

VOL. 3

NO. 66

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 24, 1981

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier. In view of the upcoming meetings with the premiers and the governors, would the Premier tell us about any negotiations he has had with Quebec about sales to the United States, any negotiations he has had with Quebec in the last six months?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition does not seem to understand the position of the Government of Newfoundland in that we have -

MR. STIRLING: That is a good pitch.

MR. DINN: He does not understand anything actually.

MR. MORGAN: That is very true.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: I refrain from making any derogatory comments on the Leader of the Opposition for obvious reasons. The Leader of the Opposition is a wonderful man, a wonderful man. I hope he stays there for a long time, Mr. Speaker, for five or ten years at least in his position.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Forever!

PREMIER PECKFORD: The longer the better. Anyway the situation is government policy on the question that the Leader of the Opposition raised is that there is a legislative and constitutional obligation on the Canadian Federal Government, as we interpret the existing BNA Act, which they have just acknowledged in the last number of days.

PREMIER PECKFORD: So our discussions and negotiations have been with the Canadian Federal Government because it is they who must act in the first instance as it relates to the whole question of the transmission of hydro-power. So our negotiations started last October. They went on through the Winter and the Spring and culminated in a positive movement by the Federal Government acknowledging that they do have the obligations that up to then, up to yesterday or three or four days ago, they had never acknowledged they had, and therefore there is movement. And until that has been clearly identified, when their intent of introducing legislation becomes actual legislation so that then we can actually deal, it is at that point in time that the NEB becomes operative, an application to the National Energy Board becomes in order, and then the Government of Quebec, along with other interested parties, can then state their case as it relates to that particular application.

The long and short of it being simply that the Province of Newfoundland has always taken the position, this government has always taken the position that our dealings on this matter must be with the Canadian Government. That has borne fruit in the last couple of days.

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: I take it that the Premier, who understands all things and knows everything there is to know about this, is now admitting that there have been absolutely no discussions with the Quebec Government or Hydro Quebec of any sort for the last six months. Would he confirm that?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I never said that, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) did. I do not understand everything but I do understand certain things for which I am responsible. And that has to do with the whole question of transmission of hydro-electricity and the export of power or the utilizing of the surplus that might be available at the Gull Island project and Muskrat Falls.

All I can say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition is that in the first instance, and we have been proven right in this case - the Opposition did not think we were right, a lot of people in Canada did not think we were right, but even the Canadian government has now acknowledged that we were right - that there is an obligation upon the federal authorities to allow for the same rights to apply to the transmission of electricity as now applies for oil and gas, and in that context that is step number one in order for us to be able to have an opportunity to negotiate sales West for Labrador power.

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

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

MR. L. STIRLING: As the Premier knows, we cannot enter into debate. No matter how much misleading information is given, on this side we can only ask questions.

Now the Premier has not answered the question. Yesterday in the discussion he indicated that the transportation corridor was not really what he wanted ; what he wanted was to use the Quebec grid for the transmission of power and to pay our own way for any upgrading in that grid. And I ask the Premier again - I mean, he played games with the first two questions saying that is not what

MR. L. STIRLING: he said, that is not what I said - I ask the question now to the Premier, in view of the fact that they had anticipated that the federal government would give them the transportation corridor as the Prime Minister had promised them over a year ago, and he has lived up to his promise, but the preferential route that the Premier explained in great detail yesterday was to use Quebec's grid. Does he accept the fact that since it is Quebec's grid that has to be upgraded, that at some point you have to sit down and discuss with Quebec the use of their grid?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) about - Oh, I do not know how long it was going on, it must be close to a year - he was not on exactly the same line of questioning as the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) is now, but it is similar. At least, it is similar insofar as it had to do with energy and insofar as the member for Windsor - Buchans did not understand the process. Now I can liken it to the hon. Leader of the Opposition. Does the Leader of the Opposition not understand that once it is acknowledged and legislation is passed amending the National Energy Board Act then what happens is that the National Energy Board adjudicates upon an application for the transmission, either for wheeling through a system or for a dedicated power corridor - does the Leader of the Opposition not understand that - which therefore, makes redundant and irrelevant the question he asked about the government of Quebec?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. L. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the Opposition in a supplementary.

June 24, 1981

Tape No. 2738

DW - 3

MR. L. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, it is a peculiar kind of thinking that can cause us on one hand to be very proud of our provincial resources, our provincial rights and then to have the gall to stand up and say that he is expecting somebody to take away the rights that Quebec have over their own grid. Now everybody in Newfoundland could understand when we were asking

MR. STIRLING: for a corridor, a clear cut corridor across Quebec. This was the great right that we wanted and the federal government said, "You can have it," and they have now given legislation. But that was not what you were talking about yesterday.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: You are speaking for Quebec now are you?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: Maybe, Mr. Speaker, maybe the Premier can explain what his colleague, the Premier of Quebec, maybe he can explain what his colleague, whose view of Canada he appreciates much more than the Liberal view of Canada, when he says, "We will be displaying in front of our American colleagues our inability to resolve differences through negotiation," are you now saying that there have in fact been no negotiations with the Quebec Government for the last six months?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I thought I had answered the question fully. I do not understand the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) when he says that there is - there is not, you see, under our constitutional and legislative things as we understand it, and all the federal bureaucrats agree with us on this, and the people who we have negotiated with, that there is no difference in requesting that we have equal rights with other Canadians in the transmission of energy goods in the methodology of that transmission, whether it is wheeling through an existing system in Quebec or a dedicated corridor. The differences are one of nuance and not of substance. The dedicated corridor involves Quebec land and the wheeling involves the Quebec transmission system, if in fact it is available, if there is a surplus or there is some room there for it, which will then be adjudicated by an independent, impartial agency called the

PREMIER PECKFORD: National Energy Board.

So the whole question that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) is posing just indicates that the Leader of the Opposition does not seem to understand the process and that for full equality to be established for the transmission of energy products, both the wheeling and the delegated corridor are integral parts of that whole situation. And I cannot understand how the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) cannot understand that to be so, admitted by even the federal people.

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: It is becoming very obvious, Mr. Speaker, not only to me but to people throughout this whole Province, where there is no roads agreement in effect, no jobs being created, is that nothing has been done except the propaganda related to this whole question, nothing but propaganda and pass-outs to the Newfoundland people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: You are trying to confuse people and you now admit -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: Do you have a question in there?

MR. STIRLING: The question I would ask - and yesterday the Premier in his rhetorical manner said he would table all the correspondence and all the propositions that he has made to the federal government, which he has not done yet, Mr. Speaker - I would ask the Premier if he would also table all of the correspondence that he has had and all of the propositions he has made to the Province of Quebec.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, you know, I do not intend to table all the discussions and correspondence we had with the Province of Quebec in this matter, at this point in time, given that it is a highly sensitive matter.

MR. STIRLING: You have not had any.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Now, Mr. Speaker, I did not say we did not have any discussions with the Province of Quebec. What I am saying is that the whole question - and the only reason why we are as far ahead as we are right now on this whole negotiation, and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) had better watch his comments now very carefully because in a few minutes I will demonstrate that he is

PREMIER PECKFORD:

incorrect so I would ask the Leader of the Opposition to be careful of what he says because there are things here that-

MR. STIRLING: I anxiously await that.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Okay, then you will be proven wrong again. And I do not want to see the Leader of the Opposition embarrassed. I want to see a very responsible Leader of the Opposition who is going to constructively criticize government.

MR. STIRLING: You will get your chance to see that Leader.

PREMIER PECKFORD: All I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that it has been recognized by everybody in Canada who has looked at this situation that the federal government are the people in the first instance who must move in order to see the transmission of electricity happen. And this has been admitted by the Prime Minister, this has been admitted by Mr. LaLonde, this has been admitted by all the friends of the Leader of the Opposition opposite, and I cannot understand why they have not told them so.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I was going to ask the Premier a question but he is in such a bad, foul mood today perhaps I will direct my question to the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) - that is providing the Premier will let him answer the question because we understand there is dissension between the two hon. gentleman over the matter of offshore and the energy policy in this Province. But the word that is coming out of Halifax these days, Mr. Speaker, site of the biggest offshore exposition every held in Canada, the message that is coming out is that the representatives from Newfoundland fear that Halifax may get everything and Newfoundland will get nothing from the offshore. Dorothy Wyatt, the mayor of St. John's, who I

MR. NEARY: presume is a good Newfoundland, Mr. Millan this morning, Dr. Stuart Peters, Mr. Steve Millan, President of the offshore directorate, and a Miss Cantwell from Bowring's, I think it is, they all seem to think that Newfoundland is going to miss the oil boat, if we have not already missed it, and that most of the benefits will go to Halifax. Now the ordinary Newfoundlander has been feeling this way for some time, that the government has not been conducting themselves in a sane, sensible, common-sense way and their shouting and blaspheming has caused Newfoundland to lose a lot of the spinoff benefits that we should have received now to Halifax to Nova Scotia. What does the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) have to say about that?

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I am happy to see that the member has been allowed to ask a question, and I suspect that it was just because the Leader of the Opposition was frightened away by what the Premier indicated he would be tabling lately. He sat down awfully fast.

Mr. Speaker,

MR. BARRY: the member opposite is not quoting his newspapers correctly today. The statements that he has made, I believe, have been attributed to Her Worship, the Mayor of St. John's, to Mrs. Cantwell and to Mr. Peters. And, you know, we have a democratic system here. They are entitled to their opinions. They happen to be wrong opinions, but they are entitled to their opinions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: Mr. Millan did not make that statement and therefore there is nothing to correct as far as his statement is concerned.

The Government of Newfoundland's position is that there may be a slight little bit of influence in the fact that the Province is the owner of the resource, the Province will be licencing those who develop the resource, the Province has been and will continue to be setting conditions for the issuing of those permits which will see maximum benefits to this Province, and if we have the support of members opposite, and if they would make true representation to their Liberal colleagues in Ottawa, we may maintain the significant impact that we have seen here in the offshore, and, indeed, it will continue to grow. But if members opposite continue to support the Prime Minister in his attempt to rip these resources away from this Province, then there could be a very real threat to both employment and to business opportunities for our people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I got the impression from all four names that I just mentioned, including

MR. NEARY: Mr. Millan, that it is about time that the provincial government got away from just going after the throat; I think Mayor Wyatt said it is time both governments got away from each other's throats on this particular matter and stopped the shouting and stopped the arm waving and the wild-eyed accusations and the blasphemy.

MR. MORGAN: Tell her to get her own house in order at City Hall.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Millan definitely stated a change of provincial policy in Halifax. If he was quoted correctly, Mr. Millan said -

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

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

A point of order has been raised by the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: First of all, the hon. gentleman is making a speech, and secondly, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is quoting from a newspaper, and I believe that newspaper is the Daily News. In Beausheue, Page 131 -
Oral Questions -

MR. STIRLING: What do you mean by that?

MR. MARSHALL: Well, anyone can draw his own conclusions. Paragraph 358: "Questions should -

MR. STIRLING: (Inaudible) the Minister of Fisheries (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: Yes, they did an excellent editorial this morning on the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan). Very perceptive, excellent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, it says, "Oral Questions: Such questions should not inquire whether statements made in a newspaper are correct". And, Mr. Speaker, you know,

MR. MARSHALL: there is a reason for that,
because the people in this House, elected to the House,
are the ones who ask the questions, it is not the people
who did not get into the House who are allowed to ask
questions from outside the House.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): To the point of order, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Just for the benefit of the House, in my questions on Mr. Millan, I was not quoting from any newspaper.

AN HON. MEMBER: You were so.

MR. NEARY: I certainly was not.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, my understanding is that the hon. member was making a reference to comments in the newspaper, but I did not understand him to quote directly. In any event, he is aware of the reference that was quoted, and he can judge that in asking his questions.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question to the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) involves a statement made in Halifax where Mr. Millan was a guest speaker, had to do with a government policy, provincial policy on the offshore. Did Mr. Millan correctly state the government policy, that this government would prefer not to take the offshore question to court, that Mr. Millan said, and I presume he was speaking for the minister and for the government, that that was not the place to settle the issue, that the government-at least he himself if not the government would prefer to see a negotiated settlement, which is a change from the policy of six months ago. Is that policy now the policy of the Newfoundland government, the one that Mr. Millan stated in Halifax?

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, with respect to Mr. Millan making policy, unlike the administration that the hon. member played a part in at one time, it is the ministers in Cabinet in this administration who make policy -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. BARRY: - and it is the public employees of this Province, good, hard-working, dedicated employees, who implement the policies and take direction from the policies decided by Cabinet. That is step one.

MR. BARRY: Step two, Mr. Speaker, it has been and continues to be the position of this government that the only way in which we are going to see a proper and an early settlement of the offshore minerals dispute is through constitutional and political negotiations, and a settlement which will be arrived at along the lines of that offered by Prime Minister Clark and which is supported by the other main opposition party in the federal government and which should be supported as well by the party to which members opposite bear allegiance but unfortunately it is not the case.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. NEARY: Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Final supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile, followed by the hon. member for St. Barbe.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is just like music to our ears over here because that is what we have been suggesting now for the last several years, that there should be a negotiated settlement, Mr. Speaker, that is what we have been saying for several years past, that the only way - as the minister says himself - the only way to get a proper and early settlement is through making some kind of a deal.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

A point of order has been raised by the hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is making a speech again, a bad one but still a speech, and this is Question Period.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, this is the hon. member's second supplementary, he should not require much preamble. I would ask him to ask his question. There are others who wish to ask questions.

June 24, 1981

Tape No. 2742

SD - 3

MR. NEARY:

So in view of the fact that the minister now has stated a change of policy, that the only way to get a

MR. NEARY:

proper and early settlement is through political negotiation, would the minister now tell the House if in future there will be no more blaspheming or shouting and roaring and bawling from one end of this country to the other by the Premier, that the minister will now go out and do the same thing as he did with Erco and carry out negotiations in a common sense way in order to bring about this early settlement that the hon. gentleman just spoke about?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, it takes two to tango, it takes two to negotiate, it takes two to settle. This government has always, always, Mr. Speaker, since 1972 taken the position that this is an issue which cries for a political settlement, which cries for the Federal Government to recognize legitimate, God-given rights of Newfoundlanders, and instead of trying to take them away from us, they should be sitting down to discuss the way of making sure that together we can see that these resources are developed for the benefit of Newfoundland, for the benefit of all of Canada.

But, no, Mr. Speaker, there has never, until the recent statement by the Prime Minister, been any indication that the Federal Government was prepared to enter into any type of serious discussion to try and resolve the issue. The Premier responded very quickly, very positively to what appears to be a change in the Federal position. We welcome that; if that is the case, we welcome that change. We will respond positively to any subsequent communications from the Prime Minister, but we are now awaiting a response to the Premier's letter. And with respect to blaspheming, we have not yet deified the Prime Minister of Canada unlike the member and his colleagues opposite.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BENNETT: I yield.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear now that - ordinary Newfoundlanders will approve of that policy just announced by the hon. gentleman, which is something new. This is a new policy, brand new. Ordinary Newfoundlanders will approve of that, that they are prepared now to sit down to the table and negotiate. Now, will the hon. gentleman tell the House how much time we have? Because the situation according to Mr. Millan again, if he is quoted correctly, the situation concerning Hibernia, it seems to be reaching a crucial stage. Now, how much time do we have in order to negotiate this settlement? How much time do we have before the oil companies want to get into production on Hibernia? And will the minister while he is answering the question tell us is it a fact that most of the spin-off benefits that, because of a better political climate in Nova Scotia, better economic climate, that the spin-off benefits, the real benefits so far from our offshore have gone to Nova Scotia, would the hon. gentleman care to comment on that?

