'No'. So they are left to throw it out their back doors.

MR. WARREN: So, Mr. Speaker, this legacy - a government that really cares. But this is the kind of government that cares, Mr. Speaker? A shame, it is a shame to see a government of the day allowing the Department of the Environment to stop the people in Hopédale from dumping their garbage in a proper place and not coming up with any other alternative; to see the Department of Health not doing inspections, not only inspections on the houses in Davis Inlet, Mr. Speaker, but an inspection on the government operated store, on the government operated store that really any store in this Province would have a report written on it concerning the condition of that store where there is food for human consumption stored. Mr. Speaker, this is how bad it is in Davis Inlet and this is how bad it is in Hopedale. So I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this government is going off on the wrong track. And it is going off on the wrong track looking at oil and gas.

MR. STAGG: Are you being completely fair?

MR. WARREN: Am I being completely fair?

MR. STIRLING: Yes.

MR. WARREN: I wish to tell you -

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible) Davis Inlet.

MR. STIRLING: I was there.

MR. WARREN: - I wish to tell you, my friend -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) new houses.

MR. WARREN: I beg your pardon? There are no new houses in Davis Inlet. Altogether there are thirty-four houses in Davis Inlet. Altogether there are seventeen of those houses not fit to walk into. There are seventeen of them not fit to walk into and those are the houses that were supplied by this government, Mr. Speaker.

MR. STAGG: What kind of houses are they?

MR. WARREN: What kind of houses are they?

They are supposed to be modern houses.

MR. STAGG: Were they ever modern houses?

MR. WARREN: They were modern houses and probably as good as houses you and I lived in one time.

MR. STAGG: Were they ever modern houses

I asked you?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I would not get into a bit of debate but I advise the hon. member from Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) that if he wished to, the next time I make a trip up into Davis Inlet, he can kindly come up and if he wanted to I could show him some pictures that I have taken. There are some pictures in the department's file, so ask the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie) or the Minister of Health (Mr. House) to show some pictures that were taken of the unsanitary conditions in Davis Inlet and Hopedale. Then you will see for yourself what kind of conditions people are compelled to live in along the Labrador Coast.

Well, Mr. Speaker, now we look at the Social Services Department, the Department of Social Services. In Hopedale there is no water and sewerage, there is no water and sewerage, and this government does not care. But this government does care about spending \$115,000 to make Mount Scio House comfortable for the Premier. They care about that, Mr. Speaker, so I would suggest that the member should realize that there are human beings living in Labrador as well as in Mount Scio House. Mr. Speaker, in the Department of Social Services again, I wish to ask

June 1, 1981

Tape No. 2025

GS - 3

MR. WARREN:

how could a family of four, who receive through Social Services roughly \$325 a month, expect to live along the Labrador Coast where the cost of fuel oil is something like \$73 a drum, and in Wintertime, with the condition of

MR. WARREN:

those houses that were built by the government, with lack of insulation in those houses, it is going to cost them at least three drums of stove oil per month? And here they have to find over \$200.

MR. STAGG: Who supplies the oil down there?

MR. WARREN: Who supplies the oil down there? Either Woodward's Oil or Labseco which - Labseco by the way -

MR. STAGG: Woodward's Oil or Strachan?

MR. WARREN: No, no not Strachan. Strachan is combined -

MR. STAGG: Be fair now, be fair.

MR. WARREN: Yes, be fair now because Strachan is combined with a guy named Mr. Fahey. Now Mr. Fahey, I understand is one of the bigger P.C.s in Labrador. So if you want to get it straight get it straight, okay?

Now, Mr. Speaker,

I believe that if this government would kindly take the advice of a member who does know a little about the Labrador Coast, a member who has lived along the Labrador Coast quite a bit, and I ask you to kindly consider-your Minister of Health, your Minister of Social Services, not as the Minister of Social Services said, go for a joy ride - going down and seeing the kind of conditions in 1981, Mr. Speaker, when this government could spend \$115,000 on a house on Mount Scio hill while we have to leave the people in Davis Inlet, the Indians in Davis Inlet, living in houses that are unfit for human habitation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe there is something wrong with this government. I understand that a government should be for the people

MR. WARREN: and I hope that this government will show concern, that the people, regardless of where they live in this Province, whether in Pleasantville or Stephenville or Hopedale, should be treated alike. And, Mr. Speaker, this is what this government is not doing.

Mr. Speaker, this is something that this government is doing. In Culture, Recreation and Youth, they are spending roughly \$100,000 on the Norma and Gladys, spending roughly \$100,000 on the Norma and Gladys. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is what you call concerned about the Province.

MR. STAGG: Is it?

MR. WARREN: Yes, it sure is. I would suggest you should spend five dollars and put a match to the Norma and Gladys and burn it and then you would be saving the other \$100,000 and use it for the betterment of the people of this Province. Because, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the Norma and Gladys is unfit.

MR. BARRY: Are you mouthing the leader's policy?

