

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD:  
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.  
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 11, 1981

March 11, 1981

Tape No. 275

RA - 1

The House met at 3:00 p.m

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

The hon. member for Torngat  
Mountains.

MR. G. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege. Yesterday I asked the Premier a question concerning the Old Cabot Highway from Little Harbour East to Southern Harbour and the Premier came back half an hour later with an answer saying that as of 9 o'clock yesterday morning that road was reopened and the people in the community were notified, according to Hansard. I would like to advise the hon. House as of this morning that road is still closed and either you said wrong information but at least the people in Little Harbour do consider this road still closed as of 9 o'clock this morning.

MR. NEARY: Misleading the House. Shame!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I believe it is fair to say that the hon. member does not have a prima facie case of privilege. If anything, he may be dissatisfied with an answer and if so there is a procedure that he may follow in that particular instance.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS.

The hon Minister of Development.

MR. N. WINDSOR: I would like to take this opportunity by way of a Ministerial Statement to read to the House for information at the table a texex that has been sent to the Department of Development from Sir Robert Dick, who was the project manager for Melville Shipping Limited, the prime contractors responsible for the voyage of the M.V.Arctic into Lake Melville, and I quote: " The M.V.Arctic entered the Labrador Sea ice pack

MR. N. WINDSOR: on Feb. 25, 1981 and was escorted by CCGS Franklin into Lake Melville. After a one day delay at the entrance to the lake, the Arctic proceeded with the demonstration run to Epinette Point/North West River and with a series of ship performance tests. The ship reached Epinette Point at mid-afternoon of the third day (March 1) of transit in the Lake and after overnight stops in the vicinity of Etagnlet and Julia Points en route to Epinett Point several tests were conducted, including four series of level ice speed/power and two series of ship noise tests. At Epinett Point a series of turning tests were conducted and the ship proceeded back up the broken track to stop overnight at Julia Point. The following day, March 2, the Arctic proceeded to a prearranged point on the Etagnlet Ridge and conducted a ridge ramming test and level ice ramming tests. The final series of manoeuvring and broken channel tests were conducted on the third of March. The test party left the Arctic on the evening of March third leaving some personnel and equipment on board. The ship then left the Lake on Wednesday March 4 and proceeded to the deviation point and off charter. The ice conditions in the Lake were affected by the mild weather over the previous few weeks. Thicknesses were around 0.8 to 1.2 meters (greater than normal), ice strength was slightly less and the roughness or rumbling was less than last year. The demonstration run to the area of North West River was a complete success as were all of the tests in the test programme. The programme has answered many questions but has opened some new lines of thought which can be pursued by a similar programme next year." And that is signed R.A. Dick. As I said, he is the project manager for Melville Shipping Company Limited

MR. N. WINDSOR: Just a couple of additional comments, Mr. Speaker, a note that the Arctic when she was running, not in ridges, was operating at one to three knots, which was quite satisfactory, and indicates that these types of ice reinforced cargo vessels can operate under those ice conditions. And as I mentioned in the statement, the telex mentions that ice was about three feet thick. The Arctic itself was designed for thicknesses probably up to two feet, so she was probably operating in slightly over her designed capacity, nevertheless operated quite satisfactorily without any problems at all. I visited the vessel on Sunday two weeks ago and spent the morning there with the captain and the project manager and some of the scientists and looked at some of the results of their tests. And in speaking with the captain he was quite pleasantly surprised at the performance of the vessel. He had no fear, neither did the shipowners at all for the safety of the vessel or anything of that nature. She was operating extremely well. And they were quite pleased with the results of the test.

I think it proves, Mr. Speaker, quite conclusively that Lake Melville can indeed be kept open as a year-round shipping port, if not for twelve months of the year, certainly eleven months of the year. And I think the voyage of the Arctic was certainly an historic occasion. I would like to add as well that although the icebreaker Franklin was there and escorted the ship, she at no time had to assist her in any way. She followed, in fact, behind the M.V. Arctic and indeed left the ice field thirty-six hours ahead of the M.V. Arctic.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Simms):

The hon. member for Torngat

Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would say

this is probably an opening for navigation year-round probably in Lake Melville, into Happy Valley/Goose Bay And I hope with these indications that the government can see fit to bring some stabilized industry into the area.

However, I want to point out a couple of things. And number one is that we must realize that last Winter when the icebreaker Franklin , and this year when the motor vessel Arctic went into Lake Melville, it was two of the least severe Winters for the last fifteen Winters. So these two past two Winters are the least severe, and the thickness of the ice in the Lake in the last two Winters has not been near as great as it was in the 1950s and the early 1960s. So if there is any indication that our weather is going to be less severe from now on, I would think probably Lake Melville will be open up. But there is a concern that we could have very severe Winters in the future, and the motor vessel Arctic, which is only capable of probably two or three feet, there may be some trouble. So I do not want to see expectations rise too high by the people in Lake Melville area and Happy Valley/Goose Bay because there could be Winters that they will not be navigation open.

MR. SPEAKER: Further statements?

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the hon. the Premier, Sir, and it has to do with a matter that we raised last Fall and it has been raised on a number of occasions since by Mobil Oil. As hon. members know, as the Financial Post said recently, Hibernia will probably bring the energy war to a head. Would the hon. gentleman indicate if Mobil have yet presented their production plans either to the provincial government or to the federal government? And if so, would the hon. gentleman tell the House when these plans have been presented or when they will be presented?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Energy (Mr. Barry) could answer that question in a lot more detail than I can. Just let me say that while Hibernia is important, we consider the fishery of this Province to be perhaps more important, not only in the short-term but for sure in the long-term and we would appreciate receiving a lot more questions on the fishery than has been the Opposition's want in the last couple of weeks.

Secondly, the process by which oil companies offshore present their various proposals to government is outlined in our regulations and therefore there has to be a development plan submitted and public hearings held on various aspects of it. Of course, that development plan has not been submitted to date. Further information on that particular matter can be given by the Minister of Energy.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I realize the fishery is a very important matter in this Province, probably our most basic industry, but this government have not seen fit to pay very much attention to it. All they can think about is oil and gas. I would like to ask the hon. the Premier if in the event that the federal government receives Mobil's detailed plans for production and the federal government approves their plans for production, can they then go ahead and start producing oil, hauling the oil away from the well head without any reference? If this Province does not approve the production plans, can they start producing oil under a federal permit and ignore the Province altogether? That is the point I am getting at.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Two points, Mr. Speaker.

I wrote the Leader of the Opposition, the Leader of the Liberal Party in December about the fishery of Newfoundland and I am still waiting for an answer, so we will see who, in fact, has the most interest of the fishermen of this Province at heart.

Secondly, of course not.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, this government is so interested in the fishery that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) was invited down to Burnt Islands on Monday for the opening of the fish plant but he did not see fit to attend.

MR. MORGAN: Too busy in St. John's.

MR. NEARY: Yes, busy in St. John's, alright. That is how interested they are in the fishery.

March 11, 1981

Tape 277

EC - 3

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, obviously to the hon. gentleman it is a very touchy subject, he does not intend to give me a very satisfactory answer, But in the



MR. S. NEARY:

process of this controversy that has arisen of whether or not Mobil is going to take one government or the other to court to have the court make a declaratory decision on which set of regulations Mobil will have to follow, in the process of that Mr. Ed Barrow, I think it was, Vice President of Exploration and Production for Mobil in Calgary, stated last week that oil would be fed to a floating storage facility on site with tankers taking it to whatever Canadian refinery needs crude. That means that there will be no pipeline. What Mobil is saying is there will be no pipeline coming into shore to bring the oil in. What does the hon. gentleman have to say about that? Can they do that? Can they load the oil, take it away under a federal permit even though the Province may object? How do we protect our rights, if we indeed have any rights to protect, with statements like this flying around?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: This is the whole reason, Mr. Speaker, and I am very glad that the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has asked the question, because it gives the government an opportunity to again reiterate its oft quoted position on offshore resources.

First let me say, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and all the ministers on the frontbench here and all the members of this House respect this Legislature and this House as being the Legislature and the Parliament of Newfoundland and Labrador, and therefore every time that they have an invitation to go somewhere in the Province it always must be in the context of whether the Legislature is open or not. And we respect this Chamber and respect this institution and therefore any time we are asked to go other places it must

PREMIER PECKFORD: . always be in the context that this is the people's House and our first obligation is to this particular institution while it is open.

Secondly, let me say directly on the question that the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) poses, let it be understood clearly by the member for LaPoile and all members of this hon. House and to the people of the Province generally that this is the whole reason why this government takes the position that unless ownership and control are vested in the Province the same way as if this oil and gas was above the salt water, these kinds of questions will continue to be posed. And therefore moving from the premise that we own and control the oil and gas on the Continental shelf in the same way as we own and control the iron ore, the lead and zinc or the trees that are above salt water, if we move from that premise then the Province of Newfoundland does have the right and power to decide how and when and in what manner oil and gas will be developed on the continental shelf.

MR. NEARY: Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): I indicated a final supplementary.  
Does the hon. member for Windsor -

Buchans wish to yield?

MR. FLIGHT: I will yield, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the first part of the answer to my question, it is time for the hon. the Premier to get his priorities straightened out, because while he would not let the Minister of Fisheries (J. Morgan) attend the opening of the fish plant, the Minister of Tourism (N. Windsor), I think it is, attended the opening of a winter carnival in Port aux Basques the same night.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I believe the Chair should intervene at this point. It seems that there has been a bit of a debate about something not to do with the question at all, and I think it is fair to say this is Question Period and maybe the hon. member should put his question.

MR. NEARY: Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but used the government aircraft the next morning -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - to bring him back to St. John's from the opening of a winter carnival. That is how they get their priorities straight. But what I want to ask the hon. gentleman is if he could be a little more specific in this matter of Mobil taking one government or both governments to court. In the event that this happens, I mean, how do we then protect our rights? Do we send out the Norma and Gladys and the water bombers to protect our rights? If we have any rights, how then are we going to cope with the situation? If Ottawa accepts the production plans and tells Mobil to go ahead and start producing oil, take it away in tankers to feed the oil refineries on the

MR. NEARY: Eastern Seaboard of the United States and Canada; then how do we cope with it then? What happens after that? Would the hon. gentleman just give me some idea because I am afraid that we are headed on a disaster course and I want to find out for my own satisfaction how we deal with that kind of situation. How do we protect our rights then?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, that is a hypothetical question and given that we have to protect some rights that the Opposition has not made clear, I think the first thing that should be done is for this hon. House to be on side, every member of this legislative assembly representing all the people of Newfoundland to be on side, that we have the ownership and the control of those resources the same way as we do with trees.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Let the oil companies know everywhere in this world that every single person who represents a district in this legislative assembly, that they are all of the same mind, that this Province owns and controls the oil and gas on the Continental Shelf in the same way as if those resources were on land and above salt water. That is the first way to prevent any of those kinds of hypothetical things from happening. That is the first way.

Secondly, let me inform the hon. member, if he does not know, the House of Assembly does not open in the night time.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary to the Premier. A month ago, Mr. Dorry Little, I think, President of Mobil indicated that they may look at taking - going to the

MR. FLIGHT: courts, asking the court for a decision to settle the ownership issue, either federal or provincial and that brought strong reaction from the Premier. But Mr. Dorry indicated that if they took that action - Mr. Little indicated that if they did indeed take that action it would be sooner and not later. Now, that is a month ago. Is the Premier aware of what Mobil's position is at this point in time with regards to seeking a reference from the court and determining who owns the ownership, federal or provincial, or the jurisdiction?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, we are in contact with the oil companies on a regular basis, the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) is, the Petroleum Directorate and so on. We have heard of Mr. Little's comments before and we are aware of them. There is nothing new to report from what Mr. Little had said previously.

MR. G. FLIGHT: But what is his present position? Is he going to the courts?

PREMIER PECKFORD: I have not called him in the last hour or so, but the present position is, one, that they are abiding by the provincial regulations and they are proceeding with their exploration programmes as they have all along and that is their present position as I understand it.

MR. G. FLIGHT: And are they going to court?

PREMIER PECKFORD: They have not indicated to the provincial government, Mr. Speaker, that they are going to move to court or anything like that? We are still talking to them and they take certain views on certain ways to explore and develop the offshore and we take certain other views as to how they want to explore and develop the offshore. We meet with them from time to time. We met with them several weeks ago. I met with them in New York in December. We will be meeting with them again in the next few days and we will talk, just the same as we meet with IOC and talk to them about their plans and we meet with most of the companies around the Province.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Are you ready to meet them in court with a reference?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Burin -  
Placentia West.

MR. D. HOLLETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) pertaining to his statement yesterday. It goes on to read, 'Provided that the cost of the project'- referring to the proposed St. John's synchrolift-after tender evaluation is within the economic limit set by CN in the Province'. I would like to ask the minister what is the maximum cost that would be acceptable to CN and the Province for this project?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, we have been given a number of times projections as to the cost by the CN Dockyard and those projections have amounted to about \$21.5 million. Now at one time it was a bit greater than that. And the size of the project was reviewed and certain not totally essential aspects to it were eliminated and it brought the projection down to that value. This \$21.5 million has been deemed or at least decided by CN to make the thing economically viable.