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

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, now that members opposite are seeing that a frank, courageous, strong defence of Newfoundland rights gets results, as it did with respect to Erco, as it has gone with respect to the power corridor across Quebec and as I know it will do with respect to getting our offshore mineral rights -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. L. BARRY: - now, Mr. Speaker, that members opposite see -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. L. BARRY: - now that they see that this government is achieving results, they are trying to jump the bandwagon, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. L. BARRY: They are now, all of a sudden, they have been in agreement with the government of this Province, there has been no opposition over there on any of these issues for the last two years.

Mr. Speaker, it is about time we had some constructive opposition opposite. I urge members to take a stand, to have the courage to get up and take a stand, not just on these issues but on the other important issues facing this Province, whether it be the fishery, Mr. Speaker, which again because of poor federal management is facing a crisis, whether it be hydro-electricity, whether it be offshore mineral rights, whatever! For Heaven's sake it is time for the Opposition to take a clear stand. Are you with us or

MR. L. BARRY: are you against us? Are you with Mr. Trudeau or are you against him? Make up your mind, Mr. Speaker! Make up your mind!

Now, Mr. Speaker, with respect to how time that we have to settle, we have as much time as it takes to see Newfoundland win its just rights.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. T. BENNETT: If this goes on for long, Mr. Speaker, I will wonder if they are thumping their desks for me or if they are thumping their desks for the hon. minister.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. T. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the hon. Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe). June 6th. we have this advertisement by five members of the government asking people to join in their efforts to maintain Eastern Provincial Airways services in and out of Deer Lake. Now I am wondering if this means - I do not see the minister's picture with the group of five and I am wondering now if there is a division, if the minister still believes in the two airport concept or if he has lost support of the two airport concept by having five from the Humber area supporting only the Deer Lake airport? I am wondering if the minister now is going to still support the two airport concept or if he is taking sides too?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. R. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, the policy of this government as it relates to a number of transportation matters in this Province is well known. We are supporting the status quo as it relates to the two airport system in Western Newfoundland, and have done so for some time. As a matter of fact, the government has prepared an interven-

June 24, 1981

Tape No. 2744

DW - 3

MR. R. DAWE: tion proposal and have submitted it
to the Canadian Air Transport Commission and that has been
done as recently as last week. We have to hear back from
them. We definitely support the two airport system in
Western Newfoundland

MR. DAWE:

as we support the airports all throughout this Province. The article indicated by the member from St. Barbe (Mr. Bennett) is a prime example of the interest that members on this side of the House take in their particular districts and is an effort on behalf of those people to encourage other residents of the district to assist government in its proposal to keep the two airport concept.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BENNETT: Oh, the interest, Mr. Speaker. A supplementary to the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe).

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

MR. BENNETT: Oh, the interest that has been displayed by the hon. persons who I suspect paid for this themselves because I doubt very much if the government would pay for this ad. It would be interesting for the minister to tell us who paid for such ad which I understand cost hundreds of dollars, half a page in the Western Star. But, however, for all the interest being displayed I was not approached and I am a member for the area that is adversely effected by the elimination of services out of Deer Lake. I was not approached looking for support. And I sit across the House and I speak about the airports continuously. Myself and my colleagues are very much in favour, Mr. Speaker, of the two airport concept. And I am wondering if the chips were down, as they appear to be - Eastern Provincial making up its mind to fly out of one airport once the chips are down I am wondering now which airport the minister himself will support?

MR. SPEAKER: That is a hypothetical question and the hon. member might wish to rephrase it.

MR. BENNETT: I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, if indeed the minister does still support the two airport

MR. BENNETT: concept when indeed Eastern Provincial has decided they are wanting to leave Deer Lake, They stated they are going to leave Deer Lake. But I have not heard anything from the minister in the House of Assembly or through the media supporting the two airport concept. And, Mr. Speaker, adding to that, when the minister does respond I wonder if he would tell us if he met with the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Jean-Luc Pepin) in Ottawa during his recent visit and what the results of these discussions with regard to the airport might have been?

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

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, it would be certainly helpful if the hon. member opposite could clarify his question somewhat. It is very difficult in fact to decide whether there is a question there.

I have stated publicly, and I have continued to do so to the group that were down from the Ministry of Transport some time ago, my feelings on the two airport system in Newfoundland and I have continued to do that repeatedly in meetings I have had with the Deer Lake Town Council and a number of people representing interest groups in Western Newfoundland. And my position is the same as it has been all along, it is the same as government's position. We do support the two airport system. As it relates to meetings I have had with Mr. Pepin as recently as yesterday, these are a part of ongoing discussions with the Department of Transportation and as soon as information from that meeting is such that it should be made available to the public, I will certainly do so.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the member for Eagle River.
We have thirty-five seconds remaining.

MR. HISCOCK: My question is to the Minister of Mines and Energy and it is with regard to Newfoundland Hydro wanting a rate increase. Because they have now had to finance the CFLCo loan, it has now gone up from 7 per cent to 8 per cent to the consumer. Could the Minister of Mines and Energy provide us with the information how much was the original loan, what interest is now being paid on that loan, and how much more capital we have to pay on the CFLCo loan? Because of rules of this government and regulations, the Board of Public Utilities cannot -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

That is a question that requires a great deal of detail and statistics and perhaps would be more appropriate for the Order Paper. I would suggest the hon. member put that on the Order Paper.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, apart from all that, it has been answered many times in the House before. It was \$160 million initially, if it is the same one that he is referring to - \$160 million of which \$30-odd million was allocated for water rights and the other for the purchase of CFLCo assets.

MR. HISCOCK: Will you table all of that?

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, it has all been tabled.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: I tabled a response to the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: I gave him the periodic interest rates applicable and it is all there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

I have indicated the question would be more properly put on the Order Paper. I can also tell hon. members the time for Oral Questions has now expired.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table some documents to prove beyond any shadow of a doubt that the negotiations between the Government of Newfoundland and the Government of Canada have been ongoing since last October and before as it relates to the positive movement that was taken the other day by the federal government in indicating their intention to introduce legislation as it relates to a power corridor through Quebec. I have given a list on top of the documents to make it easy reference for the Leader of the Opposition. I just note, by way of tabling, a proposal that went to the federal government on March 3rd of this year which delineated in clear terms the kinds of amendments to the National Energy Board Act which would be necessary, which included wheeling as well as power corridor. It has been consistent, the Minister of Energy's (Mr. Barry) letter to Mr. LaLonde after a meeting in December, my own correspondence with the Prime Minister in establishing the meeting and getting the meetings underway, right up to, and I might say to the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, in contrast to some of his questions today, "Thank you for your letter" - this is from the Prime Minister after the announcement was made on Sunday. We received it

PREMIER PECKFORD: after the announcement was made not before - "Thank you for your letter of March 13th,¹¹ - which was my last letter to him¹¹ in which you discuss the subject of transmission of electrical energy through the Province of Quebec. There is no question that we are in full agreement about the potential benefits to be derived for Newfoundland and Labrador and Canada as a whole from the development of the Gull Island site on the Lower Churchill. I also concur that a key factor in determining the economic viability of this project will be the availability of markets for surplus power. I understand that my colleague, the hon. Marc Lalonde, has recently written to Mr. Barry putting forward the view that without guarantees in their future of some markets the Federal Government will want to assess very seriously the financial risks before the project went ahead.

"In light of the above, I am most appreciative of the information which you have made available to me and to Mr. Lalonde. We are, at this time, contemplating the introduction in Parliament of amendments to the National Energy Board Act protecting electrical transmission. The material you, your minister and your officials have put forward in the recent exchanges of views "the meetings that were held that the Leader of the Opposition said were not held -" has helped to clarify the nature of some of the problems involved and will greatly assist us in our consideration of legislative and other means to encourage the development of the Gull Island project." This is the Prime Minister of Canada.

"I understand also that Mr. Lalonde has indicated his support in principle for a programme of engineering studies on the Lower Churchill and I trust that this can proceed. I hope that these actions confirm for you the urgent priority which we too attach to the need to resolve outstanding issues related to the development of the Lower Churchill."

PREMIER PECKFORD:

And I replied to the Prime Minister this morning and I want to table this letter now. I have telexed it to the Prime Minister this morning because I think it is extremely important in the response that he gave yesterday.

'Thank you for your letter' - telexed dated June 19, 1981 - 'informing me of your intention to introduce an amendment to the National Energy Board Act respecting electricity transmission. Your intention in this respect represents an important step in the direction we have been seeking but there are two important points which I wish to bring to your attention. The first relates to timing and the second to the nature of the proposed legislation.

'On the question of timing, it is extremely important that legislation to facilitate free inter-provincial trade in electrical energy be introduced as soon as possible. I am hereby requesting that the appropriate legislation be dealt with by parliament prior to its Summer recess. While we have not seen the text of the proposed amendment, it is my understanding that it deals with only part of our request and provides for the creation of a dedicated corridor through neighbouring provinces.

'Our original request, as confirmed in my letter of March 13, 1981 and in a proposal put forward at the officials level - of which a copy is being table here today - requests that legislation be introduced which will provide access to a dedicated power corridor and also provide access to inter-provincial transmission facilities through the Province of Quebec and other neighbouring provinces.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

'To reiterate, we are pleased with the initiative taken by your government. I hereby request that the proposed amendment be broadened to cover both a dedicated power corridor as well as the ability to wheel Newfoundland power through the Quebec system.'

PREMIER PECKFORD: 'Such legislation should be introduced in parliament as soon as possible and its passage appropriately expedited in view of the pressing national and provincial interest in Labrador power development.'

I hereby table and therefore provide as exhibit A, B,C and D to Z the amount of meetings and discussions we have had with the federal officials since last October.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): This being Wednesday, Private Members Day, I call motion number 6.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I call motion number 6, which is moved by the hon. member for St. Barbe (T.Bennett). WHEREAS the high cost of living in this Province has placed an unbearable burden on those who are dependant on government assistance; AND WHEREAS we profess to live in a society based on equal rights and opportunity for all; BE IT RESOLVED that this House urge the government to take measures to make adequate provision for those for whom society is responsible. Moved by the hon. member for St. Barbe.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. member for St. Barbe.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BENNETT:

Mr. Speaker, I feel very strongly that this is a resolution that should gain the support of every member of the House of Assembly. It seems to me, since I remember, in very short time, in very short years, we have had such a change in the structure of our survival, the survival of people who find it very difficult, Mr. Speaker, to provide for themselves. Some of the reason I put forward this resolution, a resolution of this nature consequently I feel will get the unanimous support of the House of Assembly.

It seems to me, at this time in our particular society, that we are entering into what appears more like the law of the jungle, Mr. Speaker, rather than being more or less our fellow's keeper. It seems to me that government of today, not only, Mr. Speaker, on a provincial level, but basically, primarily our provincial government that we have in place at this time, they seem to flog and they seem to abuse their position as government in governing. They inflict upon people unbearable taxes. In my opinion they do not return to the taxpayers of the Province, who have contributed to the treasury, they do not return to the people who are dependent on government for their very survival. So you can understand, Mr. Speaker, why I am anxious to put forward such a resolution.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that we are very lucky as Canadians to live in such a country as Canada where most of the major benefits can be gotten from the Canadian society, benefits that have been brought into being by a good strong, aggressive Liberal Government in Ottawa, a government that sees the needs of people, recognizes the needs of people, respects it and does something about it.

MR. BENNETT: We have too much discrepancy on our provincial level when so much is being done on our federal level to alleviate the anxiety and the hardship of the people of this Province.

I am not totally aware of how other provinces operate, of what their policies are with regards to helping people of their provinces, but I am becoming more and more aware of how our provincial government operates, and I am becoming more and more aware of how they neglect the needs of people who are dependent upon them. I can cite so many examples in the Province at this time, examples where I wish the various ministers of this government would, Mr. Speaker, put their knowledge and their skills and their abilities, put it together for the benefit of the people of the Province.

A few days ago I was speaking to a young man who lost his wife and left him with six children to support. The policy of this government is to afford that young man, who is less than

MR. BENNETT:

thirty years old, or probably he might be past thirty, but he has six children to support and the Department of Social Services will allow him \$60 a month for a housekeeper. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, that young man is obliged to stay on welfare. He is not a skilled tradesman, he is not into an industry where he can make great dollars to raise and educate his children, so this young man is dependent on government aid, government assistance. If he leaves his children to seek employment, he loses any assistance that he would get from the Department of Social Services - the meager \$60 a month would be cut off.

Now I feel, Mr. Speaker, myself that a young man in a position like that should be encouraged to seek employment. He should be awarded a lot more than \$60 a month so that he could go out and seek gainful employment and raise his family in dignity. At this time this particular young man - and no doubt we have hundreds of them around the Province in similar circumstances, who lose their housekeeper when they lose their wives by one means or another; and in this case it is a sad situation that I speak of - this young man finds it very difficult to get employment. Not having a trade, not being into the fishing industry where he can make substantial dollars, he has got to work by the sweat of his brow wherever he can get a day's pay and that day's pay can be a little as \$3.45 an hour to support six children and himself and the housekeeper.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I said earlier that we are lucky to belong to a society and a country as great as the Canadian society under which we live. And I had other calls from my constituents who wonder why they have been cut in their benefits from the Social Services Department in our government. And when I do research - like I have one here in front of me, an inquiry, which says, 'Why have we been reduced

June 23, 1981

Tape No. 2749

SD - 2

MR. BENNETT: in our monthly payments of \$185 down to \$172 a month?' Now \$185 a month for a person to survive on is not a lot of money - \$6 a day or less. But when I do the research to find out why this person was reduced from \$185 to \$172 per month, I am told it is because the Canadian government in Ottawa increased the allowance under the Canada Pension Plan.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, the government this year increased assistance to social service recipients in the order of ten per cent to accommodate inflation. While the ten per cent was not enough, the same thing applies to Ottawa. Ottawa increases its aid to people to allow for the high cost of living and the inflation. But when Ottawa increases its aid to the people through Canada Pension or other means, the government here takes it away, Mr. Speaker, which is most unfair. And I would like for this government to do something about it. I think they should change that policy. They have the power. They have the wherewithal. They make this money available and in view of the fact that Ottawa pays fifty per cent of all social services money into the Province anyway in the first instance, ^{so} it is most unfair that people should be treated in this manner. When they do get an increase in assistance from Ottawa, this government takes it away, ^{even} though it is meant to serve the same purpose. This government gives an increase, after we flogged them and insisted they give an increase they finally give into our demands and give the people in the Province an increase, people who are dependent upon them for very survival, ^{then} when Ottawa gives an increase this government takes it away.