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

MR. WARREN: I do not care, Mr. Speaker, but I am concerned about the people in my district who are living below the poverty level because of this government's attitude. That is what I am concerned about.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order has been raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, there are various types of debate that we get into here, some of



MR. L. STIRLING: better if the people on the other side of the House listened to the points this member is making. He is making some very sound points, Mr. Speaker, and he is just being drowned out by the interjections. I do not mind some of the speeches and it is fair game, but this particular time this member is making some very valid points and I think it would help all of us if we could hear him.

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): To the point of order, the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I heard the member speaking, as did the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) and I heard a diatribe on what should be done with respect to the Norma & Gladys which I do not think had very much to do with the intimate knowledge that the member has about the problems of poverty in his district. I would be more than glad, Mr. Speaker, to have the hon. member go back to describing the problems in his district and he will have the rapt attention of the House when he does that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I think I have heard enough. I will make a ruling on the point of order.

Hon. members are obviously aware that when a member is speaking he has the right to be heard in silence. However, there are accepted barbs back and forth that we all understand. And as far as the Chair can understand in this particular case, it was done with the acquiescence of the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren). At least I did not hear any interruptions.

So if it does get out of hand the Chair will act accordingly. But in any event, I must now inform the hon. member for Torngat Mountains, unfortunately, that his time has expired.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. member for St. Mary's -  
The Capes.

MR. D. HANCOCK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there is one thing that the government should learn, that we over here have minds, we can make up our own minds, they are not made up by a little 'Alfie'. The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) had better get his facts straight, Mr. Speaker. I have a mind and I speak my mind the same as the Leader - we have principles on this side of the House but we also have minds, independent minds that we do not have to have made up for us the same as this government who is in power today, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

Is the hon. member debating the point of order or -

MR. D. HANCOCK:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Because it has been ruled on.

MR. D. HANCOCK:

No, Mr. Speaker, I am going to have a few words on the Estimates before it is in the Social Services Department -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. D. HANCOCK:

I just want to say, Mr. Speaker -

MR. L. BARRY:

That you have no - fault leadership.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. D. HANCOCK:

We have leadership over here and that is more than I can say - we have independent minds and we can speak our minds, something you cannot do unless you get advice from 'little Alfie', Mr. Speaker.

MR. D. HANCOCK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have a few points I want to make. I am glad my friend brought up about the Norma & Gladys.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. D. HANCOCK: It is the biggest waste of money that this Province has seen in the last decade, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. D. HANCOCK: A ship sailing around the Province. The hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) had her at one time, Mr. Speaker, he did not know what to do with her. He shipped her off down South and from there she went to Europe. The biggest waste of money that this Province has seen in the last ten years.

MR. ROBERTS: If we put the Cabinet on her we could call her the Ship of Fools.

MR. D. HANCOCK: That is right, Mr. Speaker. We could call her the Ship of Fools if we had the entire Cabinet on her. But, Mr. Speaker, that ship should never be sailing where it is sailing, it should never be in the waters, it is a disgrace to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. I visited that ship. There is nothing aboard

MR. HANCOCK:

it the whale (inaudible) but we will find out about the whale comment and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) will eat his words on that statement he made, Mr. Speaker, by putting fear into the minds of fishermen around this Province. He should learn to keep his mouth closed until he gets his facts straight, Mr. Speaker.

But, Mr. Speaker, we have in the district of St. Mary's-The Capes, a community with about 1,500 or 1,800 people who are trying to get ice service for the last six years. We got a stadium out of the previous administration, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Moores gave us \$650,000. And, Mr. Speaker, we have the Norma and Gladys going around now at the same cost that it would cost to put ice on that stadium in Trepassey which could look after the needs of approximately 1,500 people in that immediate area alone, Mr. Speaker. I wonder when or if this government is ever going to get its priorities straight, Mr. Speaker -

MR. ROBERTS:

Hear, hear! Well said.

MR. HANCOCK:

- and look after the needs of the people in this Province that they were elected to do, Mr. Speaker. It is a disgrace the way this Province has been run for the last two years as we saw today in the road programme, Mr. Speaker. It was ridiculous, Mr. Speaker, for a government that was elected by the -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. HANCOCK:

Oh, I am getting away from the head, yes, Mr. Speaker. I will finish up in two seconds on that, Mr. Speaker. But it does come under health, Mr. Speaker. Roads are a health hazard to the people in this Province, especially in communities, Mr. Speaker, where the community itself is not paved.

AN HON. MEMBER: You got a bridge.

MR. HANCOCK: Well, I would like to see this government - I got a bridge, big deal, 105 miles of dirt road. If I was allowed to go over there and knock your head off I would probably do it for making a statement like that. Mr. Speaker, would the rules of the House allow me to do it?

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

MR. HANCOCK: If I do outside what I want to do with the minister, Mr. Speaker, I would be locked up. So you cannot win, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Give him an elbow in the diaphragm.

MR. HANCOCK: Now, Mr. Speaker, you talk about health -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. HANCOCK: I do not mind a little bit of debate, Mr. Speaker, its gets you wound up.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, if I may take the opportunity to -

AN HON. MEMBER: Come across the House.