MR. D. HOLLETT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. D. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, we assume that \$21.5 million is a maximum acceptable cost.

Another question I would like to ask the minister in the way of clarification. That is referring to the \$6.5 million grant - I should re-phrase that. It is not a grant, it is a loan; it is a loan until such time as it makes a profit and if it is not a profit, of course, then it is a grant. But also I view with some alarm the statement that we will pay interest

March 11, 1981

Tape No. 280

DW - 3

MR. D. HOLLETT:

referring to the Province during  
construction. Is this unqualified



MR. HOLLETT:

or are there qualifiers to paying interest during construction? And I assume, Mr. Minister, it is on the total cost during construction.

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, to make sure that this is understood, the CN Dock will now be putting funds into this. The original arrangement that they tried to put in place with the federal government was that the federal government, the Department of Public Works, or whatever that department in the federal government is called, would actually construct the dock and CN would buy the dock back or would lease back, would guarantee repayment of something like 65 per cent of the overall cost.

Now, they attempted for three-plus years to get the federal government to see this in the light that the whole project would be a viable venture - and CN's projection is that it would be. Despite their greatest of efforts they could not get the federal government to come across on those terms.

The terms that we have put in place with CN is where CN itself would put in a sizeable amount of money towards the capital construction, we would match that - or not match it, but we would add to that \$6.5 million by way of a loan which would be repayable out of profits, and at the same time we would ensure that the interest costs to CN would be no greater than they would have faced under the proposal that they first put to the federal government. We will therefore face a maximum expenditure in terms of interest costs of something like \$3 million to \$3.5 million.

DR. COLLINS: Now I think it is necessary to put that into perspective. We are facing an expenditure of \$3 million to \$3.5 million for interest costs for the CN Dock which will ensure the continuation of something like 300 jobs down there, will ensure an additional 150 to 200 jobs there, heavy industrial worker type of jobs, which are very important to the economy not only of the St. John's area but, indeed, to the whole Province. Now, I think you would have to put that against the expenditures that government has incurred to date in terms of the Marystown Shipyard. I am not quite sure of the work force down there, but I think it is something of the order of - what? - 400 to 500 jobs, something in that range.

The cost incurred by government to date to ensure that number of workers, which is comparable to the number of workers we are talking about at the CN Dock, has been of the order of \$30 million to \$35 million, and that is not including certain guarantees that government had to put in place. So the government expenditure, the provincial government expenditure being faced down at the CN Dock is miniscule compared to what the government has had to face in terms of Marystown. It has faced this because it is its responsibility to ensure, to the extent it can, that there is employment and employment of this very desirable nature in the Province, because there are very good spin-offs from that type of employment, spin-offs that benefit not only the fishing industry but other aspects of the industrial base of this Province.

We had to face these for Marystown, and we consider that the risks and the expenditures we are facing at the CN Dock compare very, very favourably. We also

DR. COLLINS: understand, of course, that there will be certain revenues coming to government from the activity at the C.N. dock in terms of retail sales tax, in terms of personal income tax, in terms of corporate income tax. So not even all that \$3.5 million will be out-of-pocket.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. HOLLETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to assure the minister and all present that at no time have I or anybody in Marystown said other than that we agree that there should be a synchrolift in St. John's, providing that the ones at St. John's and Marystown are both viable. I am sure at a later point we can debate that one. But the minister did not answer my question. I asked in relation to the provincial government paying all interest during construction; it concerns me as a legislator, Mr. Speaker, because if that be so, it means that C.N. will not put a nickel into the proposed synchrolift until after the first day of operation, as I read it. And also I ask the minister if there are any provisos in that in relation to the delay in construction through work stoppages, through accidents and otherwise? There could be a very prolonged construction period. And the minister said to me that the interest referred to is the subsidy paid by the Province to the largest, or one of the largest corporations of Canada to stabilize it at 11 per cent. But is the interest being paid, totally paid by the Province from the day that construction starts until the day it is operational and is this over and above the subsidy on the interest?

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

DR. COLLINS: No, Mr. Speaker, the C.N. will be

DR. COLLINS: putting in its share of costs during construction. In other words, there will be a draw down of provincial monies and there will be a draw down of C.N. monies. The C.N. will, indeed, be putting in monies during the construction.

In terms of interest during construction, that will be borne by the Province, but the interest on the monies that C.N. will procure, borrow, or whatever, and will amortize over-how many years? - twenty years, perhaps, in their case, that interest will be borne by C.N. itself, although we will ensure that those interest costs will not be above 11 per cent. Now, we may have to subsidize the interest rate, the future will tell that. Perhaps interest rates will come down below 11 per cent in future years and we will not have to subsidize. If they remain above 11 per cent, that is, the interest rate on long-term borrowings of C.N. holdings remain above 11 per cent, well, we would have to subsidize.

With regard the Province subsidizing a large corporation, I would like to point out that C.N. dock has itself to be a viable operation. That is the structure of the C.N. operations, that each division has to be a viable operation. That was a decision reached by the federal government in 1978. We did not reach that decision. The federal government said to C.N., 'Your various divisions, including C.N. dock, have to make their own way.' So this is not our doing, this is the federal government's doing.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Simms): The hon. member for St. Mary's-  
The Capes.

MR. HANCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), Mr. Speaker. As we all know there are some strange regulations in his department and the federal department, Well this is a federal regulation whereas a man building a boat cannot qualify for a subsidy or a bounty on that boat unless he puts a new motor in that boat, and I think it is unfair. I would not mind an old motor, Mr. Speaker, but he cannot even qualify for a bounty if he puts a rebuilt motor with a warranty in that boat. I wonder if the minister has any complaints about this? And if he has, could he tell us whether he is going to take it up with the minister in Ottawa?

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

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, it is not in order to ask questions - surely there are matters of concerns that are the responsibility of this ministry. But I refer you to Beausheane where it says that you are not allowed to ask questions - questions are out of order which deal with an action of a minister for which he is not responsible to Parliament or with matters not within his official knowledge, or raise matters under control of local authorities not responsible to the government or the legislature.

Now I do not know if the hon. minister wishes to answer the question, but the fact of the matter is the question is out of order, Mr. Speaker, and-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: I think our Question Period could be very profitably consumed by asking questions of ministers about matters for which they are responsible.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

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

MR. HODDER: If what the House Leader is saying - that would mean that we cannot speak on federal matters in this House, Mr. Speaker, that we cannot present, which has been the practice in the past, petitions aimed at a federal petition which have been presented to ministers of intergovernmental affairs in this House.

Mr. Speaker, ministers of this Parliament, this House of Assembly, have counterparts in Ottawa, and we understand that sometimes, Mr. Speaker, sometimes there is some communication between them, and that they are responsible for communication as regards to their departments.

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

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that if there are any questions to be asked about federal policy, I think they could best come from this side of the House to the people who are championing the cause of the federal government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, as Your Honour knows it has been traditional -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - in this House to ask questions of the government on federal matters, especially the one that my hon. colleague just asked, Mr. Speaker. The question that he asked, my understanding of the phraseology of his question was this, he asked the Provincial Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) if he had received any complaints about this federal policy. And in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that question is perfectly in order.

But the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), who raised the point of order, has been trying to restrict now debate and discussion in this House for the last couple of years. And this is just another example, Mr. Speaker, of how the government is trying to muzzle the Opposition in this House. It is not a point of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Well, with respect to the point of order raised, it is a very legitimate point of order because it does state in Beauchesne that questions asked of the ministry should have something to do with their particular ministry. However, there are other sections in Beauchesne that point out that there are certain limitations on questions that are asked, and there are numerous of them listed in Beauchesne, and I suggest that if every one of those restrictions were applied in every case, there probably would not be that many questions asked in the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: I point out that the question is technically out of order. If the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) wants to make a response, I will allow him; if not, I will ask the member to rephrase his question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, first of all may I say it is rather ironic that the second question asked on fisheries, one of Newfoundland's most important industry, to date in our Province, the second question to date, Mr. Speaker, since the House of Assembly opened.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MORGAN: Yesterday the first question was, 'Would you come to my district, Mr. Minister.' Today, a question out of order. Mr. Speaker, it is ironic.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I believe the hon. minister is now beginning to enter into debate, and rather than enter into debate if he wishes to respond to the question I will permit him to do so, otherwise I will ask the hon. member to ask another question.

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.



MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, indeed I will answer the question. We have numerous complaints about the regulations put forth by the federal government in Ottawa today. The regulations in the federal Department of Fisheries on the inshore quotas and the licencing policy for fishermen, on the regulations regarding the subsidies for new fishing vessels and on we go; the complaints that come into my office day in and day out from fishermen's committees, fishermen by galore, in fact, I will go so far as to say thousands of them are complaining about the regulations of the federal Department of Fisheries as it pertains to the management of our fisheries in Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. D. HANCOCK: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Supplementary, the hon. member for St. Mary's - The Capes.

MR. HANCOCK: This goes to show that you can not get any specifics in this House, Mr. Speaker, because I asked one specific question and the minister made it so broad-ranging that he covered all the complaints that they had.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HANCOCK: I want to know about one complaint, Mr. Speaker. I only wanted to find out about one complaint, I could not even get that out of the minister, Mr. Speaker.

My supplementary is, what is the overall status of federal/provincial subsidies on boats this year, Mr. Speaker? And I had to include provincial there.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, to indeed be serious for a little while in answering that question, it is a very serious matter because just a few days ago we received

MR. MORGAN: a proclamation from the federal minister and from the federal authorities in Ottawa that there will be in 1981 a very substantial reduction in the subsidies for fishing vessels paid to fishermen in our Province. And that is of major concern to us because it is coming at a time when fishermen, speaking through the Fishermen's Union in particular, are saying they are unable to carry on a viable operation based on the present prices for fish and other factors. And now the federal minister has decided

MR. J. MORGAN:

to, in his own wisdom, to cut back on the subsidies to the point where just a few days ago a man from the Great Northern Peninsula, in fact Anchor Point in particular, a Mr. Genge informed me last night that the subsidies that were normally 35 per cent have now been reduced to 20 per cent. And that has a very serious effect on the overall fisheries of Newfoundland.

MR. D. HANCOCK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A final supplementary, the hon. member for St. Mary's - The Capes.

MR. D. HANCOCK: Now, Mr. Speaker, does this mean that the provincial government now will subsidize the fishermen the same as they did for the synchrolift in St. John's?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear! Good question!

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

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, first of all, may I say that our policy in this administration is to subsidize every possible way where it means employment to improve the overall economy of any part of our Province. For example, a tremendous subsidy paid to Marystown Shipyard is an example, including also the subsidy now and the guaranteeing of funds for the St. John's synchrolift.

MR. D. HANCOCK: Answer the question now.

MR. J. MORGAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, we are presently subsidizing the fishermen of our Province by means of the Newfoundland taxpayers, in this case, whereby we are subsidizing the interest paid on loans to fishermen who borrow for the purpose of buying new fishing boats or used fishing boats or new fishing equipment for their boats. And also we are subsidizing to the point of granting to fishermen the total cost of buying a new vessel a 15 per cent grant, outright grant, called a bounty on fishing vessels. And we feel, and we feel

MR. J. MORGAN: quite strongly, that the federal government should maintain their obligation and responsibility. They want and they have now almost total jurisdiction over the fisheries, they maintain they want control of it, let them recognize the responsibility and carry it through.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. E. HISCOCK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.  
MR. T. LUSH: I yield, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Terra Nova yields for the hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. E. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan). With regard to the Gear Subsidy Programme since 1975 on the Labrador coast the deadline for this application is September 30th., and where most of the fishermen deal with companies that are on the Island, in Harbour Grace, Carbonear, Brixus and other areas by the time they get their receipts back it is probably in November or December, This application, in order to get the subsidy, has been returned back to the fishermen, several fishermen - more than several fishermen - in my district because the deadline has not been met. Can the Minister of Fisheries inform this House now whether the provincial government will change this arbitrary date and move it up to somewhere around January or February?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, as it pertains to the fisheries and the fishermen and their problems in Labrador I want to assure the hon. gentleman that we will always, always bend over and accede to any requests from Labrador fishermen, to do what we can to help them. With regard to a problem I mentioned a couple of days ago in speaking on a petition from fishermen in Labrador, because of the communications problem that we recognize exists in Labrador which is a bit different from most parts of our Province that we are willing to accede

MR. J. MORGAN: to a request over and above the status quo, if you want to call it that, in fisheries or, in fact, I would all my colleagues have the same opinion. We are willing to go over and above the status quo to make sure we deal with the problem which we recognize exists, a communications problem. So if that can be substantiated that there is a problem in connection with receipts getting back and forth to different companies on the Island portion of the Province, I would say that we will look at it and considerate it and give it every consideration and hope it can be resolved to the satisfaction of the fishermen on the coast of Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has expired.

I am sure hon. members would like to join me in welcoming to the galleries today four former Chairmen of the Renewals/Cappahayden Community Council from the district of Ferryland, Mr. Stan Brazil, Mr. Dan Pittman, Mr. Bill Hynes and Mr. James Brazil.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

#### PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am also glad to see representatives of NAPE, the Workers' Compensation Board and the College of Trades of Technology in the gallery again today. They have been maintaining a vigil now -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY: so let us hope that the government will get the hint, that the message will get through.