I am most anxious, Mr. Speaker, to see that changed and I think that the people of the Province who get increases from Ottawa should be allowed to keep those increases, kept for what they were meant to provide for in the very beginning, the increase in the high cost of living.

Even in many parts of our Province we find not equal and in my resolution here I suggest, Mr. Speaker, the second paragraph,
AND WHEREAS we profess to live in a society based on equal rights and opportunity for all. Now I feel that we are certainly not

MR. TULK: living up to what we profess to be, what we profess to support. When I hear my hon. colleague, who represents Labrador, suggesting that in government operated stores they pay as much as \$3.60 or \$3.80 for a dozen eggs just because people live on the Labrador and you pay \$1.50 or \$1.60 in St. John's, now that is not equal rights for all.

We can find a terrible amount of discrepancy in the system and it is long past due when we should be doing something about it.

As soon as this government came to power, Mr. Speaker, almost the very next day after they came to power - and I have been scoffed at in the House of Assembly for mentioning this before, and I stand to be scoffed at again and I will be scoffed at in the future - as soon as this government came to power they cut out Joe Smallwood's mothers' allowance. Now if the hon. gentleman opposite who controls the Treasury, if the hon. gentleman represented a rural area and visited his constituents like I do, the people who need this help, the people who have not got the money to buy books for their children in the Fall, and boots to put on their feet in the Fall of the year when school starts; undoubtedly the hon. gentlemen who represent St. John's can find such discrepancy too, they do not need to go into rural areas. But it is more obvious in rural areas because we are still living in a more humane manner, where we visit our neighbours and treat them like

MR. BENNETT:

human beings. We have not yet succumbed to the attitudes that are evident and displayed in the city, in the concrete jungles. People need that \$200 in the Fall of the year, Mr. Speaker. The Canadian child's tax credit is a help that people now get, coming from Ottawa, and I would very much like to see this government do something of that nature, especially in the Fall when our children need to go back to school.

I have a letter on my desk from a constituent today asking for some kind of help, any kind of help, where a widow with a child of seventeen, just gone through Grade X having done excellently, and they are living on the subsistence of welfare - a family of four, I believe. The eldest boy is eighteen now very shortly and going into Grade XI. And the mother is very concerned because she cannot afford to have that boy go through Grade XI next Fall without some kind of help. He is not able to get work this Summer, which, Mr. Speaker, fifteen years ago and even ten years ago was unheard of for young people to be unemployed. In the district of St. Barbe it was unheard of. There was a surplus of employment, there was a shortage of labourers. There were more jobs than there were people to accommodate them. But what has happened since we have Tory times in the last ten years?

MR. NEARY: Hard times.

MR. BENNETT: It is hard times.

I really do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that this government realizes and understands. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, they travel around the Province. I do not think they are in communication and in contact with the people of the Province. I do not think they know anything that is happening outside of the Avalon Peninsula and the overpass. They certainly do not know what is

MR. BENNETT: happening in St. Barbe district. If they knew, I think there would be legislation to support and to change - help to change, at least, the unbearable poverty of some of the people that we have. And I say some of the people, Mr. Speaker, I do not say all of the people. We have people who are making a very good living, but through the very good living that they make, Mr. Speaker, they contribute to the Treasury, to the payment of taxes which this government inflicts upon them, and the idea of taxing one source is to aid the other source to develop industry and to help people get into industry and to help people who cannot help themselves, now that is a general idea of taxation.

 We have had a lot of freedoms around the Province, around the Island and, indeed, Labrador. We have lost a lot of that freedom in a very short time which could make people reasonably independent, where they could get land to grow potatoes. The policy of this government, Mr. Speaker, will not allow people to get land. Crown land is sitting still. It is just out there growing to weeds and our people cannot get this land. By the time they cut through all the red tape to acquire ten acres or two or a hundred acres, by the time they cut through all the red tape of government bureaucracy and pay

MR. BENNETT: for an expensive survey and document all of this. People of the Province are unable to acquire land. By the time they get the piece of land approved that they can grow their potatoes on, they have gone out to the factories of Ontario seeking employment to support their families back here, they are paying the tax to the Ontario or Alberta governments, terrible disorganization.

I wonder if the rest of the Canadian governments across Canada, I wonder if the rest of the provinces are disorganized as this Province and this government seem to be? I heard the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) yesterday, in his usual criticism of Ottawa, suggesting that his government can organize the fishery. Well, Mr. Speaker, if building ice plants in one community and a fish plant twenty miles down the street in my district is a prime example of their - if this is an organized government, if this is organization, look, up in Bartletts Harbour we have two ice making machines where there is no electricity to make ice with those machines. They have been there for four years and they have not turned out a ton of ice and we are hauling ice from the other side of the Island. We have ambitious people up there who want to get into industry.

We have this government, our Minister of Fisheries, flogging Ottawa about their licencing system when, if they did their work, we would have plants on shore. That is not Ottawa's responsibility. Build your ice plants, put the power to them, make your roads to them. Last year there were several fish plants in my district that suffered because this government could not find any dollars. Cow Head alone was looking for \$30,000. I went to the minister and I said, Look, \$30,000 can turn on this fish plant and give us \$4 million worth of cash flow in that little community. And this government laughed

MR. BENNETT: at that kind of expenditure, \$30,000. If you do not go in with a \$300,000 expenditure to activate a little, tiny fish plant, and then turn around and tax the people to pay it back, if you cannot do this kind of thing they will not look at it at all.

There is no question about it, Tory times are hard times. I have photographs here I would like to show the hon. gentleman. If I relate from them - I told a friend of mine I would return these photographs to him so if I am asked to table them I should. But I would like the hon. gentleman to look at our methods of clearing and turning on our agriculture in a district as I represent, where we have such arable land.

Since I have been here I have had hon. gentlemen suggest to me, You do not have arable land in your district. We have the best arable land. That is the reason we have a good woods industry, that is the reason Bowaters - we have the biggest kind of timber and where there are good timber stands there is good soil beneath it and people can grow potatoes. But when you have such arrogance on the part of government, they will not spend \$2,000 or \$3,000, or \$5,000 or \$6,000, \$10,000 or \$50,000 to help to develop this land, Mr. Speaker, there is so very little that can be done about it, and still these people sweat their hearts out to make a living and develop the land. Mr. Speaker, they do this to pay taxes and to be independent, and they pay taxes and they support their children and their families.

Mr. Speaker, I wish I had more time to talk about this resolution that I have put forward but I shall, hoepfully, get another chance. I realize I have only one minute left, but I challenge every member of this hon. House of Assembly, Mr. Speaker, to get

MR. BENNETT: up and display his feelings
for the people of this Province. And if we profess to
live in a society with equal benefits and equal rights
for all, if we profess to live in a society of this type
and this nature, if we do not profess to live in a
dictatorship, Mr. Speaker, I challenge every hon. person
in this House of Assembly to display their feelings

MR. T. BENNETT: on this, in my opinion, most important resolution.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a few words in support of the resolution put down on the Order Paper by my colleague the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Bennett).

The resolution basically, Mr. Speaker, deals with matters related to people who are unable to fend for themselves in our Newfoundland society. It has to do with people who are unemployed, people who are underemployed and people who are receiving social assistance benefits. In other words, people who are neglected by the government.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are basically dealing with three groups of people - no, with four groups of people - we are also dealing with the handicapped. We are dealing with, number one, people who are unemployed through no fault of their own, people who are underemployed, underpaid, people on social assistance and people who are handicapped, sick people and disabled people. So we are dealing with four groups of people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the group that I would like to deal with first are the people who are on social assistance. Now any society, Mr. Speaker, can be judged on the way that it looks after people who are forced to go on government assistance of one kind or another. Any civilized society is judged on the way it looks after people who through no fault of their own are forced to receive government assistance of one kind or another. And that includes, in this Province, to a large degree people on

MR. S. NEARY: social assistance. Now the people on social assistance today, Mr. Speaker, in this Province, I would think on the whole are being grossly neglected by this government; you have children going to school in this Province who are undernourished. I think it is right to say that in our society today, in our Canadian society, our Newfoundland society, that nobody will starve to death - unless, of course, it is an outright case of neglect, a neglected family. But nobody really starves to death today with all the social welfare benefits that we have. But it is possible, Mr. Speaker, for children to be undernourished. And I would suspect with the slender allowances, with the meager allowances that are paid for social assistance in this Province that the government have not kept pace with the cost of living. And with inflation in this Province, with the slender allowances that are being paid, that you have children going to school in this Province, you have children today out there in Newfoundland and Labrador who are undernourished because people cannot cope, they cannot make ends meet, they cannot buy the food necessary to properly nourish, to provide nourishment for their children.

The same thing applies to rent, Mr. Speaker; this government has a crazy policy of

MR. NEARY: paying rent for people who are on social assistance. It is virtually impossible, next to impossible for people on social assistance to rent a house with the rates that are set by the Department of Social Services. The rates are almost identical to what they were ten years ago. And everybody knows the way the rents have increased in this Province. It is virtually impossible for people on social assistance, in the low income bracket and on unemployment insurance, to keep an adequate roof over their heads, to find a suitable apartment or house that is wind proof and water tight. It is nigh impossible, Mr. Speaker, and yet you hear people every day, I hear them myself, criticize people on social assistance. They say, 'They are living too high, they are getting too much now'. I hear some of the open line hosts express that view and some of the editors of newspapers especially the Torygram.

The Torygram cannot look at anything objectively in this Province, everything has to be looked at tunnelvision, buttoned down mind, narrow-minded. A good example of what I am talking about is in today's Torygram, there is an article there - pass me that 'Jim' , will you? - there is an article there about a press conference that was held yesterday -

MR. MORGAN: Torygram? What do you mean?

MR. NEARY: The Torygram, the Evening Torygram. There is a big item on page 3 in connection with the drug prescription programme. Just listen to this, Mr. Speaker, and then read the story. 'Charges against pharmacists are unfounded and misleading.' And if you read the story, the pharmacists admit, openly admit - I mean, how dense and how stupid must the editor of that paper be after reading the copy passed to him by the person who attended that press conference to put in a headline like that when in actual fact what the pharmacists did was confirm what had been said in this House by the Minister of Health (Mr. House) and my myself? They

MR. NEARY: confirmed it and what the headlines should have been in the Evening Torygram was 'Charges against pharmacists are true', that is what it should have been, or 'Charges against pharmacists are unfounded and misleading, so say the pharmacists.' But not that, no, 'Charges against pharmacists are unfounded and misleading'. Well, read the article. I challenge anybody to read it and see if it does not confirm what we have been saying in this House about the pharmacists charging - the minister confirmed it - \$4.00 for every item on a prescription, charging \$4.00 per prescription that is brought in. And the pamphlet the minister sent out only recently indicated that they could give 100 days supply of drugs. The pharmacists have taken it upon themselves - and the minister is nodding, yes, that is so - to say.' No, we are only going to give you a month's supply of drugs, so that they can get three prescriptions - \$12 instead of \$4. And that is confirmed in that article. And the gall of the narrow-minded, buttoned-down mind of the editor of that paper who cannot see beyond the Tory Party of this Province. He and Wick Collins, there are two of them left in Newfoundland, cannot see,

MR. NEARY: they are so narrow-minded and their minds are so closed and so buttoned down that it is shameful, Mr. Speaker. The reporting by these two gentlemen is shameful, it is absolutely disgraceful. And the people of this Province -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: They should be taken to court. for creating false information to the people of this Province because the people out chere throughout the Province pick up the newspaper and expect to find the truth. All they do, day in and day out, are find items that are slanted, that are slanted, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MORGAN: They are entitled to their own opinion

MR. NEARY: They are not entitled to their own opinion, they are not entitled when they are doing a straight news item to slant it and to try to belittle people and downgrade people. Is that the Thomson policy? Is that the Thomson philosophy?

Mr. Speaker, never before in the history of mankind have we seen news so slanted in this Province, so slanted that there should be a Royal Commission investigate the newspapers for slanting the news.

MR. MORGAN: They do not cover you anymore.

MR. NEARY: Oh, they do cover me. I get lots of coverage.

Mr. Speaker, in their own little cute way, in their own subtle way they try to undermine credibility of people in this Province. And all they are doing is insulting the intelligence of Newfoundlanders because this -

MR. HISCOCK: And themselves.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. HISCOCK: And themselves.

MR. NEARY: And themselves.

AN HON. MEMBER: They are still fighting Confederation.

MR. MORGAN: You are not only attacking people, you are attacking the press.

MR. NEARY: No, I am not attacking the press, Mr. Speaker, I am attacking two - Two, and I will name them. The buttoned-down mind of the editor of the Evening Torvgram in this

Province and the gentleman who writes the other column.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: And rightly so, Mr. Speaker, because the people of this Province expect when they read the newspaper that they are getting facts, that they are getting news items that are based on facts and not on fiction, are not slanted. News items should not be slanted. I have seen item reported in the Evening Torvgram from this House, little snide remarks into the news item. That should not be allowed, Mr. Speaker, and I do not mean that we should muzzle the press, either. But what put it in my mind now is the way they come down on the people on Social Assistance. You would not know but they were all living in the laps of luxury. You would not know but they were all living like the Premier of this Province, who has a house, a gift of a house, rent free, light free, telephone free, compliments of the taxpayers of this Province; a motor car and a chauffeur to drive him around and two or three bodyguards, two or three cars and helicopters and airplanes to fly him around, and an expense account. You would not know but all the people on Social Assistance were living like that in this Province, when in actual fact they are not, Mr. Speaker.

And I would submit that most of the Newfoundland people who are on unemployment insurance, who are under-employed, receiving low wages and people on Social Assistance and senior citizens are living below the poverty line. A lot of them are living in substandard housing that you would not put goats, you would not rear goats in some of the houses. And you cannot blame it on the individual, Mr. Speaker. There is no point in somebody getting up on the other side, some of

MR. NEARY: up on the other side, some of the wealthy crowd on the other side getting up and saying, 'Ah, it is their own fault.' It is not their own fault, Mr. Speaker. And this policy of forcing people to go to work: Mr. Speaker, they are saying this government, after they took over in 1972, did away with assistance for young, able-bodied Newfoundlanders, young men and women. There is no social assistance policy in this Province for young Newfoundlanders from, say, seventeen up. When you reach the age of seventeen you are taken of the assistance, and the government uses the argument let them go out and find a job. Well, where are they going to find a job to when we have the highest unemployment rate in Canada? We have record unemployment in this Province. Young men and women cannot get assistance. Their parents are on unemployment insurance or on the old age pension or on a DVA allowance and they cannot, they are not entitled in this Province - I think it is the only Province in Canada where young able-bodied men and women are not entitled to social assistance in their own right. The only Province is here in Newfoundland and that is contrary to the Canada Assistance Plan. The Government of Canada pays fifty per cent of the cost of social assistance in this Province; the government that has been so blasphemed by ministers and by the Premier of this Province, pays fifty per cent of the social assistance programme. And the philosophy and the spirit of the Canada Assistance Plan is that everybody will be assisted if they can establish need, immaterial of what caused that need. Young people are unemployed, they cannot find jobs. They are in need and they go to the government and the government has refused to assist them. As far as I know it is the only Province in Canada with that kind of a policy. Now they have a new one, Mr. Speaker, they have a new gimmick now; they are

MR. NEARY: disqualifying people from social assistance on the recommendation of what they call private investigators - private investigators who go around peeping into key holes.