MR. HANCOCK: Cross the House with that bunch of idiots over there - oh, I am sorry, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: - maybe to cite this as a perfect example of exchanges that are accepted, because I presume the hon. member is acquiescing to the interjections because he is responding. Is that correct?

MR. HANCOCK: I do not mind interjection, Mr. Speaker, it gets you going. This House is boring enough at times, especially when you have to listen to

MR. HANCOCK: speeches from the other side of the House, Mr. Speaker. You have to liven it up once in a while. But, Mr. Speaker, it is the health problems that we are faced with. In one community in my district alone, a community that was built on a hillside, Mr. Speaker, we have been after the Department of Health now for two years - and the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Andrews) should make note of this - where you have raw sewage running out in the sides of ditches in that community -

AN HON. MEMBER: What community?

MR. HANCOCK: It is a community in Branch. I am not ashamed to say it. The people over there are not ashamed for me to say it, Mr. Speaker, that they have raw sewage running out. And the government has not taken any action to do anything about it, Mr. Speaker. But they will float the Norma and Gladys around the world, Mr. Speaker, for what? At a cost of \$100,000 to the taxpayers of this Province, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ANDREWS: Bring Walter back?

MR. HANCOCK: Bring Walter back? Listen, Mr. Speaker, bring Walter back.

If Walter was back he would be in trouble, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of the Environment should take note of that problem that exists in that community and have something done about. I cannot get the answers out of the Minister of Health (Mr. House). Maybe the Minister of the Environment would take it upon himself to try and have that problem rectified in that community. It is a serious problem, Mr. Speaker, it is a problem that affects the whole community when you have raw sewage running out into the ditches on the side of the road,

MR. HANCOCK: Mr. Speaker, something should be done about it. Surely to God, we are living in the 1980's and not back in the dirty thirties that some people refer to them as.

But, Mr. Speaker, under this Social Services here we have six departments and every department under Social Services in the estimates in this Budget, Mr. Speaker, depend on Ottawa for help. Mr. Speaker, I am very surprised that we get anything signed with the attitude of this government. We saw a display of it again today from the Minister of Mines and Energy. And on Friday it was dispicable, it was a disgrace, Mr. Speaker, for all Newfoundlanders. It is lucky, and thank God, that all Newfoundlanders never had to listen to the words that came out of the Deputy Premier. They came down and

MR. HANCOCK: never gave him enough, Mr. Speaker.

Imagine a government coming down here, a federal government coming down here and giving \$30 million, Mr. Speaker, to -

AN HON. MEMBER: What about Mr. Thornhill?

MR. HANCOCK: - something that is the responsibility of the provincial government. Mr. Speaker, can you imagine and to then have the Deputy Premier get up and criticize him for doing it, Mr. Speaker? To say the least it seems a bit ironic. And I will be very surprised, Mr. Speaker, if Ottawa soon does not take the initiative to see that no more DREE agreements are signed unless this government over here realizes how much those DREE agreements mean to the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, Mr. Speaker. I know if it was a business deal, Mr. Speaker, no one - and you got the thanks you are getting from this administration over here, there would be no more loans given out to any administration, especially to this clique that we have in power now, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. HANCOCK: But, Mr. Speaker, we look around us - and the Department of Recreation, Culture and Youth comes under this Heading, Mr. Speaker - and we see the problems that some of the youth of this Province are faced with today, Mr. Speaker, when we have so much alcohol and the access to alcohol -

MR. STIRLING: And 16,000 unemployed.

MR. HANCOCK: - and 16,000 young people unemployed this Summer, the leader informs me, Mr. Speaker. And what have we done about it? We got a budget there that takes in four departments and we have got less than a \$30 million operation, Mr. Speaker. I sort of sympathize with the minister - if I had to try and run that department with that amount of money and the restrictions put on the minister. It is not nearly enough, Mr. Speaker. The youth of our Province - we are not putting enough emphasis on the young people of this Province, we are not looking after their basic needs.

MR. HANCOCK: When you have people unemployed—you do not have to look any further than my own district where you can see ten or fifteen or twenty-five young fellows in the back of a pick-up going up and down the road sixty and seventy miles an hour. They have nowhere to go, they have nothing to do, Mr. Speaker, and what do they turn to? They either have to turn to alcohol or drugs. And you would be alarmed and surprised, if a survey was done in any of the schools around this Province, to find out how many young people under sixteen years of age are really hooked on drugs or alcohol, Mr. Speaker. It would be alarming. And I do not know why the government does not take the initiative to do a research programme to see how serious a problem it is. It is a very serious problem and it is something that is facing—

MR. NEARY: They are too busy playing politics with the road programme.

MR. HANCOCK: - every young person in this Province, Mr. Speaker. Social services again, Mr. Speaker. We have a big boost in the -

MR. NEARY: That is right (inaudible)

MR. HANCOCK: - in the budget this year, Mr. Speaker, an increase of 10 per cent which I would say, will go on record as saying this is very important. But that was an insult, Mr. Speaker, to give those people a 10 per cent increase -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) Outer Cove last week.