March 11, 1981

Tape No. 285

DW - 4

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I have another petition in connection with that proposal that was made by the Tuckamore Wilderness Club in Corner Brook to establish a large wilderness area down on the Southwest coast, especially along the Burgeo road.

This petition

MR. NEARY:

is unique, Mr. Speaker, and before I present it I might say that I want to congratulate all those who had anything to do with the thought, with the thought that went into this petition because what impresses me so much about the petition is that we hear so much talk these days about young people not being interested in the affairs of the Province and this petition is indeed from the younger set in Grand Bruit.

The petition is similar to the ones that have already been presented in this House by the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (H. Andrews) and by myself. We have already seen, I think it is, five petitions presented in the House in connection with this matter and I hope now that the Minister of Tourism (N. Windsor), or whoever is responsible for this matter, will indeed get the message.

The prayer of this petition is as follows, Mr. Speaker. "We, the students of Grand Bruit All Grade School, oppose the wilderness area proposed by the Tuckamore Club of Corner Brook. We do not like this proposed wilderness area because it is the area we hunt for caribou and moose, fox, mink etc., kill saltwater and freshwater birds since hundreds of years ago. It will affect our livelihood. We would like to have some protection of the caribou herd extending five miles on each side of the Burgeo highway." And the petition is signed by Jason Billard, Charlene Billard, Keith Billard, Tammy Billard, Brenda Billard, Cathy Billard, Bradley Billard, Larry Billard, Bonita Billard, Denise Billard, Beverly Billard, Todd Billard and Michelle Farrell.

Mr. Speaker, I am so please to have the opportunity to present this petition because, as I said in the beginning, this is a petition circulated by high school

MR. NEARY: students, by students of the All Grade School in Grand Bruit. And it just goes to show how interested they are in the affairs of this Province and I want to congratulate them for having the initiative, for taking the initiative in having this petition presented here on the floor of the House of Assembly. And I also want to thank their principal, Mr. Gerald J. Howell for organizing this petition and having it sent on to me so that I could make their views known here on the floor of the people's House in the House of Assembly.

So, Mr. Speaker, I support the prayer of the petition and ask that it be placed upon the Table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. ANDREWS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to support this petition, I think with some reservation. I think there is one mention in there of the five mile corridor on both sides of the Burgeo Road. The residents of Burgeo and the Ramea area are opposed to any restrictions that would prevent snowmobile, wood-cutting and other forms of recreation and activities along the highway. Although the petition I presented last week on behalf of 600 residents of Burgeo supports the general belief that there should be a greater protection of the wildlife population, and particular the caribou herds, and I believe that can be done by a greater enforcement and a greater amount of patrolling by wildlife officials, and the long-term solution being the implementation of an education programme for school students, and it is encouraging to see that these high school students are concerned about the wildlife situation.

It is a very delicate situation that exists right now on the Burgeo Highway. The animals are accessible. You can see them. I saw them myself just a few weeks ago,



March 11, 1981

Tape No. 286

EL - 3

MR. ANDREWS: just about five or ten miles from the community of Burgeo, one thousand animals when you just walked up a little hill.

So it is very tempting for anybody who has that type of thinking in their minds. So I support this petition and also the two previous petitions presented along these lines. The two previous petitions and this one protest the Tuckamore Wilderness Club in Corner Brook and their ambition to establish a major wilderness area. I believe their ambition is more than excessive,

MR. H. ANDREWS:

what they call for, and I believe that through better management regime that this situation can be handled.

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Very briefly I would support the petitions, this petition and others presented in the same cause. And there must be some consolation, Mr. Speaker, to the people, to the groups that are presenting these petitions, when you look at this governments performance by way of what they think of wilderness areas. And the consolation must be, and they can rest assured Mr. Speaker, that there was a wilderness area designated in this Province, but when it became in the better interest of government to rescind that wilderness area, to wipe it out because of a hydro development that was going to take place, the government of the day, Mr. Speaker, this administration, just with fell swoop of the pen wiped out a wilderness area that existed. And we all know, everyone in Newfoundland interested in wilderness areas knows where that area was, they know the Opposition government got to rescinding or wiping out the wilderness area and declaring it available for any kind of industrialization such as the Upper Salmon or what have you. So one thing, Mr. Speaker, the people requesting the government not to implement or not to bring in a wilderness area, need not worry about. When it becomes to the better interest of this government to wipe out a wilderness area they will move pretty quickly to wipe it out.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further petitions.

The hon. member for Eagle River:

MR. E. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of the residents of Capstan Island, Labrador. We have 100 per cent of the residents, adult residents in this community signing this petition. I have presented three other petitions in this House on the same matter and I will be presenting other ones on behalf of the other communities as time goes along. The prayer the petition reads: " We the residents of the Straits of Labrador from L'Anse-ou-Clair to Red Bay, the community of Capstan Island, call upon the provincial and federal government to put aside their political differences and sit down and negotiate and sign the Coastal Labrador DREE agreement. We, the residents of Southern Labrador, feel that we are being used as a political football between both governments and we want and end to it. We have been waiting over three years for the signing of this agreement and we cannot go another Spring without having the road reconstructed and paved." Mr. Speaker, I support this petition as I have supported the other ones in the past, and I would like to point out that the people on the coast are extremely anxious now, because if it is not signed shortly, they feel, that construction season for this year is going to be lost. I have presented petitions like this in the House before and I have asked the Premier if they are going to accept the terms of the DREE agreement. The Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) I am rather surprised by his not knowing anything that is in the agreement and says it is the responsibility of the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, which is the Premier. I hope that this government will continue to press Ottawa and that we will have the signing of this agreement as soon as possible and that we can get on with this work. So, Mr. Speaker, the prayer of this petition I support, and I point out there is

MR. E. HISCOCK: 100 per cent of the residents of Capstan Island are supporting this petition and they feel that this government and the federal government should get down to face-to-face negotiations. We cannot have negotiations done in the press, we cannot have negotiations done in confrontation situations. So, Mr. Speaker, I support this petition and I ask that this petition be laid on the table and sent to the appropriate department, Intergovernmental Affairs, and the Premier. Thank you.

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

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I could not let the opportunity go by without supporting the petition so ably presented by my colleague the member for Eagle River. And I am amazed Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Transportation or the Premier, who is also Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, did not see fit to comment on the prayer of this petition. The prayer of the petition is very simple, it asks the Premier and the minister in the provincial government to put aside their political differences, to put aside their animosity and their war and the bad blood that they have created between this Province and Ottawa and get down to some hard-nosed negotiations and try to sign the Coastal Labrador agreement. Perhaps the Minister of Transportation could tell the House if in his conversation, his telephone conference that he was supposed to have yesterday with the Ministry of Transport officials in Ottawa, if this matter came up and if so will he tell us the results of the discussions. If not, perhaps the Premier could tell us if the matter will be raised in a meeting with Mr. Pepin and Mr. Rompkey that is scheduled



SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BENNETT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I was speaking in support of the Resolution asking this government to select a committee, in other words, to strike a Select Committee to study the high cost of living in this Province.

I would, first of all, like to ask, Mr. Speaker, who is most affected in this Province by the high cost of living? Are we ourselves affected in this House of Assembly by the high cost of living? Are the doctors and the lawyers, the \$100,000 a year business people? Are we affected, Mr. Speaker, by the high cost of living? Do we ourselves have any compassion re the high cost of living? Are we going to support this bill on the high cost of living? I bet you, Mr. Speaker, dollars to donuts that the government of today will not support that Resolution. We will vote for it and they will vote against it.

Now, the people who are most affected by the high cost of living in the Province, Mr. Speaker, are low-income people and young people, social recipient people, young people especially, who are trying to get an education for themselves. The high cost of living affects these low-income people, the struggling masses. Let us not forget, let us remind the government of today and, indeed, the Opposition that you are supported and placed in this House of Assembly by the masses. And, Mr. Speaker, it is the masses who are suffering because of the high cost of living.

The man whose income is \$20,000, \$50,000, \$100,000 a year, the high cost of living has very little ill effect on the person whose income is already in the \$50,000 bracket. It might mean, Mr. Speaker, one less trip to Florida or two cars instead of three in the driveway or a \$100,000 home instead of a \$200,000 home.

MR. BENNETT:

Mr. Speaker, I am of the opinion that the backbone of any country are the masses, not necessarily the classes who already have sufficient income, and I am very anxious to see a Select Committee struck to study the escalating cost of living in this Province, the highest cost of living anywhere in Canada, and at this time, understanding that we have the lowest productivity. Of course, you would have a low productivity, Mr. Speaker, when you have a low employment rate, when you have high unemployment the figures themselves will give you low productivity. But low productivity,

MR. T. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, in this Province of course, is aggravated, it is aggravated by the fact that not necessarily does a person perform well when he has a high income. Just because a person has a high income does not necessarily mean that he is a high performer. We have, in the House of Assembly, high income people so naturally they are going to vote against the bill that is before this House simply because, I suspect, they do not know what it is like to live - I must admit, Mr. Speaker, I do not know what it is like to live on the income that I am exposed to in the district that I represent, the income of some of the people that I represent. And our young people today—ten years or more ago, our young people who were trying to get into trade schools, the government of that day allocated for them twenty-five dollars a week to help them with their education. That is about ten years old, and there has been no increase in that allowance.

These are the kinds of things that I would like to see brought into this House and brought up to today's standard. I remember when - a lot of us here today would remember, of course, the old six cents a day. Now, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the six cents a day was equally as well received as the \$237 a day to a welfare recipient of today. The six cents a day - at that time we could supplement our income by growing vegetables, by catching fish, by shooting animals, we had wide open country. But today, we are held back by government licencing, we are held back by many things on which this government could intercede on behalf of the people, the people who are paying the wages and paying for the high incomes.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am very, very anxious to see what the vote is going to be when it is taken. And I most certainly support my colleague's resolution in having a committee struck that will study the high cost of living in this Province. And I hope every last person in this House of Assembly will support this resolution.



MR. T. BENNETT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. member for Burgeo -

Bay d'Espoir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. ANDREWS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this is an impossible motion for me to support and, I think, anyone on this side of the House. I think a lot of it was said, the reasons why, by the hon. President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) last week.

First of all, the things that influence the cost of living in Newfoundland are the same things that influence the cost of living in every other province and region in Canada. The cost of money is reflected in every activity in our society today. The retail businessman who has to borrow money to create an inventory for his stock, has to pay a very high interest. The private homeowner who wants to mortgage a house, and just about everybody mortgages their home, nobody pays cash for it, has to borrow money at exorbitant high interest rates, almost usury today.

Mr. Speaker, these are things that the Federal Government of Canada controls, the federal Minister of Finance (Hon. A.J. MacEachen), and the Bank of Canada. The rental units that are talked about so much, the cost of renting once again is reflected in the cost of money, the cost of mortgage money to construct rental units. The cost of transportation, Mr. Speaker, is very high in this Province reflected in the cost of energy, the cost of fuel oil and the cost of gasoline. The provincial Liberals on the other side of the House support very strongly the federal Liberal government that defeated the PC government only a year ago that advocated an eighteen cent a gallon increase on gasoline. What is it now? Twenty-four, twenty-five, twenty six, thirty cents a gallon in one year and it has not stopped yet, Mr. Speaker.

March 11, 1981

Tape No. 289

SD - 3

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. ANDREWS:

Home heating oil, the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) complained about the cost of heating oil on the Coast of Labrador. Certainly it is high, very high. The price of oil for generating electrical energy in many parts of the Province:

MR. ANDREWS:

Perhaps one of the reasons we have to generate so much energy - one of the reasons is because we do not have the right to transmit our own hydro electricity across Quebec.

The cost of energy for fishing boats is very high - fuel oil and gasoline for chain saws.

Mr. Speaker, all these are costs imposed upon us largely by the Federal Government of Canada, costs that we have very, very little control over. There is very little we can do about it. But I will say that the Province of Newfoundland has made some steps in what it can do in lowering the costs and of raising the standards of living in Newfoundland.

This is the Financial Post report on the Canadian economy for 1980, and there is one interesting set of figures here that quotes the income required to give the same after-tax income in 1980. In Newfoundland you had to earn \$26,000 in 1980 to take home \$20,000. This is the lowest figure they have here, they use \$20,000, \$30,000 and \$50,000 as very round figures. If you earned \$26,000 in Newfoundland last year, Mr. Speaker, you could take home \$20,000. So how does that compare? We have been told by the other side of the House that we are the highest taxed Province in Canada - \$26,000 in Newfoundland. You would have to earn \$28,000 in Quebec, Mr. Speaker. Other provinces are similar to us, \$26,000 in P.E.I., \$26,000 in Nova Scotia, \$26,000 in Manitoba and Saskatchewan.

MR. ANDREWS: Only three other provinces in Canada where you could earn less money and take home more and those are Ontario, Alberta and British Columbia, and the figures there are \$25,000 a year. I think on those figures we stand up very well, which means that our provincial income tax is not as high as some people try to make us believe, Mr. Speaker.

The employment growth from 1970 to 1980: Mr. Speaker, there were only two years when we did not have a Conservative Government in this Province, the Canadian average annual income increase in employment was 4 per cent, the Newfoundland average was 3.5 per cent.