Mr. Speaker, I had a case today of where a lady was denied social assistance on the recommendation of a private investigator who said she was living with a man. She had two children, she is living common law so the private investigator said, and it is not true. The woman was not living common law. They cut off her assistance. The private investigator, whoever he is, this pint-size Dick Tracy that the minister has running around the Province, did not even have the courtesy to interview the woman or to interview the man that she was suppose to be living with. He just made his report without the courtesy of an interview of the two people involved and on the basis of the report of a private eye, of a pocket size Dick Tracy, her assistance was cut off and now the woman is desperate, panic stricken.

Mr. Speaker, there is no harm to say that Tory times are hard times. We do have hard times in this Province at the present time. We do have hard times. We have a record number of people on social assistance. We have record unemployment. We have a record number of people on unemployment insurance.

MR. NEARY: And, Mr. Speaker, if these three ingredients do not make a recession or a depression I do not know what does. And the government are burying their heads in the sand, paying no attention to it at all.

MR. CARTER: Do not shout so loud!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is enough to make you shout. I only wish I had the voice so that everybody in Newfoundland - the government does not have the courage to bring the television cameras into the House. The President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) goes out yacking on television that the Opposition is keeping the House open. I challenge him now: bring in the television cameras and let the people see who is keeping the House open. Let the people see. They do not have the courage to do it. They are depending on the likes of Wick Collins and the editor of the Evening Torygram to pump out their spleen, their slime and their dirt and their poison. They are depending on that, and as long as that happens there will be no microphones, no television cameras brought into this House. So I would like to have my voice loud enough that it would go out to every corner of this Province so that the ordinary people would know that at least there is one voice in this House that is fighting for their rights. Bring in radio and bring in the television cameras, that is the only way, Mr. Speaker, the truth will get out to the people of this Province.

So I hope my hon. friend's resolution does some good. I hope that every hon. gentleman on this side of the House, at least, will stand up for the ordinary people of this Province who cannot cope with the high cost of living in this Province, who are given very slender and meagre resources.

MR. NEARY: I know the hon. gentleman now will come into the House, get up and say, 'Oh, yes, here is what the rates are now; here is what they were ten years ago when the Liberals were in.' It was a different situation then. We had low unemployment in this Province and the cost of living at that time was not as bad as it is now. But the rents were more generous than they are at the present time. People are being forced into slums. People cannot get shelter or accommodations for the rates that are being paid by this government. They cannot even get into a slum house these days for these rates. I think it is shameful, Mr. Speaker, it is disgraceful, and I tell you this, that I am proud to be able to support a resolution of this magnitude. It is truly a Liberal resolution, Mr. Speaker. It shows that members of this side of the House have feelings for the people out there who are being neglected by society. What does the resolution say?

MR. DOYLE: The hon. member has not read the resolution yet.

MR. NEARY: Yes, I do know what the resolution says, I do not even have to refer to it. "BE IT RESOLVED that this House urge the government to take measures to make adequate provision for those for whom society is responsible." Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that the resolution will be defeated. The government cannot think of anything except their wealthy friends, the oil sheiks and the oil kings. All they can think about is oil and gas and probably more gas than oil, Mr. Speaker. So I suspect this resolution, like all other good resolutions on this side of the House, is doomed, because all they can think of on that side of the House is gas and oil and their rich friends.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker.

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

June 24, 1981

Tape 2757

EC - 3

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is put forward by the Opposition, and the last speaker stood on his feet and condemned everybody around him except the real culprits who are responsible for the high cost of

MR. MORGAN:

living in our country today, not only in Newfoundland but across Canada. They attack the open-line hosts. First of all they attack the open-line hosts, those people who happen to express freedom of opinion every day of the week if they want to. We are living in a free democracy, surely they are entitled to their own opinion. Then he chooses to attack the people who write their opinions in the newspapers, Mr. Wick Collins in particular. Obvious reasons why he attacked Mr. Collins because last week his article was very devastating in the attack he made on the Opposition. And it was not an attack, it was true facts. He put forward his opinion as he saw it. He sits in the gallery quite often. He sees what it is happening in the House. He sees the Opposition being so ineffective.

MR. THOMS: You would think he would be bored.

MR. MORGAN: He recognizes the importance of having an effective opposition in the House. Without an effective opposition you cannot have good government. And that is what is bothering me, the fact is we do not have anymore an effective opposition. And the hon. gentleman is -

MR. THOMS: (Inaudible).

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

MR. MORGAN: Now, Mr. Speaker, I sat here and listened to the two speakers so far in silence and I want the gentlemen on the other side to give me the same courtesy.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is, as I mentioned last week -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: - the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that when politicians stand and debate in the House, unless they have the courage of their convictions and lay the blame where the blame should be laid -

MR. HISCOCK: Where is that?

June 24, 1981

Tape No. 2758

NM - 2

MR. BARRY: Ottawa. Where else?

MR. HISCOCK: Ottawa?

MR. MORGAN: Let us look at a few things that have been happening in the last -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: Does anybody in the House recall the last general election? Does anybody in this House recall the last general election? What happened? The people of this country were deceived. The biggest fraud ever perpetrated on the voters of Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order!

MR. MORGAN: Why? Why, Mr. Speaker? Because here is how it was.

MR. HISCOCK: (Inaudible).

MR. MORGAN: Because the Liberals came in, they brought in the people who were -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker. Please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I ask the hon. member for Eagle River to restrain himself.

MR. MORGAN: I recall watching the activities in the House of Commons and they brought in the people in wheel-chairs who were sick in the hospital, they brought them in that night for one purpose, to defeat the Tory Administration. Why? Because they had brought in a good, common sense budget to try to bring the economic affairs of our country into some kind of stability in the person of John Crosbie.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who?

MR. MORGAN: In the person of John Crosbie -

AN HON. MEMBER: Go on, boy.

MR. MORGAN: - who had every business community across the country believing in what he was saying and what he was doing. Sure enough the Opposition comes in and says, "No,

MR. MORGAN: it is bad for the country of Canada. We have got to get rid of the Tories, they are going to increase the price of fuel."

MR. HANCOCK: You are not that stunned are you?

MR. MORGAN: Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, they are going to increase the price of gasoline in the Country of Canada, the Tories, those bad old Tories. Get rid of them. That was the slogan of the Liberals in the House of Commons. Get rid of those bad old Tories. Mind, you will not be able to afford to drive back and forth to work every day because the cost of gasoline - eighteen cents a gallon increase. My goodness, Mr. Speaker, it went on in the House - what? - a twenty-four hour debate in the House of Commons. We have got to get rid of those bad Tories. They are going to increase the price of gasoline by eighteen cents a gallon.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the people across the country now realize and understand how hypocritical, how really, really hypocritical that position was taken officially by the Liberal Party of Canada. The Opposition man who brought the motion in cannot stand it now, you see. He brought the motion to attack the Newfoundland Government, instigated by his colleagues in the Opposition, to bring forward a motion which reads as, "AND WHEREAS we profess to live in a society based on equal rights and opportunity for all, BE IT RESOLVED this House urge the government," it did not say which government, obviously referring to this government here

MR. J. MORGAN:

government here dealing in a partisan way as they always play it, Mr. Speaker, a partisan way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. J. MORGAN: Now if the Opposition spokesman, Mr. Speaker, if he had brought in a motion asking us, the House of Assembly, to urge the federal government to try to do something about the high cost of living to all Canadians, then I think Mr. Trudeau in Ottawa, despite his arrogance of the day would maybe sit back and think, 'Well, what is going on down in Newfoundland when we have a unanimous resolution here passed by all members of the House, asking us in Ottawa -

MR. E. HISCOCK: (Inaudible) yourselves.

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. J. MORGAN: - asking us in Ottawa to look at some of the things that is going on affecting the common folk of the country.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. J. MORGAN: And let us look at some of the things affecting the common folk of our country, if you want to call them that. Let us look at some of the things that has happened today in our country. How many hundreds of Canadians today are losing their homes because they cannot afford to renew their mortgages? Is that the Newfoundland government, Mr. Speaker? How many Canadians across the country today are losing their homes? Losing them! Mr. Broadbent a few days ago stood in the House of Commons and said he could count thousands of them. He had a list of thousands of Canadians who could no longer hold their homes and no longer had a home to live in. Why?

MR. J. MORGAN: Oh, because the little Government down in Newfoundland with a half million people is causing inflation! That is the problem! Did he say that? No, indeed he did not! Indeed he did not! Mr. Speaker, indeed he did not! Indeed he did not! You see, if we are going to be sincere as politicians let us call a spade a spade and lay the blame where the blame should be laid. And let us give credit where credit is due! The fact is that right now there are these thousands of Canadians losing their homes because of high interest rate which is not influence by a half million people in Newfoundland. There is no way we have influenced that kind of situation affecting all of Canada, where the federal Minister of Finance (Mr. MacEachen) decides to sit back - and I saw a big headline across the Halifax Herald recently which read, "Mr. MacEachen Decides To Do Nothing", a big headline, "Mr. MacEachen Decides To Do Nothing". And that is exactly what is going on today in Ottawa. Exactly what is going on!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. J. MORGAN: Because the federal minister and the federal government are refusing, Mr. Speaker, to act on important issues.

Let us look at a few more factors. Let us look at inflation. I recall the Prime Minister who was still in office, the Prime Minister in the last election campaigning across the country that he was not going to let inflation be controlled by the economy of the U.S. - a quote from Mr. Trudeau. He was not going to let the economy of Canada to be guided by the economy of the U.S. He was not going to let the inflation rate be governed by the inflation rate in the U.S. and that is exactly what he has done the very opposite. He has allowed the inflation figure in Canada be increased month after month because of the inflation figures increasing in the U.S.A.

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the high interest rate, the high inflation rate right now is 11.5 to 12 per cent across Canada. And then suddenly out of the blue, Mr. Speaker, a little while ago there was a decision made in Ottawa which was going to be of great benefit to all Newfoundlanders: They were going out to acquire by means of nationalization, nationalization, a part of the oil and gas industry in Canada. They wanted all Canadians to take part and

MR. MORGAN:

share in a company which they would benefit from by holding shares in, 'A company which would benefit all Canadians,' was the quote from the Prime Minister's office— all Canadians. What were they going to do? They were going to buy, the federal government was going to buy and purchase by means of the taxpayers' dollars a company called Petrofina.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Petro-Canada was going to acquire, a Crown corporation was now going to acquire Petrofina.

So I listened very attentively and I said, 'Now, how is this going to benefit Newfoundland?' I mean, the quote from the Prime Minister was, it would be beneficial to all Canadians, surely he does not recognize us as not Canadians. We are all Canadians, we are all part of Confederation.

MR. THOMS: I do not think you fellows are.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, if one member in this House can stand up and tell me the benefit of the acquisition of Petrofina to any Newfoundlander - I will defy him to do it, or her, because, Mr. Speaker, the fact is that it costs Newfoundlanders four cents a gallon on every gallon of gasoline purchased at the fuel tanks - four cents a gallon to do what, Mr. Speaker, to do what?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: To purchase a company which does not have an outlet, a service station in this Province, has no intention of having a service station outlet in this Province and, therefore, will have no benefit whatsoever to Newfoundlanders. That is an example of the kind of thing Ottawa is doing which is having an effect on the cost of living in this Province.

MR. MORGAN: Now, Mr. Speaker, somebody mentioned, I think it was the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), he very casually mentioned unemployment insurance, we have so many Newfoundlanders unemployed and we agree, all of us, on this side, we have too many unemployed and the ultimate aim of our government is to get down to a point where we will have a very low unemployment rate. But if we have unemployment -

AN HON. MEMBER: When? You have been here ten years now.

MR. MORGAN: - Mr. Speaker, surely we have one conciliation, there is, every year, very good seasonal employment; the fishery is one source, construction, you see, a second source, the forestry a third source, the tourism a fourth source and on we go. There is a source of seasonal employment but what does seasonal employment mean, Mr. Speaker? It means that they have to work a certain number of weeks and qualify to receive unemployment insurance benefits. And what did we see last week, Mr. Speaker, coming from Mr. Axworthy, what did we see? Did we see some improvements to Newfoundland's problems? Did we see something from the new federal Minister of Manpower, Mr. Axworthy?

MR. HICKEY: Axworthy, he has the right name.

MR. MORGAN: He has the right name, He gave us the axe alright, to the point where one of the Liberal members of Parliament, Dave Rooney, stood up and said, 'I cannot support my government if we are going to have these kinds of measures'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MORGAN: And that is the kind of thing that the member for down the St. Barbe Coast should have said in his motion this afternoon - 'he was opposed to these kinds of actions which are having a detrimental effect on the low income people in our Province' -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MORGAN: - because, Mr. Speaker, it means,

MR. MORGAN: now, that if these amendments are passed in the House of Commons - hopefully common sense will prevail, hopefully people like George Baker, whom I have respect for although he is on the opposite side from what we are, people like George Baker, a couple of members from the same caucus

MR. MORGAN: in Nova Scotia and hopefully by the kind of good opposition being provided by good Newfoundlanders like John Crosbie and Jim McGrath, that the federal government will not bring forward these kinds of amendments which are going to adversely effect the low income people of our Province. It is not just those people out there on social assistance, we are talking about hundreds of Newfoundlanders and maybe thousands who are low income earners. There are more than just those people on social assistance. There are those people who go out to work, who have a job as fast as they can take it and work for a period of ten to twelve weeks - ten weeks, eleven weeks. And in some places in the Province they are lucky to get ten weeks of employment, whether it be in a fish plant, whether it be working with a construction company, building a road, whether it be building a forest access road, doing a bit of logging, whatever it may be, Mr. Speaker, they are lucky to get ten weeks. Now, the federal minister in his wisdom, the great man who is going to do things for the poor of the country, is going to bring in regulations and he is going to increase the number of weeks required to qualify for unemployment insurance. He is going to make it now, Mr. Speaker, up to fifteen and possibly twenty for those people in the work force, and higher for those joining the work force for the first time. Is that the kind of thing that is going to help the cost of living in our Province? Is that the kind of thing that is going to help the problem we have with the unemployment? No, Mr. Speaker. No. Why did not the opposition's spokesman, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) talk about these kinds of problems? Now, Mr. Speaker, he talked about welfare. Oh, what a man to talk about welfare. What a man to talk about welfare. I will leave that to my colleague here, the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey), who knows more about the problems of the social assistance people in this Province

MR. MORGAN: than any other minister we have ever had in this administration or before, the most knowledgeable man who can talk about social assistance problems. But he is not going out, he is not going out and making those personal ministerial decisions as we saw made on Bell Island that warranted a magisterial enquiry. He is not doing that, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I only have five minutes left and I want some order from the Opposition. He is not going out interfering with the process. He is not going out there using his authority and deciding this man gets a case of beer and that man gets something else as was the case over on Bell Island.