MR. HANCOCK: - it was an insult, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Harbour Grace this morning.

MR. HANCOCK: A 10 per cent increase to people who are living on starvation wages. A family of five, whether

June 1, 1981

Tape No. 2029

RA - 3

MR. HANCOCK: the husband is working or not, gets the same treatment and the same amount of money as if the husband was able to go out and get wood or if a husband was not able to go out and provide heat for that home, Mr. Speaker. I have families in my own district, Mr. Speaker which are literally starving to death. They are freezing to death in the Wintertime and starving to death at this time of the year because they are not getting enough money to live on, Mr. Speaker. I have had people who had to go out to neighbours homes to get socks to put on their children, to get pencils to give their children to take to school. We are living in the '80's,

MR. HANCOCK: and that is not good enough, Mr. Speaker. I would ask the minister to come up and even if they have to cut other departments, Mr. Speaker - and there are a lot of people on social services who are abusing this system and that should be looked into as well. There are a lot of people who are abusing the social services program, Mr. Speaker, but there are a lot of people out there who are not getting enough money to feed their children, not getting enough money to send their children to school. And whether the minister is aware of it or not, that is exactly what is happening around the Province. I know for a fact that it is in my district and I can take the minister down now and show him five or six cases where people had to get together to take up a collection to get the youngsters pens and pencils and schoolbags so that the kids could go and obtain the education that you or I or our children can have, Mr. Speaker. I would urge the minister to look in to see if he can provide more money to people who need the money on social services. Like I say, some people - I am sure if he had a complete investigation of his department he would discover - are getting too much and others are not getting enough.

With those few remarks, I will be back later on, I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Social Services.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to delay the Committee or the House. I just wanted to respond very quickly to what my hon. friend said. I would like to point out to him that we acknowledge that social assistance does not meet every need, and I suppose it will take us a long time before it will ever reach that level. Indeed, I am not sure it ever

MR. HICKEY: should because each case is dealt with on its own merits. But I would remind him - in reminding him I make it as a suggestion to him - if he has cases where he knows there is hardship of this nature to pass them along to me and I will be very happy to cause an investigation to take place because, certainly, if what the hon. gentleman says is true - and I am not doubting his word for I cannot know everything that goes on throughout the Province - if that is the case, then certainly that is not in keeping with the spirit of the Social Assistance Act nor, indeed, the spirit of the department and the mandate given the workers in the field. There are a number of ways in which a worker can assist people. One is through regular assistance, and the social assistance program, Mr. Speaker, has been enriched on a number of occasions - in fact, I believe three specific occasions - identifying this very problem where regular assistance does not fulfill the needs of a given family because of extenuating circumstances. And I make particular mention to the example the hon. gentleman referred to, where there is a husband and a father in the home and in a case where there is not a father or husband in the home. There are provisions made, Mr. Speaker, for the worker dealing with that case to cause to happen certain things to alleviate hardship. One is there are provisions for additional assistance, additional to regular assistance. So, in other words, an amount can be provided under certain circumstances over and above the regular.

MR. STIRLING: Depending on who (inaudible).

MR. HICKEY: Yes, that is right. And then, beyond that, if the amount that is permitted to be granted under that - and I believe that is \$50.00, I believe up to \$50.00.

MR. HICKEY: I have to say, Mr. Speaker, the worker himself, the social worker, would not have the authority in his own right, but certainly the regional director has the authority. So the worker can go to his regional director and get authority, and in certain instances but very few instances, those issues come to my desk. But we have attempted to delegate responsibility so that fewer and fewer depend on my approval. We farmed that authority out to the regional director so as to speed things up and to improve the overall situation.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that I certainly do not wish to convey the impression that social assistance is the end all and be all. I do not think it was ever meant that way. And whilst I acknowledge a whole range of needs today that were not present five, ten years ago, we are doing our best with the funds that we have. And I would urge the hon. gentleman to pass along any cases that he has because I, too, as he is, would be very concerned about those.

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

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, I am rather concerned with this department, not only Social Services and Education but basically the topic itself, Social Services Committee. I can say without any question after being in this House now two years, that this government has no social service policy, it has no policy whatsoever. It is a piecemeal approach of adding on 10 per cent here, throwing in the Status of Women Council here, giving the impression they are doing great things for women, setting up the Arts Council \$150,000, giving the impression that they are doing great things for the Arts. It is a cosmetic government, Mr. Speaker. It is a cosmetic government that takes a piecemeal approach.

MR. NEARY: Avon calling.