But let us look at some of the other provinces keeping, then, in mind, the 3.5 figure for Newfoundland: Saskatchewan was less at 2.5; Manitoba 2; Ontario 3 per cent; Quebec 2.5 per cent; New Brunswick 3 per cent, and P.E.I. 3.5 per cent. There were only two provinces out of the ten that surpassed Newfoundland in this past decade in employment increase, and those were, once again, British Columbia and Alberta.

I think, Mr. Speaker, these are some interesting figures. You could go on all day looking through this review. One other one I would pass along - Alberta and B.C., of course, lead in pretty well all these figures, but the real domestic product for this nation, this is the average annual increase from 1969 to 1979, once again, almost a decade, the Canadian average was 4 per cent annually. Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island were 5 per cent, one percentage point ahead

MR. ANDREWS: of the Canadian average. We beat all the other provinces except, once again, British Columbia and Alberta. Alberta had about 6.5 per cent and British Columbia just a little bit less than 6 per cent. Ontario was about 4 per cent, the Canadian average. We were 5 per cent, that is the annual increase in domestic product.

So I think, Mr. Speaker, it is fair to say that this provincial government over the past decade, approximate decade, has improved the standard of living in Newfoundland and done its best to keep down, certainly provincial taxes. But there are problems. And I did say that one of the biggest problems facing us in this Province is the cost of transportation. And to divert slightly from the subject of - or to concentrate, I should say, my thoughts

MR. ANDREWS:

on one aspect of this whole thing, I would like to refer a little bit to the whole transportation system of bringing goods and services and supplies and people into Newfoundland and Labrador. And, in particular, I would like to refer to the CNR, which is a federal Crown corporation, one of the largest in Canada, probably the largest in Canada without a doubt. Last year they spent approximately one hundred-odd million dollars subsidizing the various activities that they have in this Province, particularly CN Marine.

The Newfoundland coastal service was subsidized to the tune of \$26.5 million last year, Mr. Speaker. That coastal service employs six ships. We have in this Province a privately owned fleet of vessels totalling, at my latest count, eleven vessels which was subsidized to the tune of \$3.5 million. That fleet of vessels transported 90,000 tons of freight around the coast of Newfoundland and Labrador last year.

MR. LUSH: Last year?

MR. ANDREWS: Last year.

We are looking at twice as many vessels that operated for 10 per cent of the cost that the CN vessels operated on last year, and this is subsidy money. This is money that comes out of the taxpayers of Canada, and indirectly out of the taxpayers of Newfoundland.

AN HON. MEMBER: They operated at full cost, 10 per cent of the total cost to CN.

MR. ANDREWS: The total cost to the taxpayers of Canada to subsidize the privately owned coastal fleet in Newfoundland was \$3.5 million.

MR. NEARY: What do you suggest, that they give (inaudible) away?

MR. ANDREWS: The total cost to subsidize the

MR. ANDREWS: CN fleet was \$26 million -

MR. LUSH: Oh, boy!

MR. ANDREWS: - for half the number of vessels.

MR. HANCOCK: Then do away with the (inaudible).

AN HON. MEMBER: No, no!

MR. ANDREWS: The CN cost almost ten times as much to subsidize as the privately owned vessels in this country.

MR. MORGAN: CN is ripping off the country.

MR. ANDREWS: I would suggest that the CN has a lot of good bookkeeping to do and, a lot of tightening up to do.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman might be (inaudible)

MR. ANDREWS: The freight coming in, Mr. Speaker, to Newfoundland from Montreal, into St. John's and Corner Brook by private operators, was subsidized to the tune of \$4.1 million. But the interesting figure here, Mr. Speaker, is that the Newfoundland coastal service was subsidized 93 per cent of a subsidy as a percentage of revenue, but the private freight carriers into Newfoundland were subsidized only 18 per cent, as a percentage of subsidy as opposed to revenue.

So I think, Mr. Speaker, when we are talking about the CN, and I am sure the subject will come up in many sessions to come or many days to come in this House, that we should think very seriously about proposals that might be put forward to this Province by CN, and I am thinking particularly about CN's belief that they should monopolize, and their attempt to monopolize the whole surface transportation system between Newfoundland and the mainland and within the Province of Newfoundland. And I say that, in particular, in the hope of protecting the independent vessel owners in Newfoundland who employ, Mr. Speaker, some 600 people at the peak season in this Province,

MR. ANDREWS: no small industry in itself, and, also, independent truckers within the Province, because it will be very easy for CN to control, at their drop off charges of their containerized rail service, to control the distribution throughout the Province.

MR. NEARY: So you are saying do away with CN and give it to the private (inaudible)

MR. MORGAN: Order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, I would say that a better use of the \$100 million that CN spends in this Province, reputedly spends in this Province - because, Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that CN Marine does not even have its own bank account, that the whole CN structure is run out of Montreal, and in places like Moncton. This \$26 million that CN claim they needed to subsidize six coastal boats in Newfoundland, the administrative charges were \$2.6 million to run the office in Moncton. So, Mr. Speaker, with our dealings with Canadian National, I think we should tread very carefully.

MR. MORGAN: \$14 million for administration alone last year.

MR. ANDREWS: CN has become the largest Crown corporation in Canada. It has become almost a government onto itself. It runs the -



MR. ANDREWS: as a member who represents a district, a coastal district that depends solely on water transportation, sometimes they are very difficult people to talk to, I realize that.

MR. NEARY: Cancellation of the coastal freight service. The hon. gentleman (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. ANDREWS: I would suggest to the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) that the \$100 million that the C.N. Marine uses in Newfoundland, if it were turned over to private operators, independent operators who could compete against one another, there would be a much better service to the Province of Newfoundland and for Canada as a whole.

MR. NEARY: Do you really believe that?

MR. ANDREWS: I do so, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, in those closing remarks -

MR. MORGAN: What about the offshore activity of C.N. Marine?

MR. ANDREWS: That is another point. Well, we could go on talking about C.N. for a long time. C.N. are expanding, of course, Mr. Speaker. They care very dearly about the Province of Newfoundland and the Atlantic Provinces in general. We saw what happened when they forced the Dart Container people to move out of Halifax, disrupting about 350 jobs and moving everything to Montreal, and their move with their involvement with the offshore oil, which comes out of Canadian taxpayer subsidy money.

Mr. Speaker, the improvements that the C.N. could make with the money that they have in the coastal service, would be tremendous if it were turned over to private enterprise. I would suggest that, Mr. Speaker, especially in competition.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) in the business.

MR. ANDREWS: Well, as an example, we have a small ferry service that is run by a private operator subsidized by the Province of Newfoundland, that runs between Burgeo and Ramea. That ferry boat runs when the C.N. coastal boats are reputedly storm bound. She is a 110 foot little scallop dragger, ex Shelbourne built scallop dragger. She can go almost in any weather. She goes on emergency calls to Grey River, to Ramea, to Burgeo on stormy Winter nights when the Hopedale and the Petit Forte and the Bonavista and the Tavernor are so-called storm bound.

So I think, Mr. Speaker, there is still room in this Province of Newfoundland, this Province that has such a heritage of shipping, of ships, and that heritage must be protected and the industry can be protected and it can grow. One of the things that might prevent it from growing, is a monopoly by a large Crown Canadian Crown corporation.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words in this debate.

First of all, when we decided the order of Private Members' Resolutions on the Order Paper, we put this particular Resolution by consent of caucus as number one because we thought it was the most important particular problem which is facing Newfoundland today. We thought, as well, Mr. Speaker, that we would certainly, in this particular case, have every member in this House in support of our Private Members' Resolution. The resolution, Mr. Speaker, is a very simple one, that WHEREAS the cost of living in Newfoundland and Labrador is the highest in Canada

MR. HODDER: and continues to rise; and  
WHEREAS inflation, the ever-increasing cost of living is  
causing great torment, frustration and mental and physical  
strain on the citizens of Newfoundland and Labrador; and  
WHEREAS most of the factors involved in determining the  
cost of living fall under provincial jurisdiction,  
BE IT RESOLVED that the House set up a Select Committee  
to examine all aspects of inflation and prepare recommen-  
dations as to how the government should proceed to cope  
with these matters."

Mr. Speaker, it is beyond me  
to understand how any member of this hon. House could deny -  
Mr. Speaker, we would even go for a Royal Commission,  
we would go for any type of study to look at the high cost  
of living, and the frustrations caused by inflation, to  
look at how this is affecting Newfoundlanders and how we  
can go about doing something about it. Whether that would  
mean, Mr. Speaker, changes in provincial legislation,  
whether that would mean consultation with our federal  
counterparts, whatever it would mean, Mr. Speaker, we are  
a separate, unique part of Canada with unique problems,

MR. HODDER: transportation problems, a unique infrastructure which has not been looked at from the point of view of the cost of living since 1968, which is thirteen years ago, Mr. Speaker, when there was a royal commission at that time which is now outdated. The only other time that this particular problem has been referred to, or looked at in any way, shape or form, was in the Plumtre Report which I believe was presented in November 1974, and that was the last time, Mr. Speaker, we had a look at this problem.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution which - I am very, very surprised when I hear members opposite - I was not here last week, but I briefly skimmed Hansard and I noticed that the hon. the House Leader opposite (Mr. Marshall) blamed the cause of inflation on high interest rates. Today I hear members opposite talk about the blame of the federal government, that the federal government controls everything. Well, Mr. Speaker, there is one question I have to ask this side of the House: What is it that this government can do? What is it? Do they have any responsibility in any way, shape or form for this Province at all? For anything, Mr. Speaker? Because whatever -

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible) teach you guys (inaudible) election.

MR. FLIGHT: Do not start boasting now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I love to see a government becoming arrogant. Because this

MR. HODDER: government is the most arrogant government, I suppose, that we have had in this Province since 1949. I do not know about governments before that except what I have read in history books, but when you see the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) with that kind of arrogance, when we are talking about the cost of living, when we are talking about inflation, when we are talking about widows, when we are talking about all of these things, talking about his political skin.

MR. FLIGHT: Yes, the arrogance, Mr. Speaker, the arrogance. Shame!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame!

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, while we sit here - and I suppose there is not one of us here in the House of Assembly who personally is not hurt by the rising cost of living. I know it was only last year when all members got their heads together and gave themselves a raise, here in this House, we certainly were concerned. I think we were justified but we were concerned and we took appropriate action. But, Mr. Speaker, when we can do that -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to be heard in silence.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I would not ask to be heard in silence if the hon. member for Stephenville -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HODDER: - was not the one who was interjecting.

MR. STAGG:

(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

Order, please!

The hon. the

member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) has the floor.

MR. HODDER:

Because his comments

are too infantile to respond to.

MR. MOORES:

But they are an

annoyance.

MR. HODDER:

They are annoying.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, they are certainly an annoyance.

Mr. Speaker, when

we consider that, and anyone within range of my voice - all of us have suffered from inflation, all of us have suffered from the high cost of living. And, I suppose, the high cost of living is something that candidates, when they go out to seek election, Mr. Speaker, it is always part of your platforms, that you are going to do something about the high cost of living. But when whichever party takes power, it is suddenly forgotten. I have not seen any legislation, Mr. Speaker, since I have been here - there is some legislation, some older legislation on the books that was brought in by what I suppose this side calls the former administration, which is actually this administration. There were a few pieces of legislation like the Tenancy Board, Mr. Speaker, which was a step in the right direction. But there has been no significant legislation by this government to do anything to help the consumer in this Province with inflation, or with the cost of living.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I

consider this to be a matter which requires urgent consideration. I feel that here we have the lowest income in Canada and the highest cost of living, in this Province, Mr. Speaker, and I think that this particular

MR. HODDER: resolution calls  
for serious study. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we  
need protection against the hidden manipulators in our  
economy, the middlemen, the poor transportation  
system, and the great supermarket chains that are  
moving into this Province. Because, Mr. Speaker -  
perhaps to put this in context we should look at -  
you see, Mr. Speaker, I heard the

MR. J. HODDER:

other day that there were 5,000 people unemployed here in St. John's. I also saw, Mr. Speaker, some Social Services statistics for last year which showed that there was a great number of people on social assistance in this city. The district which I represent, and the area which I come from, have 5,000 people unemployed as well and have an even higher number of people who are receiving social assistance. We also have a large number of elderly people in this Province who are living from hand to mouth. And when we realize that - and this was a case that came to me just the other day, a widow who had no place to live, over sixty years of age, had to find a boarding house. The house in which she resided had just become - she was unable to live in it and she had no help in order to improve it. She had gone to the RRAP and the Rural Remote Housing and for various reasons she could not qualify and her house was not fit to live in. The rate which she received to live in a boarding house, was \$163.00 per month, the rent she pays in that boarding house is \$160.00 a month. Now, Mr. Speaker, that leaves her three dollars for clothing and for any other necessities which she may have.

Mr. Speaker, in this Province at the present time, a husband and wife and ten children - in my district sometimes there are families with fourteen and fifteen children, it is not unknown, but a husband and wife with seven children, a husband and wife with eight, nine, ten, eleven, twelve children, some of them of school age - and every member on this side of the House and every member on that side of the House, whether they be from the city of St. John's or whether they be from outside the city of St. John's, every member is aware of families who are in this particular position -



MR. J. HODDER: the rate, Mr. Speaker, which these families are allowed under social assistance rates is \$513 a month. Now that might seem like a lot of money to a single person, \$513.00 a month, but think, Mr. Speaker, when you have to heat your home, when you have to do the repairs for your home, when you have to send your children to school, when you have to raise them and give them the proper nutrition and a food basket, I believe, is something like - as of last year it was \$80.31 a month. I believe the minister's latest figures in various parts of the Province for a food basket this year is somewhere around \$100 a month.