The fact is he cannot stand this kind of thing. This is fact. The Magisterial Enquiry shows it as fact. Oh, no, Mr. Morgan do not dare bring up those kinds of things because it is back in the past. Let him attack my colleague the Minister of Transportation who recently resigned from his portfolio, let him attack him, let him attack Mr. Dinn and anybody else in this House but do not dare attack him. I am not attacking, Mr. Speaker, I am merely giving the facts and the facts speak for themselves. And what a man to talk about welfare and people on social assistance cannot get this and cannot get that. The hypocrisy of it all, Mr. Speaker. The fact is if he and his colleagues were sincere they would begin with a major problem right now, a major problem

MR. MORGAN: in our Province. I would venture to say that it will be so major in the next six or seven weeks, it is going to warrant the attention of the Prime Minister of the country in personal interference, he is going to have to personally interfere in a problem which is going to come to some kind of a drastic point not dramatically put forward by the Minister of Fisheries here in Newfoundland, not dramatically put forward by George Baker, a Liberal member of Parliament, not dramatically put forward by Dave Rooney, not dramatically put forward by Jim McGrath or John Crosbie as was the case in the House of Commons in the last two days, but by the people themselves, the fishermen; 1,423 fishermen right now, as of the time I speak, are having half of their total earnings that they are earning this year taken from them by Revenue Canada in a very inhumane way of treating Newfoundlanders or any Canadian - inhumane, no feeling for their families, no feeling for what the end result will mean to their families; 1,423 of these families are left with as low as \$9 and \$10 a week to live on - \$9 and \$10 a week to live on with a family of five and six.

MR. HISCOCK: Go across to Labrador.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, these gentlemen can try to push things and twist things all they like but the facts are out there. Mr. LeBlanc can come down and go to the West Coast and go back and say, 'Well, I did not hear from any fishermen about these problems.' The reason why, Mr. Speaker, was he went to Blue Beach to meet the fishermen. He met with one fisherman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: A big meeting he had in Blue Beach.

AN HON. MEMBER: Nonsense.

MR. MORGAN: No, I am not talking nonsense, I am talking facts. He met with a Mr. Dunphy, one fisherman

MR. MORGAN: in Blue Beach on the Port au Port Peninsula. That is the kind of meetings he had when he was here. But, Mr. Speaker, the fact is that if he wanted to talk about problems, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) order, you are.

MR. MORGAN: Was the hon. gentleman a fisherman? Mr. Speaker, the fact is that these problems are going to come to light in very dramatic terms, because it means that these fishermen who want to earn a living from our natural resource -

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

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

MR. HODDER: If the hon. gentleman opposite is speaking for the record and to the people of this Province, he has the obligation to tell the truth. He has that obligation when he speaks. Now, what the Minister of Fisheries just said about the meeting at Blue Beach was not correct and I would ask the minister to clarify and to correct his remarks, please.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

That is not a point of order. The hon. member will have ample time to address himself to it.

MR. MORGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that these people I am talking about, if the Opposition wants to bring forward a resolution to talk about the problems of those people who are on low incomes, having difficulty in making ends meet, there are 1,423 of them right now

MR. MORGAN: who could use the attention of every single member of this House, because if they do not get some attention from somebody - I had to wire the Prime Minister last Thursday, and it was not just I who was wiring him, it was 1,423 fishermen who were wiring him asking for help, asking Ottawa to stop the kinds of tactics being carried out by Revenue Canada in the inhumane treatment of these fishermen, inhumane to their families. They are not opposed to paying taxes, they want to pay taxes, but they want to pay them in a reasonable fashion, not to end up with \$9 and \$10 a week to maintain their families on. These are the kinds of problems, Mr. Speaker.

Unfortunately, my time is up. I could go on for another hour or so on this topic and other topics. But the fact is that if the Opposition wants to be genuine, let them bring forward a resolution which can be of benefit to us all. Let us put the blame where the blame should be laid, in the lap of a federal government in Ottawa which is insensitive towards the needs of the people of our Province.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

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

The Capes.

MR. HANCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to make a few brief remarks on this resolution so ably presented by my colleague and good friend from St. Barbe (Mr. Bennett). I would also like to deal with some of the comments made by my hon. friend the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan).

MR. THOMS: What? Your friend?

MR. HANCOCK: Yes, he is a good friend.

Mr. Speaker, I sit here and listen and there are a lot of things that go on in this Province that are the responsibility of both the provincial and the federal governments. And I think it is about time, to make life a little better for the people of this Province, it is about time that the two of them start co-operating, getting together more often and forget this confrontation attitude that has been developed over the last number of years, or the last number of months, and to try and have some serious talks and try to look after the basic needs of the people of this Province as is put forth in this resolution. When we talk about the high cost of living in this Province and the unbearable circumstances that some people - and there are people in this Province, Mr. Speaker, before I go any further, who are literally starving to death. I have them in my district, Mr. Speaker, on social services, who are literally starving to death.

I spoke to a woman this morning who just cannot make it, she has to look for a job. She has a three or four-year-old child home - she does not have a babysitter - but she cannot afford to stay home and support that child because she is just not making enough money.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries, a few seconds ago, spoke about the eighteen cents that Mr. Crosbie imposed on a gallon of

MR. HANCOCK: gasoline. I would like to point out to the minister, Mr. Speaker - and I travelled my district during that campaign - that the Liberals at no time, or in no way, shape or form said that gasoline would not rise. What they did say at that time, the federal Liberals in Ottawa, was they would not impose immediately an 18 per cent tax on gasoline to get revenue for - an excise tax on gasoline to get revenue for the Canadian government. They said they would not impose an 18 cent tax. They never said first or last, Mr. Speaker, that gasoline would not increase. They never said that. Mr. Crosbie was going to impose an automatic 18 cent excise tax on gasoline. Along with the tax that this Province is now imposing, it is unbearable on the people of this Province and it is driving the cost of living so high that the people of this Province are starving to death.

On one hand you have the - and I would like to know if the government support the Prime Minister or not, Mr. Speaker. On one hand we have the Prime Minister of this country trying to regulate the price of gasoline in this Province so that it will not put an unbelievable burden on the people of this Province, and here you have Mr. Lougheed on the other hand who seems to be in bed with Mr. Peckford, or vice-versa, trying to raise the price of gasoline to world levels, or 75 per cent of world levels. I wonder what side the government now in power in this Province comes down on, whether it be on Mr. Lougheed's side or on the side of the Prime Minister who is trying to regulate and control and keep the price of gasoline down so we are not putting an unbearable burden on the people of this Province?

We talk about social services and what people are living on. There is a 10 per cent increase on this now, which was passed yesterday in

MR. HANCOCK: the budget, but just
imagine one child and two adults trying to live on
\$345 a month, Mr. Speaker. It works out to \$3.50 a
day, Mr. Speaker, \$3.50 a day per person. And that is
not very much to live on. It is alarming to look at
the result as you go down. The larger the family the
less the person has to live on. With four children and
two adults in the family they receive \$4.16 a month and

MR. HANCOCK: that averages out to \$2.30 per day per person. Mr. Speaker, there is nobody in this House of Assembly who could imagine trying to feed a family on \$2.30 a day. There is nobody, Mr. Speaker. I could not do it with mine.

AN HON. MEMBER: A lot of it is poor management.

MR. HANCOCK: Maybe so but I think that -

AN HON. MEMBER: A lot of it is poor management.

MR. HANCOCK: Well, I agree with the member, but they are so depressed and in such a depressed state that is the only relief they can get is to either hit alcohol or hit drugs. That is the only relief they have in sight.

But, Mr. Speaker, go down to a family of nine. Seven children and two adults, \$513.00 a month, \$1.90 per person per day -

AN HON. MEMBER: Plus the Family Allowance.

MR. HANCOCK: Plus the Family Allowance, that is true, that is right. It may bring it up to \$2.20 a day per person, per child, Mr. Speaker, which is not a heck of a lot, Mr. Speaker.

I would also like to get back, Mr. Speaker - and you talk about the cost of living going up in this Province. If everybody - and I, in principle, like my hon. friend said a couple of days ago about the local preference policy, it is great to have a local preference policy but it is another thing to go advertise a local preference policy from one end of the country to the other, Mr. Speaker, I cannot imagine what would happen to the unemployment rate in this Province and how the cost of living would go, Mr. Speaker, if the Government of Ontario or the Government of Alberta came in with a local preference policy. I cannot imagine, Mr. Speaker,

MR. HANCOCK:

And I can assure hon. members of this House, Mr. Speaker, if something is not done within the next two weeks you are going to see fishermen in my riding taking guns, shooting those whales and you will have every Greenpeace movement in Canada and the United States down here witnessing what is going on, Mr. Speaker. And once again we will be painted as being barbarians.

I am encouraging this type of thing to happen because that is the only way we are going to get any action, Mr. Speaker. I have a meeting next week with the fishermen in my district, pertaining to the whale situation as it is today, and I am going to encourage those people to take guns and dynamite or whatever in their boats to try and destroy those whales so we will get some attention, Mr. Speaker. There are people out there now who cannot feed their families because of whales, the damage that has occurred last year, the year before and this year, and still no sign of a compensation programme in sight.

So, I think, Mr. Speaker, it is ridiculous. And I am going to see to it, before this week is over, that Mr. LeBlanc lives up to his commitment that he made to the people a year ago, when he said there would be a compensation programme this year.

MR. MORGAN:

(Inaudible) wire the Prime Minister to have him (inaudible).

MR. HANCOCK: I am continuously warning him, Mr. Speaker, but it seems to be of no avail. I do not know what happens to the telegrams once they leave Newfoundland, whether they get lost between here and Ottawa.

MR. MORGAN: Romeo, where art thou?

MR. HANCOCK: But, Mr. Speaker, it is about time-

MR. TULK: We all know where Jim Morgan is.

MR. HANCOCK: - that this problem was dealt with in a serious manner, Mr. Speaker. It is about time the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) took it seriously and tried to come up with a cost shared programme, if necessary, between the provincial and federal government. If not, why in the heck do we need a Provincial Department of Fisheries to begin with?

MR. HANCOCK: It may be the minister better wait on Ottawa. It is driving the cost of living up in my area, Mr. Speaker, that whale damage. There are people out there now who had their trap moved the day before yesterday about 200 feet down the shore by one whale, Mr. Speaker. Those monsters are about 20 to 30 ton, they just take the trap like it was a little skiff and go on with it. There is no stopping them, Mr. Speaker. But they will be stopped this Summer. I got an awful feeling that we are going to be painted as barbarians, especially in the district which I represent, this Summer and I hope the heck it happens tomorrow,

But, Mr. Speaker, the cost of living in this Province is the highest in Canada. It is unbearable to the people who are trying to live on fixed incomes.

MR. HANCOCK: There is no way, I think the hon. Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) will have to agree with me, there is no way he can expect people in this day and age, a family of nine, to live on \$513 a month. It is just not possible. You have to heat your home, you have to clothe your children, you have to send your children to school, you have to try and give them the nutrition that is going to keep them alive, and it is just not possible, Mr. Speaker, for people to feed their families.

And with those few remarks I would like to support the resolution and call upon the government, Mr. Speaker, to try and take some measures -

AN HON. MEMBER: What about Ottawa?

MR. HANCOCK: - both levels of government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HANCOCK: It is about time, both levels of government, Mr. Speaker - when it comes to the people of this Province, if one government is at fault and the other one is not, I will come down on the side of the government who is at fault. But I think in this resolution here both levels of government have a responsibility, the provincial government as well as the federal government, to look after and try to keep the cost of living in this Province down to what it should be and at an acceptable level, Mr. Speaker. That is about all I have to say. There are other members over here who want to speak and I am sure there are members on the other side.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

June 24, 1981

Tape 2765

PK - 3

MR. HICKEY:

Mr. Speaker, first of all I am somewhat surprised that the hon. gentleman brought in a resolution such as this. I would like to just quickly go through it. It says, "WHEREAS the high cost of living in this Province has placed an unbearable burden on those who are dependent on government assistance;

MR. HICKEY:

AND WHEREAS we profess to live in a society based on equal rights and opportunity for all; BE IT RESOLVED that this House urge the government to take measures to make adequate provisions for those for whom society is responsible."

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a very motherhood kind of resolution, if one took it in a very general term. But what would we be supporting, Your Honour, if we on this side were to support this resolution? The question arises, what would we be supporting? The answer to that question is, we do not know because the resolution does not say. It just says, to make provisions, to take measures. To take what measures? What kinds of measures is the hon. gentleman talking about?

In the middle of his speech he indicated that nobody over here knows what is going on in the Province.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Quite true.

MR. HICKEY:

I can assure my hon. friend that is not so. I can assure him that I know very much what is going on in my department and what is going on with regard to families and how families are having difficulties in making ends meet. And nobody on this side will stand in their place and deny that the high cost of living today,

MR. HICKEY:

double digit inflation today, aims to having an effect on the families in this Province. Well, I did not hear the hon. gentleman say who was responsible for that. Is he telling this House, Mr. Speaker, that this Assembly, this government, is responsible for inflation and the high cost of living? If we are, what have we done to bring about the high cost of living?

MR. HISCOCK: Mount Scio House.

MR. HICKEY: Blarney! You know, the hon. gentleman can come up with all those fancy things he wants to. Mr. Speaker, the fact remains that inflation -

MR. HISCOCK: Linerboard, Come by Chance.

MR. HICKEY: - why does the hon. gentleman not keep his mouth shut now, he will have a chance to say what he wants to say and get all his nice little digs in later? - the fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that inflation is a problem of the Western world, not just Newfoundland, not just this country but the entire Western world. But the hon. gentleman would like to blame that on this government too.

MR. HISCOCK: Tell about the fisheries (inaudible).

MR. HICKEY: Let me say to my hon. friend from St. Barbe (Mr. Bennett), Mr. Speaker, that, number one, his resolution would have some meaning if it, in the first instance, called on the federal government of this country to take some measures and, having won that battle, then to call on this government to follow suit. Well, if the hon. gentleman now will follow my trend of thought, he just might agree with me. Because, Mr. Speaker, in the first instance the initiative has to be taken by the federal government. Monies paid out to social assistance recipients happen to be under a cost-sharing formula with the federal government. Mr. Speaker, at a time when we need more money from the federal government in the social sector,

MR. HICKEY: what is the federal government saying? They are saying, Mr. Speaker, that they want to cut the social sector. Mr. MacEachen, the federal Finance Minister, informed his colleagues in the social envelope that they must bring about a trimming of the budget in the social sector. The hon. gentleman would be more appropriately - it would be more appropriate for him, I should say, if he were to appeal to his colleague in Ottawa to back off from those cuts which might well enable this Province and other provinces and territories across this country to do more for those people who need help instead of facing a possible cut, a real possibility of a cut in the social sector. Or, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman might well, instead of coming here with a resolution which asks this government to take measures, have addressed himself to the question of the whole income security system in Canada - and I will give him a couple of figures which might set him thinking - the total bill of which is \$20.166 billion, two-thirds of which goes into the pockets of the non-poor. Two-thirds, Mr. Speaker, of all the money spent in the social sector across this country finds its way into pockets of the people who are not termed to be poor by the standards of living in this country. If the hon. gentleman in Ottawa wants to do some cutting, he might start cutting in the right places instead of attempting to cut and instead of attempting to balance his budget and correct his balance of

MR. HICKEY: payments and the national debt on the backs of the poor across this country and in this Province.