MR. HISCOCK: We hear, Mr. Speaker, the university, the great university that Mr. Smallwood erected here in our area, the great university has now seen fit to name the Newfoundland Room the Smallwood Room.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: And I would say, Mr. Speaker, after all these years with the free tuition, paying students to go to university, we saw the first blunt and the first cut in it by the former Minister of Finance for the federal government, Mr. Crosbie, when he got in and said, 'Why should anybody end up

MR. E. HISCOCK:

getting education paid for, they should pay their own way." Now we have seen this government, through the two administrations, gradually whittle and whittle and whittle away at education. And what are we seeing now, Mr. Speaker? We are seeing students, themselves, the university in debt and even the President, who is now retiring, mention that all of the money that is coming to the university, most of it is coming from the federal government and this government, itself, has no policy with regard to education, with regard to education itself. If this government is concerned with the overall process of education, they would have free milk in our schools and they would also have a dental programme not only up to age twelve but they would have it all the way up to Grade XI, then Grade XII and, hopefully, have a free dental programme like Medicare in this Province. And hopefully, Mr. Speaker, our great nation of Canada will bring in a programme like this in the next three or four years.

But I feel, Mr. Speaker, very strongly with regard to the nutrition that is taking place in our schools - in the majority of our schools, because they are not getting enough money to run their programme, they are selling chips, bars, candy and other junk food in the schools, Mr. Speaker, and out of that money they are buying lab equipment, they have to buy books. And we are causing health problems in our schools because we do not have any nutrition in our programme. And I would say, Mr. Speaker, that if we had a conscientious government in this Province, we would have milk in our schools. Because you ask the people in your district, Mr. Speaker, how many children go on to school without any breakfast in the morning? And then when they go on the bus over twenty or thirty miles of gravel road, their stomachs are almost coming up in their very mouths.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. E. HISCOCK: Dinner time, Mr. Speaker, what is it that they have? Do they have what the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) suggested - nutritious food? No, Mr. Speaker, they have a tin of coke or a bag of chips. And then Mr. Speaker, if they are on social assistance, they come back in the night and have Kraft Dinner.

So, Mr. Speaker, particularly with regard to low income families, this government itself has no policy whatsoever towards the poor of this Province. And the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) just said, 'I do not think it should be at such a level because it might be an incentive for the people to stay on social assistance'. Who in his right mind thinks that anybody in this Province is on social assistance because he wants to be on it?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. E. HISCOCK: Our people are not lazy, Mr. Speaker. Our people are

MR. HISCOCK: not lazy. It is after ten years of not having any jobs in this Province or any industry whatsoever, this Tory attitude of 'Get rid of all these social programs, help big business by way of going to international prices for oil'. By doing that, Mr. Speaker, what do you end up getting? Get them off the social assistance, and I would say, Mr. Speaker, the people who are on social assistance in this Province are on it because they cannot their ten weeks work, they cannot get the other weeks work.

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible).

MR. HISCOCK: And the Minister for Mines and Energy and member for Mt. Scio (Mr. Barry), if he wants to ask any questions he can jot it down and after I am finished he can get up, Mr. Speaker, and speak as much as he likes, but I have no intentions of paying any attention to the interjections that he is making.

With regard to the social policies of this Province, Mr. Speaker, we have had none. We have had none whatsoever.

The Minister of Recreation, Culture and Youth (Mr. Andrews) - and now we have the Youth bill in this Province - the great things that - this government is now going to listen to the youth of our Province, be in communication. The Minister of Recreation, Culture and Youth, when he was out at the annual meeting, said there is no money, there is no money for any recreation expansion. So what do you have in communication with the youth of this Province? So that you can tell them there is not going to be any expansion whatsoever, Mr. Speaker. If this government was concerned about the youth of this Province, they would have a youth program, Mr. Speaker,

MR. HISCOCK: a youth program entirely geared towards employing the students of this Province so they can go to university, trade schools and technical college, But, no, Mr. Speaker, they throw up their arms and they depend entirely upon business and they depend entirely upon the federal young Canada Works projects. I have been saying time and time again in this House, and it will be one of the things we will do when we form a government, we will have our own provincial youth program to employ youth and get our young people working. So, Mr. Speaker, do we have anything like that? Do we have milk in the schools? Do we have any form of recreation towards our youth? No, Mr. Speaker, the recreation in this Province is riding on the backs of beer bottles. That is where we are getting the majority of our sponsorship, Mr. Speaker, from the big breweries. And I heard, Mr. Speaker, the other night in Corner Brook there is not one of the breweries here in St. John's or in this Province which made any profit last year. No, they are not making any profit, Mr. Speaker, they are putting it back into advertising, of getting the soccer and the baseball and whatever. By the way, and I take this - I compliment them, I compliment them for their involvement because if it was not for it, we would have nothing. But I also say, Mr. Speaker, that this government is entirely throwing its responsibility towards recreation in this Province and that we cannot have a Minister of Recreation, Culture and Youth, Mr. Speaker, if he is not doing anything. And you cannot have a youth bill and have open communication with the youth if you keep saying to them, "No, we do not have any money; we are a

MR. HISCOCK:

poor Province." And so with regard to this Department of Social Services, with regard to Environment, my able colleague for Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe) suggested to the Minister of Environment, does this government have a nerve centre for the possibility of an oil spill, to bring together the Department of Fisheries, the Department of Environment, the federal Department of Environment, the Canadian Coast Guard and industry together? Do we have all of this data assembled?