AN HON. MEMBER: One hundred?

MR. J. HODDER: Yes, a nutritious food basket runs at \$104 in Glovertown, \$96.73 in Gander, \$106.70 in Lewisporte and on you go around the Province and the more remote the area of the Province, the more it costs.

MR. F. STAGG: What about the licensing programme?

MR. J. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member wants to know about the licensing programme, when a fisheries resolution comes up I will talk about it. But at the moment, I am talking about the cost of living in this Province.

MR. WARREN: Which is more important?

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. J. HODDER: Now, Mr. Speaker, I predict that there will be a raise in social assistance in the next budget. I predict that the government will probably give its usual 10 per cent, which is 10 per cent on nothing. Because you can give - we have seen this in some of the strikes around the Province. If you are not making anything to start with, there is not much use trying to raise nothing to something by percentage points.

MR. J. HODDER: But, Mr. Speaker, the outlook for 1981 by the Retail Council of Canada says that prices will rise from 13 to 15 per cent this year, the cost of food will rise from 13 to 15 per cent this year. Now, what has this government done so far? What have they done?

MR. F. STAGG: (Inaudible)

MR. J. HODDER: And I mean this very seriously. Whether the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) knows it or not, I am serious about this. The Premier and his wife, God bless them, went down to a supermarket in St. John's and noticed for the first time, they found something wonderful, something new, they found that the food prices in St. John's were higher than they were elsewhere and thought there should be an investigation.

Now, it is that investigation that I want to talk about for a few minutes, Mr. Speaker. Because instead of in a normal

MR. HODDER:

fashion, what a normal government would do, if methodically and I might say, Mr. Speaker, you know, the very method and the very public nature in which it was done to cast reflection on to the Premier and his concern for the Province, the very nature in which it was done, suddenly came up and, We are going to look into this. So what did they do? In their usual fashion they phoned down to the Department of Consumer Affairs and said, 'We want a survey.' Well, the first week the survey had certain items on it and were in certain towns, and the next week they surveyed other items. The third week they did not have certain items that were in the first two weeks, so, Mr. Speaker, suddenly, due to public officials, the consumer groups across this Province and some of the very good consumer affairs people that we have in the media, blew the whistle on them. Yes, blew the whistle that these surveys were not working. So finally we get another survey and I notice that the Minister of Justice (G. Ottenheimer), and Consumer Affairs did not bring this in as a Ministerial Statement, he sort of slipped it out to the media so that there probably would be no public debate on it, or there would be no criticism here in the House.

But suddenly we have another survey done in the Province and basically - Mr. Speaker, this particular survey - how much time do I have, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. member has about six minutes left.

MR. HODDER: Oh, Mr. Speaker, such a shock! Mr. Speaker, this particular survey which came out, we do not know what it means. Mr. Speaker, if we are going to do something worthwhile in this particular Province, we have to sit down and we have to methodically go about and find out what is the under-

MR. HODDER: lying cause of those problems.

The Premier has already said that he is not interested in playing around in any way, shape or form with the market - the free market process. We can agree with that to a certain extent but he has also said we are going to look into it but we do not know what we will do about it.

Now, Mr. Speaker,

everything is being done in secret. We do not know, for instance the hon. member - the seat that he represents, the town of Stephenville, was not included in the survey. Do we know that this town will be done the next time? Will the government be doing the same particular communities each time? If so, will they be doing them on a regular basis? Will there be input from consumers, interested consumers across the Province? Is there any input from interested consumers across the Province?

Mr. Speaker, will any of the consumer affairs people, the Canadian Consumer Association, which have an active group in this Province, will any of those people have any input into this particular process?

And, Mr. Speaker, most important of all, this is what we would like to hear from the government. What about - what will happen when things turn up that are not quite right? What process is going about now, what investigative process - besides surveying prices across the Province, what investigative process is going on?

Mr. Speaker, and that is only food prices. When we take the housing prices here in the city of St. John's, you know, the housing prices are about \$10,000 more than they are in the city of Corner Brook. There may be reasons for that but are we looking into the reasons? Is this pure

MR. HODDER: speculation because of the coming of offshore oil and gas?

Mr. Speaker, these are the questions. But yet we have those surveys being done which seem to be something to let us know that the government is doing something, they are surveying prices. What are they doing about it? That is the question, Mr. Speaker. What are they doing about it? Mr. Speaker, just to finish: Mr. Speaker, milk went up in this Province by seven cents a litre, back about three months ago. I phoned the Department of Consumer Affairs. I phoned the Department of Agriculture and I spoke to people there. The Department of Agriculture said, 'We are monitoring it, of course we check into it.' Consumer Affairs said, 'We had nothing to do with it, except that we know that it is going up and we are asking about it.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is no control whatsoever in this Province, none! Absolutely no control over the price of milk, one of the staples of a diet. The price of milk in other provinces - we are the only province that does not have any kind of a milk board. Now, they are called different things in different provinces but one of the functions, and I have talked to some of those boards across the country and one of the functions that they have is that the consumers, the producers and interested people, and government officials as well, and the industries themselves, sit on those boards and there are protections for the consumers and they are well received by the - because sometimes, Mr. Speaker, it is the

MR. HODDER: producer himself who gets hit when you have a year like last year, when the feed prices go up and that sort of thing. But we have no mechanism whatsoever in this Province to monitor the price of milk. We have no mechanism to monitor very much as far as prices are concerned in this Province. I was asked by my - apparently, one litre of fresh milk in Postville today cost \$2.91. That is something that perhaps we should be looking into as well, when we have a price in St. John's of ninety-nine cents and a price in Postville of \$2.91. Perhaps instead of sitting down and blaming everything on the federal government and on inflation, we should look at those particular figures.

Mr. Speaker, as well, I would just like to refer to some of the things in the Plumptre report, which was the last look that has ever been done into food prices in this Province. One of the top recommendations by the Plumptre report said that the poor road system and related facilities for land transportation of food products, especially for some perishable food items, is one of the causes in this Province of high costs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when you try to get truckloads of perishable materials out to Mainland or down to Fox Island River in my district with the types of roads that they have to come over, is this the federal government's responsibility or is it the provincial government's? I know the provincial government says, 'We want more DREE money.' If we want more DREE money, what are we going to put in ourselves? What is this government doing?

It says, 'The need to keep larger stocks of food products as a precaution against continual possibility of interruption in supply.'

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, that is one of the things that amazes me about the minister's study. Here we have in St. John's a port, an airport and all the physical infrastructural facilities that there are in any place in Newfoundland and yet, we have the highest food costs. Now, why is that, Mr. Speaker, when particularly we have two or three large supermarket chains here who are selling by volume? Now, is there any investigation by this government into that particular aspect? No, there is not, Mr. Speaker. They are out surveying and they are finding out but they are not doing anything. What are you going to do? Tell us. Somebody get up and tell us.

Another thing that the Plumptre report pointed out, Mr. Speaker, was 'limited specialized storage for produce and fresh foods'. And it says in some communities, Mr. Speaker - now, this would not be the Avalon Peninsula - but in some communities this type of storage is non-existent. So not only are the disparities between the urban and outports being expanded more and more in things like education and transportation and the road system, but, Mr. Speaker, the disparities are there as far as food is concerned, the cost of food and the quality of food in this Province, and there are no real reasons.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what about the middleman? You know, we came into Confederation with the type of economy - because we were a nation and we were bringing much of our goods in from another country, we went through a system of middlemen. What about those middlemen, are they still in place? Yes, they are. But how much, what effect does this have on food prices in this Province? That is what I want to find out, Mr. Speaker.

I will conclude now, Mr. Speaker, but there are many, many issues that this government could

MR. HODDER: look into as regards the cost of inflation and food prices in this Province. But, Mr. Speaker, it is not being done, and this government on a Resolution, when the Opposition gets up with a Resolution that you would think would be regarded as a Motherhood Resolution that everyone would support -

MR. NEARY: Right on!

MR. HODDER: - Mr. Speaker, you get the members on the other side standing up and saying, 'Do not blame us, it is all Ottawa.'

MR. WARREN: Shameful!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, not only have they given up on trying to do something about this problem, they have given up debating.

Now, Mr. Speaker, yesterday when I was speaking, I said that this was a hard government to sort of knock, a hard government to say anything about because they always ran for shelter under two main areas, one, they blame things on the previous administration, and what they could not blame on the previous administration they blamed on Ottawa. And here, Mr. Speaker, we have a resolution



MR. LUSH:

that strikes the core of the economic and financial problems of this Province, and the government is saying they cannot do anything about it. They are abdicating their responsibilities, Mr. Speaker. They are running away from the responsibilities which the people of this Province gave them the mandate to deal with, the cost of living, Mr. Speaker, and inflation. And there is nothing this government can do about it.

Mr. Speaker, let me just read this unanimous resolution so that I can get myself in tune and so that I can make sure that hon. members on the opposite side realize what this motion is about, because I cannot believe that they read it, Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe that they read it and are getting up and objection to it and not supporting it. Well, Mr. Speaker, it says;

WHEREAS the cost of living in Newfoundland and Labrador is the highest in Canada and continues to rise:

AND WHEREAS inflation and the ever-increasing cost of living is causing great torment, frustration and mental and physical strain on the citizens of Newfoundland and Labrador. These are the two facts, Mr. Speaker, about this resolution, the cost of living, Mr. Speaker, and the continual rise in inflation and what this is doing to the people of this Province, the anxiety, the untold anxiety, the tremendous financial bind that inflation is putting upon the people of this Province. Mr. Speaker, not to support this resolution is to be callous, is to be completely insensitive to the problems that are facing the people of this Province today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: Ahd, Mr. Speaker, that is the message that our people must understand. That is the message that our people must get when we come up with a resolution that

MR. LUSH: will bring some relief to the people of this Province. When we come up with a resolution that is going to try and do something to relieve the financial bind which our people are in, we find the government on the other side, Mr. Speaker, do not want to do anything about it.

MR. WARREN: Will not even debate it.

MR. LUSH: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if there is anything new that I can say in this debate. But, Mr. Speaker, I do want to emphasize two areas in which this government can work on, two areas in which this government can have some input, two areas in which government can have some influence which would help to reduce the mesmerizing situation, the mesmerizing circumstances that the people of this Province are placed in.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to direct the essence of my remarks to two areas; one, Mr. Speaker, is the lowering of the cost of goods, or at the very least, Mr. Speaker, maintain the status quo of the cost of goods to people in this Province. And hon. colleagues of mine have suggested, Mr. Speaker, the great discrepancies in prices of groceries and fuel throughout this Province. And no wonder the people are asking questions. No wonder they are saying, what is the use of a government? Why is it, Mr. Speaker, that a basket of groceries is cheaper in Glovertown this week than they are in St. John's or any place else in the Province? Now, I am glad, of course, that they are cheaper in Glovertown, I do not know if it has anything to do with the great representation of the member they have, but, Mr. Speaker, I would not be so presumptuous as to say that. But I am glad to know that Glovertown is the cheapest

MR. LUSH: place in Newfoundland to get a basket of groceries this week, and if I had known that I would have been down there and gotten a couple of baskets this week. But I did not know that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Did the Empress go down there this week to buy her groceries?

MR. STAGG: The hon. member (inaudible).

MR. LUSH: Yes, obviously because - or somebody went down there and found out it was the cheapest place in Newfoundland to buy a basket of groceries.

MR. WARREN: (Inaudible) they are (inaudible).

MR. LUSH: I just forget the range, Mr. Speaker, between the lowest and the highest. The highest obviously was in Labrador, and it was a tremendous range in the cost.

MR. NEARY: I suppose they could send the government plane out to Gander and have the Empress in a chauffeur driven car taken down to Glovertown to buy her basket of groceries and then jet it back to St. John's

MR. LUSH: That is right. And, of course, most of us cannot afford to. Well, the point of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, the analogy I am trying to draw from that is the

MR. LUSH: frustration that is in this resolution, to talk about the frustration that people are experiencing because of the discrepancies in prices, Mr. Speaker, and certainly there must be some monitoring system, there must be some agency, there must be something we can do with the differences in prices in groceries throughout this Province, and fuel, and oil. There must be something we can do. If not, Mr. Speaker, people are saying, 'What is the use of our government?' And we have to believe them. But what is this? And this thing that the Premier is doing now, Mr. Speaker, if hon. members over there believe there is nothing they can do, what is this foolish exercise that the Premier is engaged in? I mean, this is for what it is worth. This is going to come out for what it is worth. Hon. members are going right against the Premier's own actions here. The Premier has set up this monitoring process and now, when we say, 'Let us do something about it', they say, 'No, we cannot do anything about it'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: Then, what is the benefit of this foolish exercise the Premier has going? What is the purpose of it? What is the purpose of it, if hon. members are saying there is nothing they can do about this particular resolution?