MR. BENNETT: Would the hon. gentleman comment on some of our remarks on the resolution, just as I asked?

MR. HICKEY: Does the hon. gentleman want to ask a question?

MR. BENNETT: I was wondering if you would respond to our remarks on this resolution, some of the things which you have control over such as cutting back, once a recipient here gets a CPP increase from Ottawa, things of that nature. I wish the minister would talk on those things.

MR. HICKEY: It is not unusual, Mr. Speaker, for the hon. gentleman to want me to confine myself to my own little shop and the things over which I have control -

MR. BENNETT: They are provincial matters not federal matters.

MR. HICKEY: because that is convenient for the hon. gentleman to ask me that. He does not want me to say anything about the federal Liberals. He does not want me to say anything about his position which is unknown to this House and the position of the Opposition on the offshore. They have had three or four different positions. When this government articulates its position and say, 'We own the offshore and we must have control of the offshore to create employment', when this government says, 'We want shared jurisdiction of the fishery so that my colleague can create more jobs', when this government says, 'We want to develop the Lower Churchill and all the other hydro resources to create jobs', what is the position of the hon. gentleman? I do not know, I will have to check with my colleagues. Yesterday it was this, tomorrow it might be something else. I have not really made up my mind. So no wonder he would want me to confine myself in the provincial sector over which

MR. HICKEY: I have control and not say anything about the federal government. Well, I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to accede to the hon. gentleman's request. He dug the hole for himself when he brought in this resolution and I feel sorry for him.

Mr. Speaker, what has this government done? And, Mr. Speaker, I will not go back, although I am greatly tempted, to when I was Minister of Social Services in 1972, I am going to resist that temptation. I will not make any pronouncements on what I found or what was there or what I caused to happen or anything of that nature. That is the past, we will bury it. But, Mr. Speaker, what has this government done during the current fiscal year for the poor of this Province?

MR. THOMS: (Inaudible).

MR. HICKEY: Does the hon. gentleman want to rise in his place and oppose the 10 per cent. I challenge any of you over there.

MR. HANCOCK: Oh! (Inaudible).

MR. HICKEY: Well, then, if you do not oppose it, gentlemen, agree with it. But you cannot make up your minds on that anymore than you can on the offshore. Anything, Mr. Speaker, for political expediency. It has been the history of the Liberal Party, Mr. Speaker, political expediency even on the backs of the poor. I saw it when I was a civil servant. The more people you can get on welfare the better you like it.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is not so now.

MR. HICKEY: That is so. I saw it on the Cape Shore, my dear man, when I worked there. I saw that when I saw a Liberal Cabinet Minister get up and say, 'You know what side your bread it buttered on, and you will know how to vote, and you know that if you do not vote the right way you are not going to have that bread'. That was

MR. HICKEY: a Liberal Cabinet Minister.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame! Shame! Shame!

MR. HICKEY: And I sat in the audience and I heard it. And, Mr. Speaker, if there was ever any doubt in my mind to enter the field of politics then I made up my mind that night to help stamp that out.

MR. HANCOCK: That was before my time.

MR. HICKEY: I know it was. I am not saying the hon. gentleman is responsible for it. But, Mr. Speaker, let me get on to more interesting things, let me tell hon. gentlemen in case they do not know, what this administration has done this year, just this year.

The budget in my department, Mr. Speaker, is \$143 million. A 10 per cent increase in social assistance rate, a 15 per cent increase in foster home rate and regular child welfare allowances, a 20 per cent increase in clothing

MR. T. HICKEY:

allowances for foster children, \$90.00 per month allowances for preschool children, which we did not have before. An additional \$1.8 million, Mr. Speaker, swelling the budget to \$4.2 million, in employment opportunities to help create jobs for people on social assistance, a 10 per cent increase to licensed boarding home rates effective July 1st, and a 10 per cent increase in clothing and personal care allowances for residents of homes for special care. Now, Mr. Speaker, is that all there is to those people whom the hon. gentleman from St. Barbe (Mr. Bennett), in his resolution, is referring? And the answer, Mr. Speaker, is no that is not all, there is more. To those people the hon. gentleman refers to who are starving to death - and I challenge, Mr. Speaker, any member of this House to produce one case where there is anyone in this Province starving to death. I have issued that challenge before and I issue it again today. That is a no no. That is not so. In addition to all of the things that I have just read, Mr. Speaker, there is provision for emergency assistance, there is provision for \$50.00 additional assistance on top of regular rates, there is provision in my budget for special needs, where there are needs over and above the ordinary, and where there are needs in terms that would be considered to be special. And, Mr. Speaker, there is no level as such on this area of special needs, it depends on the case, it depends on the merits of that case, and it depends on the circumstances in the home, over and above the \$50.00 and over and above the regular rates. So, Mr. Speaker, you know, it is not right to say that there is a system here of social services that do not zero in on the people in need. Every single programme that is in my department is developed in such a way that it zeros in on need, every single programme in terms of money that we pass out is based on the merits of each case and based on need. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not standing here today, and I do not guess I ever will, and say that the amount that

MR. T. HICKEY: we give, putting it all together, is to replace income, is to be more attractive than employment, gainful employment. What kind of a system would we have if we had that? That would only discourage people, You know, what reward would there be for working if, in fact, it was to be something like that? But, Mr. Speaker, I have not and I will not deny that people are finding it difficult to make both ends meet, Of course they are. And as long as inflation is rampant, as long as it continues to increase, so will they find difficulty and so will they experience difficulty in making both ends meet. Now, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) made some reference to abuse and I just want to briefly comment on it. I accept his remarks in the spirit in which, I assume, he offered them. And I was not here, I did not hear the exact words, I just got sort of the tail end of it. I assume that he concludes that some of my people are heavy-handed in terms of investigating cases.

MR. NEARY: Private investigators (inaudible)

MR. T. HICKEY: Not private investigators, a branch of my staff which are called investigators, I mean, they are not private investigators called in.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible)

MR. T. HICKEY: Yes. We have a number of investigators throughout the Province.

MR. NEARY: Who are they?

MR. T. HICKEY: That is their job.

MR. NEARY: Who are they? Are they ex-police?

MR. HICKEY: No, no, no. They are more social work oriented than anything else.

MR. NEARY: Well, identify them. I do not mean names (inaudible) their qualifications.

MR. HICKEY: There qualification? There is no qualification based on like an ex-policeman or anything of that nature. There might be one or two. The qualification is that

June 24, 1981

Tape No. 2768

RA - 3

MR. T. HICKEY: of Grade XI education and based on
a certain background that they have

MR. HICKEY: in terms of positions that they have held. And very high on the agenda of screening those people, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that they have tact and understanding and compassion - very much. Well, Mr. Speaker, let me make a few remarks with regard to it. Those people have a job to do and they are given a mandate to do it and the mandate is this: that where there is rip-off, where there is abuse of the program, that is to be found out and dealt with and, Mr. Speaker, I do not make any apology for that. I am answerable for every single dollar that is in my budget and in my department and I am answerable to the Auditor General; I am answerable under the Financial Administration Act; I am accountable for every single cent that is spent by my department. And, Mr. Speaker, as long as there is money going into pockets where there is not eligibility for that money to go into those pockets, then something has to be done and we are doing it. It is not so, Mr. Speaker, that people investigating will go in and just make assumptions and cut people off allowances. In fact, I have seen too many cases of recent times where my staff bent over backwards before they cut people off allowances, where every benefit is afforded a client and there is no prejudging done.

Mr. Speaker, I guess the important thing out of all of this, in terms of this resolution, is the fact that there has to be a more flexible system at the federal level before a Province of this kind, a government which has the problems that we have in terms of revenues, limited revenues, are able to deal with the issues that the hon. gentleman refers to.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, we on this side support the term 'just society' but we are not the architect of that term. The architect of the just society is Pierre Elliot Trudeau -

MR. POWER: The architect?

MR. HICKEY: Yes, the architect.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order.

MR. POWER: I would hate to go into a house he built.

MR. HISCOCK: (Inaudible) and his oil.

MR. HICKEY: The hon. gentleman opposite - again it would be more appropriate for him to appeal to a Prime Minister who must at some time or other have had some compassion in order to coin that term just society and appeal to him to slacken off and loosen up a little bit on his federal funds to make them available to this Province and other provinces. And I can assure the hon. gentleman that every program the federal government will offer this Province or make available to this Province on a fifty-fifty basis, this government will match it every step of the way and do something for the poor of this Province.

MR. HISCOCK: (Inaudible) careful there.

MR. HICKEY: I am careful. The hon. gentleman does not have to worry about my being careful.

MR. HISCOCK: (Inaudible) reception.

MR. HICKEY: The hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, does not know what he is talking about when he is talking about anyone in my department not accepting any program on a fifty-fifty basis.

MR. HISCOCK: Talking about your department.

MR. HICKEY: I am talking about my department, that is what this resolution deals with. It does not deal with any other department, it deals with mine.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the hon. gentleman might have meant well. He might have been well motivated when he put together his resolution but you will have to agree that his resolution really says nothing because it does not spell out, does not spell out what he would like to see done -

MR. BENNETT: I told you (inaudible).

MR. HICKEY: Yes, yes, he told me. Now, the only thing he told me, Mr. Speaker, in his remarks was that somebody could not get enough land to go farming and the hon. gentleman knows that is so. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, you know, it is impossible for me to support this resolution. I would like to. I would like to support anything which would help the poor of this Province but, certainly, it is impossible for anyone on this side to support that. The hon. gentleman should really take his case to the federal government and we will co-operate with them and maybe we will solve some problems.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, with regard to supporting this resolution, with regard to the cost of living we would assume that here we have the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador and here we are celebrating our birthday. Four hundred and eighty-four years ago Cabot discovered this Island, this Province of ours and after those 484 years, Mr. Speaker, of trying to eke out a living and existence in this Province and now with only thirty-something years joining the Nation of Canada, you would think that we, as a provincial people and citizens of our own Province, that we do not have any control over our own rights. I am also surprised, Mr. Speaker, that it being the 484th. anniversary of our creation, of the discovery of this Province and our people, that the Premier himself and that the government itself has not had its troops come into the House of Assembly and not have its guards throughout all the Province with regard to our nationalism, our provincial nationalism. I am somewhat disappointed in the Premier that he has not risen to the occasion to use the 484th anniversary of asking all the citizens of this Province, the true Newfoundlanders, to get behind him and the Conservative Party and march on the Government of Ottawa and make sure that Newfoundland, after 484 years, finally gets its rights as equal Canadians, not as Newfoundlanders now but equal Canadians, that somehow or another when we joined we were not equal and we are not equal and we never will be equal until the national government carries out the will of this provincial government.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am a little bit rather surprised in that and I propose as a dedication to this regime and this Province and my commitment—because the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) has stated many, many times, asking people on this side, to stand up and be counted as Newfoundlanders and that. So in that regard

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, I take great pride in draping myself with the provincial flag of this Province, wrapping myself in it and saying to the people of this Province, I am ready to go forward and fight battle on behalf of our people and go and fight Ottawa and ask for our equal rights, Mr. Speaker, because if we cannot get them -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT): Order, please!

MR. HISCOCK: - and only, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I ask the hon. member for Eagle River to remove the flag.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, I do not think -

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I ask the hon. member to remove the flag.

MR. NEARY: When you are burying somebody you usually drape them in the flag.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, with regard to the parliamentary rules I think it says that draping anything over your desk, but as for anything saying that - I am only showing my patriotism, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HISCOCK: - as a true Newfoundlander -

MR. SPEAKER: Order! Order!

MR. HISCOCK: - fighting for equal rights in this Canada, that is what I am doing.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I ask the hon. member for one final time to remove it.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the Chair, but I am rather surprised as a true Newfoundlander not

MR. HISCOCK: being able to do that. I
am rather, rather surprised, rather surprised.

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT): Order, please!

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

A point of order, the hon.

Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman
is so patriotic to Newfoundland we will arrange in the
Department of Fisheries, in conjunction with the Department
of Tourism, to make him a skirt made of the provincial
flag and present it to him next week sometime.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

That is not a point of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

That is not a point of order.

MR. THOMS: I wish we could make something to go over
the hon. Minister of Fisheries mouth.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I ask the hon. member for

Eagle River to continue. He has about fifteen minutes
left.

MR. HISCOCK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, in draping
myself, as I said, I am surprised that after 484 years or
our existence that here you have the Premier of the Province,
and in our Province, rising and saying that we are not equal
Canadians and that we will only have it - so I would say,

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, if it means draping yourself in a flag, if it means putting on a skirt of the Department of Tourism and Fisheries and Rural Development, I will wear anything that will convince this administration that we are and that I am an equal Canadian in this Country.

MR. MORGAN: Go and take it off now.

MR. HISCOCK: And, Mr. Speaker, with regard to this resolution if we are a Province and a country, we could even call ourselves a country up to thirty years ago, after the thirty years of Confederation surely did we relegate all our authority to the National Government? Do we not have control over the Department of Consumer Affairs? In bringing in this resolution, Mr. Speaker, with the high cost of living, what has the Premier done? He did away with the Department of Consumer Affairs. Is this anything to do with the federal department? The federal department added to their Department of Consumer Affairs and what have we seen? We have seen the oil companies taken to court, we have seen the national newspapers change monopoly. But what have we seen this government do? We have seen them do away with the Department of Consumer Affairs. We have seen, also, in this Province, Mr. Speaker, the price of oil and gas indexed, indexed 22 per cent. It has nothing to do with the federal government. In actual fact, the federal government subsidizes Atlantic Canada by \$3 billion, and wants to keep a dual price system for Canada because they believe that is what Canada is, that we should have an equal resource. But, Mr. Speaker, what do we see our government here with jurisdiction over?

MR. THOMS: A full moon (inaudible).

MR. HISCOCK: No, Mr. Speaker, we have seen it indexed the cost of fuel and gas, and also ask for world prices. Is that a government that is concerned about the cost of living? Is that a government? No, Mr. Speaker, they are not concerned with the cost of living.

And here we have Coastal Labrador in my region, and other regions of Newfoundland and Labrador. Those who are on hydro power have to provide more cost, more cost of fuel because the more they consume on diesel the higher the rate. And with regard to that, Mr. Speaker, what have we seen? Are they going to do away with the indexing on the price of oil and gas? No, Mr. Speaker, they are not.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. HISCOCK: Another point - Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) to give me the same courtesy that he ask that I give him, but I know -

MR. SPEAKER (Butt); Order, please!

MR. HISCOCK: - it is rather difficult for him to do that.

MR. NEARY: He is continuously breaking the rules of the House. Continuously.

MR. HISCOCK: But, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey), he said that any cost sharing programme on a 50/50 basis he will accept. The Minister of Social Services forgot to point out that any increase that is given by the department in Ottawa with regard to the Canada Pension Plan - any increase in the Canada Pension Plan that is passed on to the recipients of social assistance on a cost-shared basis, do they get that?

MR. NEARY: No, it is taken away.