MR. NEARY: The answer is no.

MR. HISCOCK: No, Mr. Speaker, we do not. As we pointed out, all the equipment now is down in Pleasantville, -

MR. NEARY: Right.

MR. HISCOCK: - Mr. Speaker, in storage behind a chain link fence. And Mr. Speaker, we are not prepared, as a Province, to have the possibility of a spill and a blow out. This government, Mr. Speaker, is totally bankrupt with regard to social conscience. They have no social conscience.

MR. CALLAN: They are worse than The Evening Telegram, the Tory paper.

MR. HISCOCK: They have entirely a piecemeal approach.

And, Mr. Speaker, they are struggling in the dark and wondering what to do with regards to social policy. They got into power, Mr. Speaker, for only one reason and that was for the negative attitude towards the government of the time and when they got back into power, when they got into power they were so surprised that they are still struggling and they are still surprised that they are in power after ten years. And I would say, Mr. Speaker, it is only by this cosmetic approach that they continue to use, and Mr. Speaker, our press and some of our people have continued to support this

MR. HISCOCK: attitude if they go, Mr. Speaker, with the idea of giving a 10 per cent increase, or doing this. But, Mr. Speaker, this government is not getting at the root of the problem in this Province, they are more concerned with Band-Aid approaches. And I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the people and the press of this Province will wake up and try to get to the heart of this matter and say what is this government doing from a long-term point of view? It is not doing anything with regard to long-term point of view.

So thank you, Mr. Speaker. And as I say, with regard to this social services, they have no policy, they have no conscience and they have no direction.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I want to -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HANCOCK: Come on now, do not be shy. Stick the knife into them. Give him a hand.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HANCOCK: You are down the tube and you know it. You are down the tube and you know it.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I want to switch now -

MR. HANCOCK: You are down the tube and you know it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Earlier.

MR. HANCOCK: You do not have guts enough to come out and run against me.

MR. NEARY: Earlier, Mr. Speaker, I was dealing with the matter of the ever-increasing vandalism and crime in this Province. And I must say I did not get any specific answers from the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) on how they propose to deal with this

MR. S. NEARY:

serious, serious problem in this Province. So, having failed, Mr. Speaker, to get any specific plans from the minister, I can only assume that they are going to continue to keep their heads buried in the sand, that they are going to hold these little intellectual meetings they have once a month and we can expect nothing constructive in the way of trying to cope with the uncontrollable vandalism and crime that we see at the present time. So, I will switch to another subject, Mr. Speaker, and I am awfully sorry the Minister of Health (Mr. House)- here we are, we are dealing with the Social Services Committee, Education, Justice, Health, Environment, Recreation, Culture and Youth and Social Services. The Minister of Education is not in her seat, the Minister of Health is not in his seat, so the only thing we can do, because as hon. members know we only have three hours, three hours to discuss these concurrence committee debates and so the three hours are running out so we have to raise these matters anyway. And let me say, Mr. Speaker, in connection with the time limits, the restrictions placed on debating in this House, let me say for the benefit of the members on the other side, that if they think for one minute that we are going to rush things on this side, if they think we are going to be placed in the same situation as we have in previous years on legislation, everything is going to be shoved through at the last minute, we are going to have a bottle-neck on the last day or the second last day, well this year, Mr. Speaker, the situation is going to be different.

MR. HANCOCK: Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY: Because the Opposition--and I do not think I am letting the cat out of the bag

MR. HANCOCK: You are not.

June 1, 1981

Tape No. 2035

RA - 2

MR. S. NEARY: - the Opposition are dug in, the Opposition are dug in and we do not care if we are here til Christmas.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY: Every item on the agenda -

MR. HANCOCK: Every item is going to be dealt with, it is going to be dealt with in the proper manner.

MR. S. NEARY: Every item on the agenda is going to be dealt with thoroughly.

MR. HANCOCK: Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY: And every piece of legislation will be thoroughly debated.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY: And there will be nothing rushed through this House at the last minute.

MR. HANCOCK: No multi-million dollar deals like the one we had last year,

MR. S. NEARY: The Opposition have worked out a formula whereby we will be operating during the Summer months. We will be operating during the Summer months on the shift system. If a member goes on his holidays, he will go and he will come back and relieve some other member. So, we are here, Mr. Speaker, until the business of this House has been completed and thoroughly dealt with,

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY: And there is going to be no last minute-

MR. HANCOCK: It is the same now as if all of their fathers had died.

MR. S. NEARY: There is going to be no last minute rushing things through this House

MR. MORGAN: Can we get a day off do you think?

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

MR. STIRLING: It is up to you fellows.

June 1, 1981

Tape No. 2035

RA - 3

MR. S. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, if the government intends to clean off the Order Paper and keeps bringing in legislation day in and day out,

MR. S. NEARY:

with the number of items that we have on the agenda now, I would say we are good until about mid-August and we are quite prepared to stay here for that length of time.