Mr. Speaker, it just demonstrates, again, that all this government can do is talk, talk, talk, talk, talk. But, Mr. Speaker, they are not going to win the support of Newfoundlanders by silly and idle talk. I said yesterday the people of Newfoundland are growing impatient, they are growing impatient through this silly talk, they want to see some action. And we have given the government a chance to

MR. LUSH: demonstrate their sincerity, we have given the government a chance to demonstrate that they will act, but, Mr. Speaker, they are not going to do it. What is it? Is it silly politics? Is it because the Liberal Opposition put forward this resolution? Is that the reason? Is that the reason, Mr. Speaker? Well, Mr. Speaker, if it is, we can solve that because we will submit our resolutions to them privately and let them put them all on the Order Paper.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: If that is the kind of thing we have to do to get action for the people of Newfoundland, if that is what you have to do, we will do it.

MR. TULK: Give them to the PC Association.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, there is something! The hon. the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), Mr. Speaker, again is over there demonstrating his insincerity about all of this. You would not know but this was just a big joke, Mr. Speaker, you would not know but this was a big joke. Well, this is no joke, Mr. Speaker, this is no joke. It is no joke, Mr. Speaker, when you look at the numbers of people throughout Newfoundland, the number of people out there so frustrated, do not know where they are going to get their monies next week to buy a week's groceries, do not know where they are going to get the money to pay their phone bill, to pay their light bill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there must be something we can do. There must be something we can do.

AN HON. MEMBER: Have one.

MR. LUSH:

I will take one.

There must be something we can do in either lowering the cost of goods or keeping them at the status quo. There must be something we can do.

How about taxes, Mr. Speaker? How about taxes? Are we going to see any increase in taxes this year?

MR. WARREN:  
certainly are.

Oh, yes. We

MR. LUSH:  
said there would be no increase in taxes, did he not?

But the Premier

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH:  
get them, and we are going to get them hidden in our motor registration.

But we are going to

Now, Mr. Speaker, here is an area where we can work to, if not lower the cost of goods, to keep them at the status quo by lowering the taxes, the S.S.A., the highest in Canada. But, Mr. Speaker, I have no doubts but they are going to raise them, they are going to put them in other places, motor registration and in other places.

Mr. Speaker, there must be something we can do about the cost of goods to consumers in this Province. The hon. the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) alluded to our distribution system. There must be something there we can look into to see that that system can be structured, and to see that this system can be changed for the benefit of the consumers of this Province. There must be something we can do.

But, Mr. Speaker, just to look on the opposite side of the House now to

MR. LUSH: see the number of people that are there, illustrates the lack of interest, the complete lack of interest in trying to do something tangible and concrete for the people of this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is one area, certainly, in which the government can do something, can put in some monitoring agencies, can do something to check on the cost of goods to the consumers of this Province. There is something that must be done in this area to relieve the anxiety and the frustration and the financial and economic problems imposed upon our people by the cost of goods. There must be something. If there is nothing they can do, why do they not resign, Mr. Speaker? If they cannot do anything, well, let them resign and let us take it over, give it to a group of people who will at least

MR. T. LUSH:

demonstrate interest, who demonstrate concern. Let us not just, Mr. Speaker, bury our heads in the sand.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, this is something - this strikes the core of rural Newfoundland. And I get very emotional about it because I know the problems that people have, I know the problems that people have in rural Newfoundland when it comes to trying to live in this Province today, when it comes to meeting the cost of goods and services, when they have to pay their electrical bills, Mr. Speaker, their grocery bills and the cost of clothing and school taxes.

Mr. Speaker, they are skinned out, the people of this Province are skinned out. And they do not know, Mr. Speaker, where they are going to get their next dollar. They do not know, Mr. Speaker, how they are going to provide their families with food and shelter in the weeks and months that lie ahead. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is one area where this government certainly should be able to do something, that is one area.

Mr. Speaker, how about raising the per capita income of the people of this Province. The lowest per capita income in Canada, Mr. Speaker, the lowest per capita income, in this Province. Now, Mr. Speaker, is that not a responsibility of the government? Is that not a responsibility of the provincial government, to look into the per capita income of this Province? Mr. Speaker, is that not their responsibility? Is that a federal responsibility?

MR. F. STAGG: Yes, indeed.

MR. T. LUSH: That is a federal responsibility.

That tells, Mr. Speaker, again how much the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) knows about what the responsibilities of government are. Well, Mr. Speaker, you cannot expect



MR. T. LUSH: him to know very much about it, I suppose, he is not in on the inside of what is going on. He is kept in the dark.

Now, Mr. Speaker, here is an area that is a responsibility of the provincial government, raising the per capita income of the people of this Province.

MR. G. FLIGHT: How about the minimum wage?

MR. T. LUSH: Now, Mr. Speaker, we do that mainly through two areas. We raise the per capita income of our people mainly in two steps -

MR. J. DINN: (Inaudible).

MR. T. LUSH: And, Mr. Speaker, here is the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) over there mouthing off and he is a part of the problem and not part of the solution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, one way in which we can raise the per capita income is to try and raise the wages of our people, raise the wages of those people at the College of Trades and Technology who could do better by receiving social assistance. That is what we can do. Look at those employees down there who would do better, Mr. Speaker, to go on social assistance. So, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour and Manpower is a part of the problem. He is part of the problem.

So, Mr. Speaker, one thing we can do, and the government must set the example - I realize, Mr. Speaker, there has to be some responsibility, but when we look at employees within the Public Service who could do as well or better by being on social assistance, Mr. Speaker, how iniquitous can that become? And we call that equitable, equitable and fair! Equitable and fair! Well, Mr. Speaker, that is one area we can work on. We are sort of bridging the disparity between wages in Newfoundland and in Canada,

MR. T. LUSH:

but we have not arrived there yet.

I think it is something like 85 per cent of our people in all areas of the economic sectors of the Province, who are receiving - 85 per cent of them are on parity with wage earners throughout Canada. So this means that there are 15 per cent still not on a parity, 15 per cent still not on a wage parity with other Canadians. Well, I hope that we can improve that. If we can improve that, Mr. Speaker, that is a step towards helping people overcome the cost of living and inflation. That will be a major step. And, Mr. Speaker, that certainly falls under the purview of the provincial government, does it not? Now, Mr. Speaker, raise it and see that our people receive a decent wage, to see that our people receive fair and equitable wages on a parity with other workers throughout Canada.

And the Premier talks about equal treatment, talks about equal treatment, Mr. Speaker. Well, this is equal treatment to all the people in this Province, to ensure that every worker in this Province receives a wage that is equal to his counterparts in other parts of Canada.

But the big area, Mr. Speaker, that will raise the per capita income in this Province is to provide employment for the 32,000 people who are unemployed in this Province, provide employment for the 32,000 people who are unemployed, that hard core of unemployed people who have been with

MR. T. LUSH:

us, Mr. Speaker, ever since this government got elected in 1972, 32,000 people. And then, Mr. Speaker, when the statistics fluctuate by one percentage point, everybody gets dancing up and down Mr. Speaker, and it does not matter a row of beans, it is that 32,000 hard-core unemployed people that this government has to be concerned with and they are not, Mr. Speaker, and they are not.

MR. HOLLETT:

They are callous.

MR. LUSH:

And in terms of that, Mr. Speaker, this provincial government have done nothing, they have done nothing. Regardless of these little changes from month to month in the unemployment rate, we still have a hard core of 32,000 people unemployed in this Province. Let us provide them with job opportunities, Mr. Speaker, let us provide them with job opportunities and that will enable these people to be able to fight the war against inflation and the cost of living. And those 32,000 people, Mr. Speaker, is not the true figure, but I do not want to get into that. I think that demonstrates the severity of the problem. That demonstrates the graveness of the problem, 32,000 people continuously unemployed year in and year out in this Province. And that, Mr. Speaker, is the major reason, that coupled with the fact that there are fifteen per cent of the people working for wages less than their counterparts on the mainland. These two factors, the 32,000 people and these 15 per cent of the workers in this Province receiving wages lower than their mainland counterparts, that is why we have the lowest per capita income in Canada. That is why we have it. And, Mr. Speaker, are the government going to bury their heads in the sand and say we can-

MR. LUSH: not do anything about that, that is a federal problem? Now, Mr. Speaker, if it is a federal problem, if this government cannot get to- with their federal counterparts and do something to fight unemployment in this Province, to do something to up the per capita income, if they cannot do that, let them resign! Let them resign, Mr. Speaker, let them resign! Let them resign!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, it is a complete abdication of their responsibilities. It is a complete abdication of their responsibilities and let the word go out, let the word go out to the people of Newfoundland today that this government have resigned themselves to the fact that they cannot do anything about the cost of inflation, that they cannot do anything about the rise in the cost of living, they cannot do anything about it. They have taken a defeatist attitude Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: But, Mr. Speaker, this is the core of the economic problem in Newfoundland today. They would much rather -

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): One minute left.

MR. LUSH: - we got up here, Mr. Speaker, mouthing off about the offshore oil. That is what they would like for us to be talking about Mr. Speaker.

MR. HODDER: The constitution.

MR. LUSH: And talking about the constitution. Now, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to allow these divers- inary tactics to overcome. We are going to let the people of Newfoundland see the real problems.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH: We are going to expose, Mr. Speaker,

MR. LUSH: the government for what they are.  
Well, Mr. Speaker, if they want to demonstrate their concern, if they want to demonstrate concern and interest let them get up today , let them rise in their places and support this resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Right on! Hear,hear!

MR. L. THOMS: Thank you.

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

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address this Resolution and point out just one or two of the small inaccuracies.

MR. HANCOCK: You are going to make up for a bad speech yesterday, are you?

MR. L. BARRY: The statement, "AND WHEREAS most of the factors involved in determining the cost of living fall under provincial jurisdiction." The very basis of the resolution, Mr. Speaker, has not been substantiated by members opposite, they cannot substantiate that. And I would like to just mention a couple of the things that point to the very real failures of the federal government in this area. I do not know if anybody in this Province knows what is happening right today, Mr. Speaker, and it started as of about three or four weeks ago, where a decision was made on a plain partisan, politic basis, for the federal government to duplicate an already existing delivery system which we had in place in this Province, in the Energy department of this Province, to deliver the new energy programme and the funding, which will be provided to assist Newfoundlander's in getting off oil and on to other sources of energy, and this involves, in addition to assisting

MR. BARRY:

homeowners to convert from oil to, say, better woodstoves, it also includes what they call a superchip programme, or a super-insulation programme, which is a very desirable programme and one which I support, as Energy Minister.

But, Mr. Speaker, officials of the Department of Mines and Energy spent several months in negotiations with officials of the Federal Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, and had an agreement virtually completed, a federal/provincial agreement virtually completed which would have seen the Provincial Department of Energy utilizing an already existing branch of our department; people in place, management personnel in place, consultants contacted and ready to go, computer programming started, all of which would have seen, Mr. Speaker, a programme in place right now where citizens in this Province would today be receiving cheques to assist them to convert their homes, or to better insulate their homes, which would have meant dollars in the bank accounts of citizens of this Province.

MR. HANCOCK:

What is your point?

MR. BARRY:

Here is the point. At the last minute, Mr. Speaker, when that agreement was ready for signing, at the last minute for partisan, political reasons, members of the Newfoundland caucus of the Liberal party, presently in power in Ottawa - for a short time -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:

- persuaded the Minister of Energy, not - the Federal Minister of Energy (M. Lalonde) - not to go along with the province administering the programme, persuaded the Minister of Energy, for no other reason than because it was felt that this would mean that the Province would get some benefit. For no other reason!

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. BARRY:

It had nothing to do with ability.

MR. BARRY: It had nothing to do with ability, Mr. Speaker, it had nothing to do with competence, we have proven that. We have proven that by the fact that we are already administering another federal-provincial agreement. If it had anything to do with competence, I would invite, not just the provincial Auditor General, I would invite the federal Auditor General, I would invite the Federal Cabinet to come down and scrutinize the operation of the department and point out where it was not competent.

It had nothing to do with competence. Worse than that, it had nothing to do with cost or efficiency because, Mr. Speaker, the decision was made for the rankist, partisan, political reasons, that the Federal Government did not want to see this Provincial Government get the benefit of the good impression which would be received by people of this Province by having that system delivered by a joint Federal-provincial Planning Committee. Now, I think that is indicative of a sad, sad mentality on the part of our federal representatives in Ottawa, a sad, sad mentality.

And they started off, Mr. Speaker, they had to start off - they did not have one body, one breathing, living body in this Province that could deliver an energy system. And do you know what they have done, Mr. Speaker? Do you know what they have started to do? They have started to hire people in the Province and they have started to - the only place they can find them - talking about competence - are the people that we have down in the energy department, the Provincial Energy Department, and they have started to go down and offer, I do not know, one third as much money, twice as much money, who knows? A lot more money, in any event, to buy away provincial civil servants to set up an office, go out and rent

March 11, 1981

Tape No. 301

EL - 3

MR. BARRY: an office building, to do their computer models, to spend the time trying to track down who is out in the community in the way of consultants and so forth, who is in the private sector, who has the capability in the private sector to assist in providing these facilities for insulation and so on. They knew absolutely nothing about it, Mr. Speaker, and they do not know very much more about it now, a month later. But what has happened, Mr. Speaker, is we have had a duplication of management personnel in the energy branch because, we still have our management people down there in the department.