MR. HISCOCK: No, they do not.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. HISCOCK: It is taken away from them. And the amount of money that is indexed, by the way, the federal government has indexed to the cost of living for old age pension and also with regard to Canada Pension, any increase with the cost of inflation, is this passed on to the recipients in this Province? No, it is not, Mr. Speaker. And I would say to this government, if this government is concerned about the social well-being of our own people, that they will not have to come in each year and give us a 10 per cent increase, they will index, Mr. Speaker, the cost of living, to those people on social assistance tied to the rate of inflation.

MR. NEARY: What Ottawa giveth the Provincial Government taketh away.

MR. HISCOCK: If they can index the 22 per cent on oil and gas to this Province, then they can also index, Mr. Speaker, the cost of inflation to the people in this Province who need it the most.

But with regard to another point, when Mr. Crosbie ended up getting elected the first time, he was asked if he would give forty dollars to senior citizens? He said, no, he would not do that. That would put \$600 debt on the Treasury of the nation. Well, Mr. Crosbie got elected, and did he do it? No, he did not. Within nine months they were out of office and Trudeau was back again, and they did give the forty dollar increase. And again what did the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) do? Did he pass that forty dollars on?

MR. THOMS: No, no way.

MR. HISCOCK: No, he only gave them five dollars and the other thirty-five dollars went into the general revenue and the coffers of this Province. That is the type of government that we have, Mr. Speaker.

MR. THOMS: Shame, shame!

MR. HISCOCK: And now you have Flora MacDonald and Mr. Crosbie in Ottawa saying - and I do not know, maybe the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) knows best - that they are eating, now, dog food in this country. But when Mr. Crosbie had something to do about it, no, he would not give it to us because it would give us \$600 debt. So if you talk about hypocrisy, as the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) mentioned, I hope that he takes notice of that point that I raised.

MR. NEARY: What Ottawa giveth the Province taketh away.

MR. HISCOCK: The cost of living in this Province - I would like to see this government give a free dental plan to all students in the schools of the Province, all the students not only up to age twelve, and also free milk, Mr. Speaker. When we talk about nutrition in our schools -

MR. NEARY: Give them mother's milk.

MR. HISCOCK: - the number of students who come to school without breakfast and the only food that they get during dinnertime is probably a tin of pop and a bag

MR. E. HISCOCK: probably a tin of pop and a bag of chips and a bar and then a lot of them have to go home and, because of the income, end up getting Kraft dinner. No wonder, Mr. Speaker, we have so much sickness among our young people, and contagious diseases today. It is because of the nutrition. If the government was concerned about that they would bring in these two measures.

But with regard to an issue that I would like to bring up where the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) wanted to know what Petrofina had to do with how our Province -

MR. MORGAN: One or two service stations in Newfoundland, in Labrador.

MR. E. HISCOCK: Petro-Canada ended up taking over Come by Chance and \$90 million now being spent in Labrador. We do not have a Petrofina-Lab. But as Newfoundland Hydro was saying, they need their rate increase now so they can be prudent in the international bond markets. I would assume by the purchase of Petrofina it would make them a more prudently sound corporation so that when they need to buy Gulf or Esso or Texaco or Ultramar, then they will be in a better economic position to do it. So I would say to the Minister of Fisheries keep an eye on Petro-Canada within the next four or five years. And if the Minister of Fisheries do not want the \$90 million spent off Labrador, and do not want them to take over Come by Chance, then he should be against their purchase of Petrofina. I am sure that he is against any involvement by government.

But with regard to the high unemployment insurance in this Province and the federal government deciding to probably raise the rates, I have also written on this matter as it is a matter of concern of mine. But, again, when Mr. Crosbie was there, the great liberator of Newfoundland, the great man of justice - when he was in office

MR. E. HISCOCK: in Ottawa he was going to do away with all the Canada Works Projects. Ask the people in Salvage, ask the people in Bonavista and Little Catalina and Port Union and all the other places in his district how the people -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. E. HISCOCK: And here is a minister who was a former chairman of one of the M.P.'s delegation committees in picking them. So with regard to the cost of living we cannot as a Province put over all our responsibilities on to the government. I do compliment the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) in saying, 'It is a world problem, the high rate of inflation'. But by listening to the Minister of Fisheries you would only think that its is a federal - Canadian responsibility.

But I would like to see our own government take leadership in the roles that they do have. After 484 years, surely, is this the product of our existence? Is this what I am looking at, the leaders who stepped into the great shoes of Bond, Whiteway, Smallwood and Moores? Is this what we have, Mr. Speaker? Is this the leadership, you know, after 484 years of trying to eke out an existence? Is this the leadership? Is this the leadership that we got? Have we now evolved to a state that we do not need to take any more responsibility for our own provincial rights? Is that what Bond did? Is that what Little did?

MR. S. NEARY: Coaker.

MR. E. HISCOCK: Is that what Coaker did? Is that what -

MR. S. NEARY: Squires.

MR. E. HISCOCK: - Squires and Whiteway did? Is that what they all did, threw up their arms and blamed it on the economic conditions of the world climate? Did they, Mr. Speaker? And, Mr. Smallwood? Did they do that, Mr. Speaker?

MR. E. HISCOCK: No, they did not! They accepted the responsibility and the challenge at the time and they made sure that Newfoundland and Labrador got was due to them.

But with regard to that, Mr. Speaker, what have we done? We have now thrown up our delegation and said, 'It is all Ottawa! It is all Ottawa!' Surely, Mr. Speaker, we need more leadership after 484 years of existence. And the propoganda that is coming out of this administration -

MR. S. NEARY: Hitlerism.

MR. E. HISCOCK: As I said, when draping myself and then pledging allegiance, I was rather surprised that we did not have the youth corps, or that we did not have all the ministers saying the same thing and clicking their heels and saying, 'heil'. But, no, Mr. Speaker, we did not have it. So I am a little bit disappointed in the Premier in that way, that he did not rise to the occasion to use this day as an emotional outlet and say to all Newfoundlanders, 'Get on the Trans-Canada and let us march to Ottawa'.

So with regard to that, Mr. Speaker, when a person receives unemployment insurance in Newfoundland, Bonavista, I would assume he is receiving the same rate as the person in Vancouver. The person who is receiving medicare in Port au Port, I would assume is receiving the same medicare as Northern Alberta. The person who is receiving Canada Pension Plan, I would assume that he is receiving it. But, again,

MR. HISCOCK: if you really talk about the cost of living, any jurisdiction that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) has, and he is concerned about the welfare of the people in Labrador, what is he going to do about reinstating now the bounties that - because of the mix-up of the Fisheries Loan Board, Mr. Speaker, there are men and people in that area going through great hardships because they built their boats and did not hear from the minister's department, six or seven months, Mr. Speaker. If he is concerned about the welfare of the people there he will make sure that the Cabinet will approve the guaranteed loan for the Labrador Ship Union Company. So with the minister blowing off all the time and talking about all the things -

MR. NEARY: Like a beluga.

MR. HISCOCK: - that Ottawa should do -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order.

MR. HISCOCK: I only hope that the Minister of Fisheries will be responsible for his own area. And in bringing in this resolution we are saying to the government, 'Stand up and be proud Newfoundlanders and Labradorians. Stand up after 484 years and do not shuck off your responsibilities and assail Ottawa. Have some backbone, have some valour, that the people of this Province - let Coaker and let Whiteaway and all the other people that have gone before us have some pride in, that we did not let their spirits go.' But no, Mr. Speaker, we are throwing everything up and we are blaming it on Ottawa and them. As I said, I am sure Coaker and Whiteway and all the other - Bond - and all the other great leaders, who have gone before us, are turning over in their graves at the part that they have to throw over their delegation to Ottawa.

MR. HISCOCK: In concluding, Mr. Speaker, I hope we have boosted this government to bring in some areas of helping the poor and the low income people -

MR. HANCOCK: (Inaudible).

MR. HISCOCK: - and in concluding, Mr. Speaker, if I asked the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) -

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please! The hon. member wishes to be heard in silence.

MR. HISCOCK: - to go down for another (inaudible) that after twenty-three years of existence, after twenty-three years, Mr. Speaker, almost 400 - not twenty-three years but 460-something years - after all the creation of Newfoundland and Labrador, all the leaders we had, we had a debt of \$750 million. And now, after only ten years, only ten years of the Conservative administration, of Mr. Peckford and Mr. Moores and group, we have a debt of \$3.5 billion. And I would ask if this is what Bond is proud of, is Whiteaway proud of this, is Coaker proud of this, is the Minister of Health (Mr. House) proud of this, that after 484 years we have quadrupled our debt in ten years? I tell you, I am proud to be a fighting Newfoundlander, and I wish that the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) and other people and get up and say that they are all so proud of the state they have us in.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I am prompted to say a few words. I always thought that I would see the day when the Liberals embraced the flag but I did not expect to see the day when the flag embraced the Liberals, as we saw just now, and I guess that was one of the basic reasons I had to get up and say that.

MR. HANCOCK: You would want a dory sail to get around the minister.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to - thank you, it is all right, it has cost me a lot to get this way and I want to keep it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I have enough energy to suit my purpose and I do not want any quips from the hon. member who is not so full of energy that he is out running around all day.

Anyway, I just want to say a few words about this and I want to refer to the particular resolution because we have the member for the Strait of - for St. Barbe - I should not make that mistake, I should not make that mistake.

MR. MORGAN: He is a good member, the member from Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts), he is a good member.

MR. HOUSE: We have him there putting a resolution forth that his colleague ridiculed people about, his colleague from Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms), ridiculed people about making a resolution that urges, and this is one of the famous urging resolutions where the member is urging the government to give more -

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) have to do.

MR. HOUSE: - social assistance to people and more help. Anyway that is a little bit of a quick rapport that always comes back and forth this way.

MR. HANCOCK: You could not resist it could you?

MR. HOUSE: I could not resist that, no.

The other fact of the matter is, that we are talking about how poor people are on social assistance and, obviously, that is the whole purpose. Because people are poor we give them social assistance but

June 24, 1981

Tape No. 2773

GS - 4

MR. HOUSE: you will recall during the House
of Assembly debates and arguments some time ago, when we
were having petitions come in from the people who were on
strike, and we were up arguing and saying how well off,
pretty well, the people on social assistance were, and that
some could

MR. HOUSE: make more on social assistance than they were getting for working. And so when it is to the advantage of the other side, they talk about how good our social assistance programme is and when it is not of course, to the advantage, they talk about how poor it is.

And the other thing we have to bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, is when we are talking about \$345 a month, people with \$345 a month, two in family, there is another fifty dollars a month coming in in Family Allowance. There are free drugs. Social assistance people, not only do they get free drugs they get things over the counter that pass as drugs such as certain kinds of shampoo. And I use that as an example, a lot of things across the counter.

MR. THOMS: What kind of shampoo do you use?

MR. HOUSE: I do not use much. I have a special brand called Easy Off. So, you know, there are a lot of things that you have to bear in mind, that there is a lot of support that these people get that you are not counting. Then, of course, in addition to that there is the tax credit they get at the end of the year.

MR. HANCOCK: What about their heat and light and their phone bill and their oil bill?

MR. HOUSE: Well, I say, everybody else has these costs too, there is no question about that. But again in Social Services, as the minister said, there is a case to be made for special needs and there is money for that. And that is done and is well used. And that is the reason why you have to have people going around, social workers, investigating. And I take exception, of course, to the people who say that it is wrong to have these people investigated. Because there have been rip-offs that have to be investigated. And we found out that there are a lot of people who have been getting assistance who should

MR. HOUSE: not have gotten it, they did not qualify and some of them are - so I would not take any offence to that happening. We know what happened in Ontario, it became a game for people. Families split up deliberately and one of them got welfare and it was just organized between the two parties. So you have to bear all that in mind. And what may seem to be something that is criminal and might be rough on persons, is something that we have just got to go through. And I do not care which government would be in power, you would have to do that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I was mentioning just now - and I want to get back to some of the things that this government has done to help those people in need. We have got cases in this Province today, medical cases where people are not on welfare but they need special help and they get it. You know you do not have to be - I was talking to a man this morning who would not go on welfare.

MR. HANCOCK: (Inaudible).

MR. HOUSE: It is the same kind of case. But because he needed a prosthesis, of course, they just came back and assisted him with that. It was not that he was on welfare it was just a special case.

MR. HANCOCK: A lot of people will not go to - once you mention taking social services you turn them right off.

MR. HOUSE: Right.

MR. HANCOCK: They have too much pride.

MR. HOUSE: Well, a lot of people have been advised from my department that there is special help that they can get in the cases of hardship. And you mentioned one to me yesterday - the member for St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. Hancock) mentioned one yesterday.

MR. HOUSE: So, these kinds of things have been brought in by this government. Now, you talk about the free drugs, that is a tremendous programme. That is an amount of money that the social services, all social services people get, particularly the long-term.

Now, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) mentioned today about the other programme, the programme for senior citizens and talked about the rip-off, as he deemed it to be. The actual fact is that we this year in our drugs - the cost of drugs to the government this year for senior citizens has been six dollars per prescription. In other words, if we had not had that programme in it would have cost each senior citizen who was getting the GIS supplement, some form of it, six dollars per prescription more on an average. The dispensing fee is four dollars. So they are getting six dollars out of ten paid for the average prescription. Would anybody say that that is not a good positive programme? And the people that it does assist most are those people who are on, of course, the high cost drugs. Because you can have a drug that costs you twenty-five dollars and you still only have to pay the four dollar fee.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there was some reference made, too, to the children's dental programme. We have added to that programme, added to thirteen years of age, and I have no doubt about it, as finances and everything permit, it will be made, perhaps, a little higher in subsequent years. The fact is, though, for people who are on social welfare, their children up to sixteen years of age or to the age they go working, take advantage

MR. W. HOUSE:

of the free drug programme.

Now, some of the other things, you know, we talk about what this government has done to help the needy. You can go back - it has not been bad, it has been an excellent programme. Even a few years ago, when they talked about the high cost of taxes, you know, the 11 per cent sales tax, we have to bear in mind that everything under that tax was implemented. It went from 9 per cent to 11 per cent, I think in one jump. But what we looked at there was the fact that there are certain things that people need, basic needs, heat, there was no tax on heating oil; they took it off wood stoves; there is no tax on food; there is no tax on clothing. And these are the kinds of things that, of course, people on social services have to buy and senior citizens. So the structure has favoured these. So there has been a lot of work done, Mr. Speaker, by this particular government.

Reference was made to the mothers' allowance. Of course, that was - the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Bennett) made reference to that, this government took it away. That was not an allowance, that was a political ploy, giving everybody so much money. You know, it was a political ploy. It is a lot better to divert the money we have to where it is needed. It is a lot better to have a fund for special circumstances, like we have in the Department of Social Services now, a fund to help people who are in need not a fund -

MR. T. BENNETT:

Could I ask a question?

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

Order, please!

MR. W. HOUSE:

- to give everybody so that it would be politically good.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. minister permits a question?

MR. W. HOUSE: Are you asking me a question on the Social Services Department?

MR. T. BENNETT: Well, I would like to ask the minister if that \$200 mothers' allowance can be recognized as a political ploy what would the \$1.5 million be down in the explosion at Flower's Cove? Is that not a political ploy?