Now, let me switch for a moment to the Department of Health. And I am sorry that the Minister of Health (Mr. House) is not in his seat to hear what I have to say.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would you ask the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) to restrain himself?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has the floor.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am going to raise a subject now that is a very delicate matter.

MR. D. HANCOCK: It has never been raised before.

MR. S. NEARY: No, it has been raised before but it is a very delicate matter and I am going to raise it now.

MR. L. STIRLING: Not right away you are not.

Wait for the minister.

MR. HANCOCK: Remember our strategy, now.

MR. S. NEARY: No, I am going to raise it now even though the Minister of Health is absent from his seat. And it has to do with the appointment of a director of - what is it they call that organization downtown?

MR. L. STIRLING: Planned Parenthood.

MR. S. NEARY: Planned Parenthood, a director of Planned Parenthood in this Province. An appointment that has aroused suspicion and controversy in this Province, a director of Planned Parenthood, the appointment

MR. S. NEARY: which has not been confirmed yet by the minister but is in the works.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. S. NEARY: No, it has not been confirmed yet by the minister. It is in the works. It is the appointment of a lady who was the administrator of an organization called Planned Parenthood, an organization that advocates abortion on demand, an organization that brainwashes young people in this Province -

MR. MORGAN: Abdicates or advocates, (inaudible) abdicates?

MR. S. NEARY: Advocates abortion on demand. Now, Mr. Speaker, we were -

MR. E. HISCOCK: The Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) is -

MR. S. NEARY: Well, the Minister of Education will be dealt with in due course. The hon. lady need not worry. This particular matter is becoming the subject of a raging controversy right across North America -

MR. HANCOCK: She is on verge of (inaudible) virginity.

MR. S. NEARY: - North America, especially - I am amazed at what is happening down in the United States.

And, Mr. Speaker, we were told by the Minister of Health (Mr. House), the people of this Province were told that before anything was done in the way of appointing or developing policy on Planned Parenthood

MR. NEARY:

in this Province, that an advisory council would be established in this Province. The Right to Life Association was told that there would be an advisory council appointed before any policy on Planned Parenthood in this Province would be developed or any appointments made. The people of Newfoundland were told that. This House was told that by the Minister of Health (Mr. House). Yet, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health made that statement out of one corner of his mouth and out of the other corner he advertises for a Director of Planned Parenthood, a provincial Director of Planned Parenthood without establishing, without setting up the advisory council. Now, why was that done, Mr. Speaker? I think hon. members are probably aware of why it was done. The hon. Minister of Health was influenced by the women's liber types, influenced by the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge), influenced by his deputy. The Minister of Health does not run his department. The Minister of Health is dictated to by the officials of his department. And if you have officials who are pro-abortion on demand - the poor old Minister of Health does not know what he is doing - all they have to do is to feed the information to him, feed the propaganda to him and he fires it out in his ignorance.

And so, Mr. Speaker, here we have a situation that is likely to reach an impasse in this Province. The Government of Canada now has threatened to cancel grants to the Planned Parenthood Association in this Province. And now they are getting desperate and they are starting to scream for help. And the administrator of that Association is now one of two in line for the job of Director of the provincial Planned Parenthood Branch of the minister's department. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is wrong, that is wrong. It is unfair, it is unjust. And the Minister of Health should reverse his

MR. NEARY: decision and not proceed further with a Planned Parenthood programme in this Province without, first of all, setting up as he promised to do, the advisory committee on planned parenthood in this Province. The hon. gentleman will not get the goodwill of the majority of the people of this Province and will not be able to implement his programme into the schools of this Province because certain denominations will be opposed to the appointment and to the programme

MR. NEARY: developed by this lady. The ad, I might say, that appeared in the paper, the ad was handmade, the ad practically described this lady's qualifications. I have the ad down in my office, tomorrow I will bring it up. The ad was designed to suit this particular individual. The advertisement in the newspaper advertising for the job was designed for this particular lady who was the Administrator of the Planned Parenthood Association downtown. And we have already heard the objections, we have already heard the cries of protest that are starting to rise in this Province over this appointment. I will bring the ad up to the House tomorrow and I will bring up certain other evidence that I have.

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

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: No, I have not been appointed yet.

MR. SPEAKER: I must advise the hon. member his time has expired.

MR. NEARY: Well, maybe somebody will intervene and let me carry on for a few more minutes.

MR. MORGAN: By leave, by leave, by leave.