MR. BARRY: They have to bring in a new management team to supervise this program. They are, as I have said, hampering the Province's ability to perform our normal services in this field by going in and trying to buy away, hire away personnel that we have working for us, And I hope there is somebody up in the press room listening to this because it is one of the most dastardly deeds that we have seen committed in this Province for the rankest of partisan political reasons. So, now, Mr. Speaker, not only do we see the federal government having to duplicate personnel, interfering with the personnel of the provincial government, they are also incurring expenses that the taxpayer has to pay for that would never be incurred, such as to the renting of office buildings and so forth. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, not only that but the whole program is delayed. We could be issuing the cheques right now. The people, the citizens in this Province are losing the benefit of the dollars that were obtainable under this program because it is not yet ready. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is going to be a great announcement made, very likely pretty soon, by the federal government that they are going to have this great new office set up. Mr. Speaker, not only is it going to be months late -

MR. WARREN: More jobs (inaudible).

MR. BARRY: not more jobs, not more jobs -

MR. WARREN: More jobs.

MR. BARRY: - the duplication of jobs which the people of this Province and other taxpayers of Canada are paying for. Now, if you are asking, "Is that improving the cost of living?" Not likely, Mr. Speaker, not likely that is improving the cost of living, that is just increasing the burden on the taxpayer of this Province.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I received a nice little publication I get regularly called "An Ottawa Newsletter" which, if you are not reading it, is well worth reading. It has some nice insights into what is happening in Ottawa, a nice summary, and they usually have the news hot off the presses. They pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that whereas most departments of government are either - they are trying to hold the line, even though the Auditor General says up there that their spending is out of control, and everybody knows that the federal spending is out of control, they make the pretence of trying to keep a freeze on in most departments, keep control on hiring in most departments. But in the Energy Department, Mr. Speaker, they have thrown it open and they have estimated that the personnel involved in the federal Energy Department will close to double within the next year or so and, Mr. Speaker, we can see the reason for that. Well, you see the reason for that right here in this Province where, because the federal government influenced by our own provincial representatives in their caucus - it was a caucus decision. I spoke to the federal Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources half an hour before he went into his caucus, where this was going to be discussed. By coincidence I was up there to talk to him on another matter and I raised this and, as I say, by coincidence he happened to be leaving my meeting to walk right into the caucus where it was going to be discussed. So, it was not a matter, Mr. Speaker, of the federal minister not being aware that we were ready, willing and able to do the job, Mr. Speaker, it was clearly a political decision that the federal government did not want to share, so-called, share the glory of having these dollars distributed by provincial personnel.

MR. BARRY: Now, if our national government is going to proceed on this basis, if our national government is going to duplicate the delivery services that the provinces already have in place, if they are going to start going into communities and paving roads and duplicate the facilities of the Provincial Department of Transportation, are they going to go in and start duplicating our Department of Municipal Affairs, to supervise the installation of water and sewer facilities? Are they going to duplicate every aspect of government life in this Province because they do not want to co-operate or participate with this government or with other provincial governments? Mr. Speaker, that is a short-sighted and destructive policy for the federal government to adopt.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order.

MR. BARRY: It is shocking, Mr. Speaker. If there was any question of competence or efficiency, then you could say, "Oh, they are just mistaken, they are misguided." Mr. Speaker, they are wantonly destructive for politically partisan reasons.

MR. BARRY: Shameful, shameful, shameful!

Now, as I have pointed out, if we are looking at attempts to reduce the cost of living, this action by the federal government is doing nothing to reduce the cost of living, it is, in fact, going to have a direct impact on the people of this Province in increasing their tax burden and thereby increasing the cost of living. This provincial government, Mr. Speaker, has identified a number of areas that will have a direct impact on improving the cost of living in this Province. And, Mr. Speaker, hon. members opposite say that our energy policy or our constitutional policy cannot be eaten. A nice, trite, simplistic statement, 'Oh, you cannot eat the constitution, you cannot eat offshore oil and gas!' Mr. Speaker, how is it that the federal government, their counterparts in Ottawa are putting enough emphasis on energy to double the size of the department in the coming year? I believe that they see that that might have something, that the energy sector might be able to play an important role in improving the economy of Canada. Well, Mr. Speaker, we have, for a long time, been saying that as soon as we get our own supply of offshore oil and gas we then have some control over our destiny in the energy field. As soon as we get our hydro developed in Labrador, we then have some control over our destiny in the pricing of energy costs in this Province. But, Mr. Speaker, as long as we are listening to members such as the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) who does not want to flood a little bush, does not want to disturb the German Browns that may be floating belly up in a particular brook in this Province, is prepared to have the electricity costs of the consumer in Newfoundland increased dramatically to meet his own bleeding heart, wishy-washy -

MR. FLIGHT: Tell us about the Lloyd's River (inaudible).

MR. BARRY: - concerns, Mr. Speaker, then -

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT): Order, please!

MR. BARRY: We do not hear very much

MR. BARRY: from the hon. member for  
Windsor Buchans (Mr. Flight) -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT): Order!

MR. BARRY: - we do not hear very much from  
him when the utilities are applying for the rate increases, we  
do not hear very much then in terms of his environmental  
concerns, who cares more about the German Brown than he does  
about the Newfoundlander.

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible) going to have more  
Churchill power in Newfoundland. In 1981 he said.

MR. BARRY: 1981? If you had listened to me,  
and if your Liberal Colleagues in Ottawa had listened to me,  
we would have the Lower Churchill built in this Province today  
and for the half the cost, or one-quarter of the cost of what  
it is ultimately going to be.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: We would have the 1,700 megawatts  
available from Labrador to hook into our system right now. It  
would be done. Does the hon. member say that it should not  
have been done?

MR. STAGG: Your buddies and Rene Levesque, ruined  
it.

MR. BARRY: And if we had a little more positive  
attitude on the part of members opposite instead of being the  
total negatives of this Province - the Liberal Party is being  
identified as the negative party of this Province. In China  
there is the ying and the yang. In physics there is the plus  
and the minus. Well, we are both the ying and we are the plus  
and they are the negative and they are the yang.

MR. STAGG: Right, and grab them by the  
ying yang.

MR. BARRY: Now, Mr. Speaker, just contemplate  
the picture in this Province with offshore oil being produced  
and with another couple of hundred million dollars a year in

MR. BARRY: revenue from my colleague, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) to play with. Now, I am sure my colleague, the Minister of Finance, is very much aware that we have a heavy sales tax burden in this Province, and I am sure that every night his pillow is a little harder because he is aware of that 11 per cent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is not going to be a person more pleased in this nation, more proud in this nation than the day that I can say to my colleague, the Minister of Finance, "Minister of Finance, there is now oil being produced and coming ashore. Minister of Finance, there are now

MR. BARRY: several hundreds of millions of dollars of revenue for your coffers."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: " Minister of Finance, is it not time that we took a look at that heavy sales tax?"

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, is anybody saying that that would not have an immediate and beneficial impact on the cost of living in this Province, an immediate reduction in the cost of living by reducing the sales tax? Now that is what we are trying to do by having offshore oil and gas developed under terms that are beneficial to this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. BARRY: But if we accept the policy of the party opposite, Mr. Speaker, you know what we would have in terms of revenue? Mr. Speaker, instead of having from a billion barrel field, approximately \$800 million over a fifteen year period, we would have less than one-third of that. The policies of the federal government would give us less than one-third of the revenue which our Provincial regulations would see the people of this Province have.

In other words, we could only do less than one-third of what we might otherwise be able to do with the sales tax, because of the policies of the federal government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: And that is what is being supported by members opposite. They are doing everything they possibly can to put roadblocks in the way of this government getting the management and control of our offshore oil and gas.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, here is the statement of the Leader of the Opposition, 'We will be taking a look at the total economy, the management of the economy and the facts of life as they are. We would be doing something to create jobs, to deal with unemployment, to take advantage of the offshore development as a part of Canada, to use that as a negotiating tool rather than a declaration of war.' They are going to give it away, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: - they are going to trade it off for a few more handouts.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame! shame!

MR. BARRY: Now, Mr. Speaker, the policy of this government is to insist upon our right to develop our resources for the benefit of the people of this Province to get away from handouts.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: And, Mr. Speaker, that policy is going to see an immediate and beneficial impact if we are permitted to follow through.

MR. FLIGHT: How about the pipeline?

MR. BARRY: All you have to do is look at hydro-electricity. Again you say you cannot eat the Constitution. Well, let us take an example of the constitutional power that now exists on the part of the federal government to permit the transmission of electricity across the borders of Quebec, across the territory of Quebec. Is anybody saying that that constitutional authority not being exercised has no impact upon this Province? If we had the \$500 million a year from that hydro power, if we had the \$500 million -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!



MR. SPEAKER (Butt) Order, please!

MR. BARRY: - that the previous Liberal leader had to give away, in a take it or leave it position, would we not be able to reduce the cost of living for the people in our Province? You bet your boots, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: - we would be. And we will reduce the cost of living in this Province.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister's time has expired.

The hon. member for Carbonear.

MR. R. MOORES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HANCOCK: He had so much press, Mr. Speaker, he had to come back.

MR. FLIGHT: A good speech, Mr. Minister.

MR. R. MOORES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for this opportunity to address this hon. House again. The Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) had the privilege yesterday afternoon of following me and making some rudimentary comments on the substance and the content of my words to the House, so I might want to reciprocate this afternoon.

We do not deny, as members of Her Majesty's Opposition, that the Minister of Mines and Energy is one of the most important and influential members of this Peckford administration, of the Government of Newfoundland.

MR. TULK: He is supposed to be.

MR. MOORES: We do not deny that he is an able speaker capable of conveying to this House and to the people of Newfoundland on any given occasion, on any given topic, something

March 11, 1981

Tape 304

PK - 4

MR. MOORES: of substance and something that can catch  
a headline. And today is no exception, The minister has  
caught

MR. MOORES:

himself a headline and that headline is "Newfoundland's Minister of Mines and Energy Condemns the Superchip and Conversion Program because the Federal Government Determined that Newfoundland was unable to administer it properly". That is the headline and that is all he spoke of. The Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry), perhaps the number four Cabinet minister in this Province, spoke of nothing but trash and rubbish and irrelevancy. He talked about superchip and conversion, a miniscule program, miniscule in its effect upon the inflation and the cost of living in this Province, and miniscule in terms of preserving and conserving energy.

MR. HOLLETT: No political clout.

MR. MOORES: Nothing there at all, no substance, no magnitude, no significance, no importance, and why did the minister, the fourth most important minister in the Government of Newfoundland, get up and waste twenty minutes of his thirty minutes allocated on such trivia? Because the man had no concept and no grasp of concept of the problems confronting the ordinary citizens of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MOORES: Did the minister talk about the highest sales tax in Canada? Did he talk about the highest gas tax, provincial gas tax, in Canada? Did he talk about the highest beer tax in Canada, and tobacco tax? And did he talk about the highest provincial income tax in Canada? Did he talk about the highest rate of unemployment in Canada? Did he talk about the lowest minimum wage in Canada? Did he want to address any of these significant

MR. MOORES: problems facing Newfoundlanders today, or did he want to talk about superchip and conversion? The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), supposedly the number one Cabinet minister in this Province, says it is very important the superchip program, it is very important. Of course, it is very important in his mind. In the minds, however, of Newfoundlanders and Canadians faced with some very deficient finances, personal finances, it is not significant. What is another \$800? What is another \$800 when they cannot afford to put food on the table, when they cannot afford to pay rent and pay for groceries? Energy is only one aspect of a very serious problem facing Newfoundlanders today in trying to budget their personal incomes.

MR. FLIGHT: He does not understand that though.

MR. MOORES: Very important, yes, indeed, and the minister, while we are on this superchip program, talked about the blatant political partisanship of the federal government in refusing to go along with the Province administering the program. Well, if this Province administered the superchip program as well as it looks after our roads, as well as it looks after our hospital facilities and our education facilities, if it administers the superchip program as well as it has messed up the fisheries in this Province -

MR. FLIGHT: The forestry.

MR. MOORES: - and forestry and development of natural resources and you name it, any aspect of our economy, any aspect of our society- you can point directly at it and say that since 1971 under a PC government, of

March 11, 1981

Tape No. 305

GS - 3

MR. MOORES:                    which a fair number of the  
Cabinet ministers opposite were a part of, if you looked  
at it since 1971 there has not been one positive thing  
done to help the average, ordinary Newfoundlander, not one.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:            Hear, hear!

March 11, 1981

Tape No. 306

DW - 1

MR. R. MOORES: And you talk about political partisanship.

MR. HODDER: (Inaudible) what they did with it.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. R. MOORES: And you talk about political partisanship and the administering of programmes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. R. MOORES: If the minister wants to talk, not only this minister -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. R. MOORES: Gentlemen you are interrupting a fine speech.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. R. MOORES: I mean you are interrupting a fine speech.

AN HON. MEMBER: I agree. It is sincere.

MR. R. MOORES: If I continue to make these very good points I might get more press coverage tomorrow.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. MOORES: If the minister wants to talk about political partisanship in the administration of programmes in this Province, Mr. Speaker, I would have to ask leave of this House for an indefinite period of speaking time to go into the details. Because if there has ever been a government more blatant in its partisanship, then it has been this one. They conceal it a little better but from time to time we uncover it.