MR. W. HOUSE: Now, I do not know. No, Mr. Speaker, that was not a political ploy. That was something that was done in all sincerity and I am sure that that will be used - or a lot of that will be used in the future.

The fact is the mothers' allowance was going out to everybody. It was a political ploy and there is nobody who can say it was not. It was a misuse, in my estimation, of public funds.

MR. T. BENNETT: It was a good one.

MR. W. HOUSE: Now, Mr. Speaker, some of the other things our government has done. The ambulance services - this does not only help - this helps everybody. Persons are not prevented from getting any kind of medical treatment by reason of lack of funds and you can see the tremendously improved ambulance service that we have put in place in the last three or four years. The latest part of that was this year when, for emergencies and stretcher cases, we now only charge a flat fee of \$50 anywhere in the Province. Before we had people coming in from Labrador, costing as much as \$2,500, buying three seats on the plane, and return if the person had to go back on a stretcher. These are some of the kinds of programmes that we have put in place, Mr. Speaker, to help the poor people.

Now, as the member for Bonavista South, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) just mentioned, you know, you have to recognize the fact that inflation is the thing that is hurting the poor. And everybody is saying

MR. W. HOUSE: by virtue of inflation the poorer are getting poorer and the onus, obviously, has got to be on the federal government to curb that inflation. It cannot be on the Province.

MR. S. NEARY: Who charges the 22 per cent on gas?

MR. W. HOUSE: Well, that is the other thing, Mr. Speaker, despite what the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hancock) said, that the federal government-in the last election, the Liberals said they would not go as high as 18 cents a gallon. What have they gone? Thirty-seven cents, is it not?

MR. POWER: 37 cents a gallon.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W. HOUSE: 37 cents. They would not go as high as 18 cents!

MR. D. HANCOCK: (Inaudible) 18 cents excise tax on a gallon of gasoline (inaudible) no way. Gas would go up but it would not go up 18 cents (inaudible).

MR. W. HOUSE: Well, they are gone up now to 37 cents in a matter of-what? - a year and a half.

MR. D. HANCOCK: (Inaudible).

MR. W. HOUSE: That has a lot to do with it too, Mr. Speaker, about the cost of the provincial debt, you know, it quadrupled or three times what it was.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, if you look at the Department of Health's budget that is about six times what it was ten or fifteen years ago and this is a natural thing. But we are paying off to date everything that was done. You take credit for

MR. HOUSE: the Health Sciences Complex, that is being paid off now. That had to be borrowed by this government and the interest did not stop -

MR. BENNETT: Did the minister (inaudible)?

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order!

MR. HOUSE: - and the payments did not stop when this government got elected. We are still paying it. And, of course, we will have to continue.

And they talked so much about the roads, and they say, oh we have not done any roads. We have had to rebuild the roads.

MR. BENNETT: Mr. Minister, (inaudible) a lot Health Sciences Complex.

MR. HOUSE: Roads like those, Mr. Speaker, right now up the Northwest Coast, which they took great pride in, they had to be completely rebuilt in the last eight or nine years.

So what this government was adding to the Provincial debt has been redoing a lot of the work that was purported to have been done before.

So if you look back at the record, Mr. Speaker, look at the health benefits, look at the benefits that are given to people on social services, I think we have done tremendously well. And that is the mandate of this government, of course, to help the needy and, of course, we will be doing that in every successive budget.

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Thank you very much -

MR. NEARY: Give it to her, boy!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: Do not take up too much time now.

MR. NEARY: With that applause you are going to make a good speech.

MR. THOMS: I left the House for a few minutes, Mr. Speaker, there to do an interview with a member of the press, I came back and she was certainly in an uproar with my friend for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) with himself wrapped in the flag.

MR. NEARY: We thought he was getting buried because you wrap people in a flag when you are burying them.

MR. THOMS: Maybe it is the hot weather outside or the full moon or something, getting to members of the House of Assembly.

MR. HISCOCK: (Inaudible) nationalism.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, we are discussing here this Wednesday and next Wednesday -

AN HON. MEMBER: Do you want to put the flag on?

MR. THOMS: - a resolution introduced by my friend for St. Barbe (Mr. Bennett) dealing with people who cannot fend for themselves, dealing with the handicapped, dealing with those on social assistance, dealing with those who receive the unemployment insurance payments in this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have had three ministers from the administration get up and speak in this debate. I do not know what is wrong with the backbenchers in this government, but when it comes to anybody debating - what did we have - we had the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) and the Minister of Health (Mr. House). We have had nobody yet from the back benches speaking on this very important topic.

MR. F. B. ROWE: And it is a Private Member's resolution.

MR. THOMS: But, Mr. Speaker, - and it is a Private Member's resolution.

MR. THOMS: It is not a minister's bill coming in the House, it is a Private Member's resolution. Well, Mr. Speaker, let the record show, let the record show that the only reason this very important Private Member's resolution dealing with the people in this Province who cannot fend for themselves, let the record show that the only reason there is anybody speaking on the other side of this House on this very important resolution is because the next resolution to come up is that which is going to be introduced by the member for Harbour Main-Bell Island (Mr. Doyle), and he was not prepared to debate his resolution in the House of Assembly this afternoon so a very hurried conference had to be called and they had to decide that they would have to get some speakers up on the other side of the House because we might let it go through and embarrass the member for Harbour Main-Bell Island who was not prepared to go along with the resolution.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is not true.

MR. THOMS: That is the only reason that we have members on the opposite side of this House getting up and speaking on this very important resolution this afternoon.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. THOMS: Well, how shameful, Mr. Speaker, how shameful. Here we have a resolution dealing with the people in this Province that this House should be talking about. Mr. Speaker, it is time that we got off oil and gas in this House of Assembly. It is time that the Premier of this Province and the Minister of Mines (Mr. Barry) and this administration decided that they were elected for something other than talking about the potential of oil and gas off the coast of this Province. It is about time they realized they were elected for some other purpose in this Assembly than to confront day in and day out

MR. L. THOMS:

week in and week out, month in and month out with Ottawa. It is about time that they realized that they were elected for something else. This resolution, Mr. Speaker, brings this very important subject up in the House of Assembly and is to be debated this Wednesday and next Wednesday. But, Mr. Speaker, the reason why they did not want to talk on this subject, and I guess it is one of the reasons why I am a Liberal instead of a Tory, is because they know nothing about ordinary people. Ordinary people is not their bag.

MR. CALLAN: Right on target.

MR. L. THOMS: It is not their bag. They do not care about the ordinary people of this Province. All they are concerned about, all they are concerned about—and try the cocktail circle in this city and you will see more — If you want to see a Cabinet minister, if you want to see a Cabinet minister go down to the Captains Table down at the Hotel where the offshore resources people are putting on fabulous meals, fabulous feasts the best of everything, the best of liquors.

MR. HISCOCK: (Inaudible)

MR. L. THOMS: There is no trouble seeing the Cabinet ministers then. But they are not interested in what this resolution is all about. They are not interested in the ordinary, everyday people of this Province. So, what happens? Things are going bad in Newfoundland. Do not let anybody mistake that. Things are not going well in Newfoundland with this administration. And it is an old trick, it is a very old trick that when things are going bad at home you focus your attention abroad. In this case this administration focuses its attention on the federal government, it focuses its attention on Ottawa. You can pick up the paper day after day after day after day ad nauseam and you can see the mug of the member for Bonavista South, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan). And is he really about the fisheries -

MR. CALLAN: No, no.

MR. L. THOMS: Is he really talking about the fisheries? No, Mr. Speaker, he is not talking about the fisheries, he is talking about the Minister of Fisheries, the federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Romeo LeBlanc). So what do we get? We have the Minister of Fisheries for the Province (Mr. Morgan) forever - I think fed bashing is the word for it. And what do we get? And then, finally the Minister of Fisheries for Ottawa has got to come back and what he says is the Minister of Fisheries in Newfoundland is a liar, he is a liar. Now, he may or he may not be right. But, Mr. Speaker, we heard the Minister of Fisheries here this afternoon talk about a meeting that the hon. Mr. Rompkey attended at Blue Beach and he said there was one fisherman turned up at the meeting, one fisherman. He was challenged by my friend the House Leader (Mr. Hodder) but did he make any correction? No, he would not get up and admit that he was wrong. But, there were forty or fifty fishermen, at a bad time of the day, who attended that meeting in Blue Beach. But, no, the Minister of Fisheries gets up and says ' There was one fisherman, Mr. Speaker, ha, ha, ha!'. There was one fisherman who turned up to meet with the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Rompkey)!. That is incorrect, it is incorrect. Mr. Speaker.

MR. HANCOCK: (Inaudible)

MR. L. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I doubt if there is a fisherman in this Province that is only making \$18.00 and \$20.00 a week. But that is what the Minister of Fisheries told us this afternoon. He said that because of the audit on the fishermen in this Province, because of the audit on the fishermen in this Province, that the take-home pay of some of the fishermen who were audited is \$9.00 and \$10.00 a week. Now, the attachment by the National Revenue is 50 per cent, therefore, it logically follows, if I know my mathematics at all, that \$9.00 is 50 per cent of \$18.00, that \$10.00 is 50 per cent of \$20.00. Therefore, all they are making is \$18.00 and \$20.00 a week,

MR. THOMS: a deliberate attempt to mislead and to bring inaccuracies and to lead the people of this Province astray as far as the federal audit on fishermen is concerned. But, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) is famous for this sort of thing, of throwing little innuendos and making statements -

MR. CARTER: Are you calling him a liar?

MR. THOMS: No, I certainly would not compliment him by calling him a liar, I would not do that. Mr. Speaker, he is famous for doing this sort of thing and he has got to be brought to task. And the people of Newfoundland have got to realize that, thank God, Ottawa have got control of the fisheries in this Province. Because we have an incompetent Minister of Fisheries, totally, absolutely incompetent Minister of Fisheries.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Liberal Tabloid, the Liberal Tabloid.

MR. THOMS: The Liberal Tabloid, Well maybe we can get the Torygram to do a little different editorial. Maybe we can get the Torygram.

MR. CARTER: Holy Moses!

AN HON. MEMBER: Even the Minister of Fisheries does not think that is too good.

MR. THOMS: But, thank goodness, Mr. Speaker, that the fisheries in this Province is controlled by Ottawa. Thank goodness we do have a very competent federal Minister of Fisheries, extremely competent Minister of Fisheries, one well liked by the fishermen in this Province. I can assure the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Power) of this, that Mr. LeBlanc is welcome in the district of Grand Bank, welcome. But if the Minister of Fisheries goes down there he might need bodyguards. Either that or he will need a lesson in swimming, because they are likely to throw him over the head of the wharf.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) immediately when he spoke, as all other ministers in this administration - I do not know what the backbenchers think in this House, I do not know what they have to say, because apart from the garbage and rubbish and asinine statements that come out of the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter), we do not hear from anybody else. When was the last time the member for Kilbride (Mr. Aylward) spoke in this House? When was the last time the member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Stewart) spoke in the House? When was the last time the member for Exploits (Mr. Twomey) spoke in the House?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. THOMS: I do not know, I have nothing to judge on what the hon. member might or might not say.

MR. HISCOCK: What about the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), does he have the right to speak?

MR. THOMS: Yes you do, you have the same - the precedent in this House is that one speaker from this side, one speaker from that side. So what do we get? We get three Cabinet Ministers in a row standing up talking about this resolution but nobody from the other side. So the Minister of Fisheries, the Minister of Health (Mr. House) - I did not hear the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) - the first thing they say is put the blame where it belongs, put the blame on Ottawa. Of course, if this administration wants us to aid and abet them in taking the pressure off within the Province then, of course, we would attack Ottawa. That is exactly what we would do. But they are in trouble at home. The Tories in this Province are in trouble. I doubt if you would win

MR. THOMS: a dozen seats if you were to call an election today. So what happens?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, this is what they have to go - this is their record, this is their record, this is their record - what they have to go to the people with. After making a commitment - and the people on social assistance, people on unemployment insurance, they have to pay the 22 per cent retail sales tax on gasoline in this Province, the retail sales tax on gasoline in this Province after the commitment from the Premier that there would be no increase in the retail sales taxes. No increases! No, he creates a new one, he creates another retail sales tax of 22 per cent and puts that on. But can we blame Ottawa for that? Can we blame Ottawa? Of course not. Can we blame Ottawa about the taxes that have been levied on vehicle permits, on drivers' permits in this Province?

MR. CARTER: Sure we can (inaudible).

MR. THOMS: Oh, I am sure the Tories can because the blame goes anywhere but on the shoulders of the member from St. John's North (Mr. Carter), anywhere but on his shoulders. But can we blame Ottawa for the increase in motor vehicle licences in this Province? Can we blame Ottawa for the fact that Crown land applications in this Province have gone from \$1 to \$110? Can we blame Ottawa? Was it Mr. MacEachen who came down here and put a fee on people applying for Crown land in this Province? Was it Mr. MacEachen.

MR. CARTER: Yes.

MR. THOMS: I am sure you would like the people of Newfoundland to believe that because it would be another Tory lie, and this is one thing the Tories are famous for, is spreading Tory lies. You are good at

MR. THOMS: it, you are good at it. I have to give you credit, you are really good at it.

Mr. Speaker, the conveyancing fees in this Province are going to be increased before this House closes. There is a bill on the Order Paper now increasing the conveyancing fees. We already have the highest conveyancing fees in Canada and we are going to increase them again. Can we blame that on Ottawa? Did somebody come down from Ottawa and speak to 'Little Alfie' and say, 'Boy, you have got to increase your conveyancing fees.. We want to make sure that you continue to have the highest conveyancing fees in Canada.'

MS. VERGE: (Inaudible) registration charges (inaudible).

MR. THOMS: The registration charges, the registration fees, yes, the highest in Canada. Now, did somebody from Ottawa come down and order the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) to raise the conveyancing fees in this Province, which are already the highest in Canada?

MR. CARTER: Yes.

MR. THOMS: Did they do that? Somebody did that.

MR. CARTER: Yes.

MR. THOMS: Yes, and that is what you would like the people of this Province to believe. Mr. Speaker, if I am not mistaken, last year when I bought a family salmon licence in this Province I paid \$7.50. This year for the same licence I am paying \$15.00 -

AN HON. MEMBER: \$10.00, it is not worth it.

MR. THOMS: - \$15.00, Sir - I am sorry I -

AN HON. MEMBER: Well, tell us anyway.

MR. THOMS: I am talking - come down to the car and I will show it to you. I paid \$15.00 for a family licence to go fishing in Newfoundland, a Newfoundlander

MR. THOMS: going fishing in Newfoundland.
You will pay \$15.00. Now, Mr. Speaker, tell me did somebody
in Ottawa come down and say to the Minister of Finance
(Dr. Collins), 'Your sports salmon fishing licences are
too low?' Did he come down here and say, 'Your salmon
fishing licences are too low? Double them, double them.'

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. THOMS: 'Bring them up from \$7.50 to \$15.00'.
I am just getting -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. THOMS: - wound up, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I do apologize but it is six o'clock
and if the hon. member would adjourn the debate.

MR. THOMS: I move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: It being six o'clock this House
stands adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, at three o'clock.