MR. SPEAKER: By leave? By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. SPEAKER: By leave, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Well, no, Mr. Speaker, I can come back again. Go ahead, 'Len'.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, while we are on this Heading, let us deal with a couple of the things that have been brought to the attention of this House that we have no satisfactory answers on.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, this government has a policy of offshore gas and oil, the synchrolift and a new Confederation Building. Those are the only things that they are spending any money on, but when they get around to talking to people and about people, Mr. Speaker, we brought to the attention of this House what I was sure was a situation that would be corrected immediately, and that is a person who is blind, who had an accident and is totally dependent on social services, has a young family. He has a young family including a young sixteen year-old. This man is on social services not through any fault of his own and he has no hope of doing anything to get out of social services. He cannot be rehabilitated; there is no way. The man said to me - and I brought it to the attention of the Minister of Health (Mr. House) and I brought it to the attention of this House and it still has not been dealt with - that his son, his sixteen year-old son, needed dental work. The young boy needed dental work, not in the old traditional manner of getting his teeth extracted, he needed dental work. He went to the dentist. Now here is a man who has no other source of income only social services, and they were told that the government policy - this government with a social conscience - they were told that the government policy is that if it is in your front teeth you can have the fillings. Otherwise, you will have to go away until your teeth get bad enough to have them extracted. And we are talking about a concern for getting young people off the welfare roll, giving young people a chance. This young boy has no other source of income. The father is blind, he had an

MR. STIRLING:

accident and has no hope of getting any other source of income. They cannot put their hand in another pocket or take it out of another business or get it somewhere else, they are completely dependent on social services. That boy cannot get his teeth filled. That day I expected that somebody would get up on the government side and say, 'Okay, I am sorry. It is a policy that might have been all right 100 years ago but it is not our policy today. We will change it this moment.' Because, Mr. Speaker, this government has no problem in bringing in legislation that is made retroactive. They will have 100 per cent support. But it is not even required in legislation.

As the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) said when he explained, there are special situations, special needs.

DR. COLLINS: (Inaudible).

MR. STIRLING: The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) had better be careful because the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) is not prepared to tolerate that kind of insolent talk because he represents a rural district, he knows how important this is. The Minister of Social Services has said that there can be special considerations. So I would like for him before this debate continues, Mr. Speaker, let the Minister of Social Services correct that. Because it is a shame on this House of Assembly that that is the government policy.

MR. HANCOCK: Where did Joey find the money?

AN HON. MEMBER: Cap in hand policy.

MR. STIRLING: That is right, cap in hand policy. Mr. Speaker, there is no reason in God's world why the Minister of Social Services, who is a concerned man, unless he has not got the authority by this government to make any kind of a comment. If he can stand up - the Minister of Health (Mr. House) could not do it - but if he has the authority that I know - and I say this in all

MR. STIRLING:    seriousness, that I do believe that this Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) is concerned about people and that if he has the authority of the government to act, if he has any leeway at all - and the problem may very well be that we have seen this government bring in a restriction that says, 'If you cannot hire the person that is recommended by public service, you have to go to the Premier'. They are saying that only the Premier will set the lines of conduct. Maybe they are now saying that the Minister of Social Services cannot make that kind of decision. And I believe if the Minister of Social Services had his own way he would try to bring this in, he would stand up today and say, 'I do not care what the Premier says, I am going to guarantee that those children who are getting this kind of discrimination against them, the kind of shame that says, 'Well, if they are your front teeth then we will do the filling but if they are any of your other teeth, then you will just have to wait until they get bad enough to be extracted.'

MR. STIRLING: That is the present government policy. I hope that the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) can get up , because that is the kind of decision, in his comments, he made earlier, and he can say, okay that is it, we will look after it, I will guarantee you this is changed, unless the Premier has issued instruction that they cannot say anything about it. They are not allowed to make any change. They cannot say anything in the way of new government policy unless the Premier approves. Now that may be the possibility.

MR. HANCOCK: That is a fact, that is not a possibility.

MR. STIRLING: There is another thing that I asked the Minister of Social Services to indicate, I attended a meeting in which a senior deputy minister or a senior member of government, a deputy minister gave an indication that the government is changing its attitude about nursing homes so that the only nursing homes to be funded will be the ones in which the people in that nursing home will be either confined to bed or confined to a wheelchair, and that these homes that now have 50 per cent or more of their people who can walk around and live without the constant nursing care, that those will be cut back, they will not be funded and that any new entrants to that home will have to be people who require treatment almost constantly, in a wheelchair or in a bed. In other words, nursing homes, these senior citizen's homes around the Province will be changed from homes to hospitals. That is a bad policy, Mr. Speaker. That is a bad policy. One of the reasons that these homes have been working very well is that they are homes, they are places where some people live a normal, ordinary, everyday life, they move around on their own. And they have other people in the homes who require the kind of bed care and hospital treatment that is needed.

June 1, 1981

Tape No. 2040

PK - 2

MR. STIRLING: Now, Mr. Speaker, since I believe it is just about a minute to six I will adjourn the debate.

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

The hon President of the Council.

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

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

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

JUNE 1, 1981

(2)

Tabled by Hon. Member  
of questions, 1 June

IN ANSWER TO AN ORAL QUESTION BY THE HONOURABLE THE MEMBER FOR THE STRAIT OF BELLE ISLE ON MAY 26, 1981, THE CHAIRMAN OF THE ST. JOHN'S AND EASTERN RESIDENTIAL TENANCIES BOARDS WILL BE PAID A MONTHLY FEE OF \$1,250, PLUS \$200 FOR EACH DAY LONG MEETING OF THE BOARD WITH PRO-RATED AMOUNTS FOR MEETINGS OF LESS THAN A DAY.