MR. STAGG: The tip of the iceberg.

MR. R. MOORES: Just the tip of the iceberg. And perhaps in another year, because the Premier is not going to go to the people, he has threatened to but that is just bluffing, the usual bluff that he gets on with with just

MR. R. MOORES: about everything. He will not go to the people, he will hang in there by his fingernails until the last minute and by that time we will have uncovered more of the iceberg. And we will see more, for instance, of how Social Services and the emergency fifty dollar funds are being used around this Province.

MR. S. NEARY: And we will find out who paid Frankie's rent for him.

MR. R. MOORES: Ah, will we ever.

MR. S. NEARY: They have been sitting on that now for the last couple of years, but we will find out.

MR. R. MOORES: And we will find out why PC Associations in this Province are announcing ferry programmes to various islands.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. G. FLIGHT: Arrogance is a sign of downfall, boys! Arrogance is the start of the downfall. When you start getting arrogant you are in trouble.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY: And we will find out about Confederation Trust.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. R. MOORES: We will find out where the provincial home ownership grants are going, where the bulk of them are going. And we will find out, for instance, about the RRAP programme in this Province and Rural Development grants and little things like that. And we will find out, for instance, why sixteen or seventeen of the petroleum related development sites have gone to PC districts. And why Carbonear, for instance, that fine old fishing port of Carbonear was overlooked. But yet why, for instance, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: And find out why Argentia was (inaudible).

MR. R. MOORES: Oh, this is so funny.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Very funny!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. R. MOORES: This is humourous, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt about it. Now, see, I do not mind, being from Carbonear myself, that the port of Harbour Grace, its major, positive reasons why it was chosen, was because of the facilities in Carbonear. The reasons why Harbour Grace was chosen as a site development port was because it had hospital facilities, and where is the hospital? It had school facilities, where are the schools? Carbonear?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no!

MR. R. MOORES: It had commercial establishments available to it and government offices, where are they? Carbonear.

Now I do not deny, Mr. Speaker, the port of Harbour Grace its



MR. MOORES: right to have that chance at being chosen. That is not the substance of my remarks, but I do think that Carbonear does have the right to have a preliminary study done on it but it did not because it was Liberal.

MR. HOLLETT: If the study is no better than that, it makes no difference.

MR. MOORES: That is fine with me, it is fine. For instance, Mr. Speaker, it does my heart good to know that there is not much coming to Carbonear because the government has written it off as a Liberal seat. I am proud of that. I am proud that the district of Carbonear is so solidly organized and so self-sufficient that it does not need government support and roads and whatever you want to put your finger on.

MR. YOUNG: They have a good town council, a good mayor.

MR. MOORES: Oh the Mayor of Carbonear is winding up now to run against me in the next election.

MR. HOLLETT: Before he increases taxes there.

MR. MOORES: I should give him his nomination fee now.

MR. NEARY: You can write Harbour Grace off the next time.

MR. YOUNG: Like you did the last time.

MR. PATTERSON: New. World will take care of you then.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) better off.

MR. NEARY: New World will take care of you.

MR. MOORES: It hurts. It hurts. It is not only the member for Harbour Grace that this is getting to, by the way. My point is that you responded to the burrs, but there are others over there who feel it coming too. They are not responding but they know what I am saying is right, that there are districts in this Province that are being seriously

MR. MOORES: neglected by this government and the time is coming very soon, I hope, that this government will be accounting for its ways.

So, Mr. Speaker, to get back perhaps more germanely to the topic at hand, to the motion, to the resolution before the House, when the fourth ranking Cabinet Minister of this government stands on his feet in this House for thirty minutes and addresses nothing but rubbish and trash and avoids the major issues facing the people of this Province, then I say that not only is indicative of this government but is pathetic in the sense of the people of this Province having any hope. No compassion. This government is void of it. They do not know the meaning of compassion. All they want to do is whack the taxes on her and pay for the synchrolifts in St. John's. For the last seven or eight years we have been paying because of John Crosbie's silly, stupid buying of BRINCO, we have been paying all over this Province in poor roads and poor hospital and education facilities, \$160 million gone down the drain plus the interest on it.

MR. FLIGHT: \$160 million to develop the Lower Churchill. The aim was to develop the Lower Churchill. What a laugh!

AN HON. MEMBER: You will not laugh long.  
(inaudible).

MR. FLIGHT: What a laugh!

MR. MOORES: And the present Premier of this Province was as much a party to it as anybody could have been. And to cover up the lack of action and the negligence in providing services to the people they talk about constitutions and Hybernia, something over which they have no more control than I do. And they will go on misleading the people of this Province and misleading them and misleading them and camouflaging the real issues. And the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) will get up, as he does every year and say, 'Well boys, you know,

MR. MOORES: the way it is we just do not have the money to spend on roads because there are other parts of the provincial budget that need propping up like the interest payments on the \$160 million for the purchase of BRINCO", and on and on.

MR. FLIGHT: To develop the Lower Churchill.

MR. MOORES: And the people of this Province -

MR. FLIGHT: To develop the Lower Churchill.

MR. MOORES: God help us, Mr. Speaker, the people of this Province are too green to realize that right before their eyes they are being misled, and that is the tragedy of it. Newfoundlanders today are supposed to be more educated than they were in Smallwood's days and you accused Smallwood of misleading them and denying information. And what do we call this?

MR. HOLLETT: A cover up, Watergate.

MR. MOORES: What do we call this? A government of inaction, a government of talk and old guff -

MR. LUSH: Bluff! Buffoonery!

MR. MOORES: - and nothing else. And that is borne out, it is proven day after day in this House, when a Minister of the Crown like the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) can get up for two-thirds of his allotted time and talk about superchip.

MR. FLIGHT: Hypocrisy.

MR. MOORES: Yes, Mr. Speaker, this government is not going to do anything about the cost

MR. MOORES: of living in Newfoundland. I saw on CBC's Here and Now - and I give credit where credit is due; last night it was a very unbiased, non-partisan report on the old trash and rubbish that the Premier was talking about about the price of food in Newfoundland. I must say that that girl on Here and Now last night, on C.B.C. I never caught her name, but I commend her today for a task just superbly done. She took that statement, that joke, that bluff of a program, of an investigation by the Premier and she ripped it apart and she showed Newfoundlanders all over this Province just what substance it lacked, and I commend her for it. Here is what this government is going to do about the cost of living and inflation in this Province: they are going to talk about it, they are going to talk about it. And when we get a new constitution they are going to distribute the pages to the people of Newfoundland for breakfast. Mr. Speaker -

MR. FLIGHT: By leave, 'Rod'.

MR. MOORES: - again -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. MOORES: - I thank this hon. House -

MR. FLIGHT: By leave.

MR. MOORES: - for the privilege of addressing it and I thank the hon. members. The House is full, the House is full. The House has come to hear me as they always do. They know that it is one of the best attacks, pieces of criticism. Whenever I get up to speak they know it is not going to be personal -

MR. HOLLETT: Constructive criticism.

MR. MOORES: - it is going to be constructive, that the points are going to be well made, are going to be communicated well and conveyed well to the people of Newfoundland. No, I withdraw that, not to the people of Newfoundland, to the members of this House, because the

MR. MOORES: only way it can be conveyed to the people of Newfoundland is if there is some unbiased, non-partisan person in the press gallery who wants to report it. If you have wondered why the headline yesterday in The Evening Telegram was the first positive headline that I have received in six years -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) the one you got?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MOORES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am glad the hon. the Premier has taken time out to come to the House while we are discussing the number one problem in this Province at the present time, namely, inflation and the high cost of living. As I said when I introduced this resolution, Mr. Speaker, my reason for putting a Private Member's resolution on the Order Paper was because the government in its Throne Speech, when it outlined its policy in a Throne Speech that was read by the Lieutenant-Governor a couple of weeks ago, no reference was made to the high cost of living in this Province. The government ignored it as if it did not exist and I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that they have just thrown up their arms in defeat. They have accepted the high cost of living in this Province as a way of life, as something that they cannot do anything about, they cannot cope with it and they have just given up. Now they are embarrassed that we have brought this Private Member's resolution into the House to stimulate some debate on the number one problem in Newfoundland, the high cost of living.

MR. NEARY: I was rather disappointed, Mr. Speaker, with the speeches that were made from the other side of the House. Some of them were good speeches. Some of them were lively and some of them were dramatic, but the unfortunate part about these speeches, Mr. Speaker, they had nothing to do with the cost of living. They had nothing to do with the topic under discussion. The first reaction that we received when I introduced the resolution was from the President of the Council, the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), who got up and again unleashed an attack on Ottawa. Well now, we knew when we put this resolution on the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker - we had talked it over very, very carefully and decided to put it number one on the Order Paper - but we knew the risk, the danger, that we were running when we put this on the Order Paper, the danger we were running that it would give the government ministers, the Premier and his supporters, his colleagues, an opportunity to let go another

MR. S. NEARY:

attack on Ottawa. And no doubt, Mr. Speaker, I will be the first to admit that Ottawa does play a role in coming to grips with the high cost of living not only in Canada but in this Province. But as evidenced by the Food Prices Review Board, Mr. Speaker, a report that was tabled in this hon. House in November, 1974, which made ten recommendations, six of these recommendations fell under provincial jurisdictions, six out of ten. And the only one that the provincial government implemented was the establishment of the Department of Consumer Affairs and now they have dismantled that. Just to show you the priority that they give to the high cost of living in this Province, they have dismantled the Department of Consumer Affairs and tossed it in with the Justice Department.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY: And, Mr. Speaker, I can tell the hon. House now and tell the people of this Province, that one of the first things that we will do when we form the government in this Province after the next provincial election, is to re-institute a Department of Consumer Affairs in this Province.

MR. HISCOCK: With some teeth.

MR. S. NEARY: And, Mr. Speaker, with some protection for the consumer, not just a crowd of inspectors who run around, because the Empress discovered suddenly that the food costs in Newfoundland were high, not just a few inspectors running around and pumping out propaganda, statistics, showing the people of this Province the cost of a food basket here and the cost of a food basket there and then doing nothing about it. Everybody knows that! Everybody knew it! Everybody knows it today! And we will find out tonight when the results of that survey that my hon. friend referred to, when the results come in tonight. We will find out, Mr. Speaker, that everybody

MR. S. NEARY: but everybody in Newfoundland knew that the cost of living in this Province was high except the one gentleman who gets his rent paid, compliments of the taxpayers of this Province, tax free rent! Maybe that is the reason, Mr. Speaker, maybe it is the reason why they are out of touch with reality. It may be the reason that they do not want to be bothered with talking about the high cost of living because they are up there in their ivory tower, in Mount Scio House -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY: - living in a tax - living in a rent free house paid for by the taxpayers of this Province, where you have round the clock security, where you have chamber maids serving your food on the table, where you have somebody to make up your bed, where you can jump in a warm car, started by the security, drive down to Confederation Building, compliments of the taxpayers of this Province. And if you want to take a weekend, jump in the government aircraft and go on down for a weekend and insulate yourself from the people. Is that the reason, Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER: Who paid for Roaches Line?

MR.S. NEARY: Yes, I can tell the hon. gentleman who paid for Roaches Line, Mr. Speaker. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that we have in this Province the only Premier in Canada who gets a house compliments of the taxpayers. As a matter of fact, the hon. gentleman that the hon. member referred to gave - not only did he not get a house he gave one to the people of this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who built it?

MR. S. NEARY: I do not care who built it. He gave it to the people. And, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman can smear all he likes and sneer all he likes. I would advise him to go down in the registry office and see who paid for the house, he might find out to his dismay that there is a



MR. S. NEARY: mortgage on that house, that house was passed over for one dollar to the people of this Province. And they can smear, sneer and jeer all they like! But what about the rent free house, what does the hon. gentleman think of that? What does the hon. gentleman think of a rent free house? Mr. Speaker, what does the hon. gentleman think of a rent free house?

AN HON. MEMBER: He deserves it.

MR. S. NEARY: He deserves it, the only Premier in Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY: And so the reaction I got when I brought up the rental down at

MR. NEARY: Regency Towers; the hon. President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) said, "No, this is all a federal matter". Well, this happens to be a provincial matter that I brought up, where you have eighty-odd citizens living over in Regency Towers down here on the Boulevard, owned by a buddy of the Tory Party, who used to be their bagman, who has given eighty residents their notice to get out of the apartments. And I brought that up. Is that a federal matter or is it a provincial matter?

And listen, Mr. Speaker, what they are doing down there. Two bedroom apartments are now \$360 including heat and lights. Now that is going up to \$455. One bedroom apartment, \$320 including heat and light, going up to \$410. And when they sent out the notice they said to these people, you can call this number. And when they called the number, now they will not accept the phone calls. And when Mr. Green was given his last increase, by the way, in Regency Towers, he told the Rent Control Board that he was going to repair the building. He raised the rents, Mr. Speaker, but he did not carry out his part of the bargain. He did not repair the building. As a matter of fact, at that time he denied ownership of the building before the Rent Control Board. Now he has told the residents of Regency Towers to get out on the street, get out.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask this House, is that a federal matter? Is it, Mr. Speaker? What is the government going to do about that? And, Mr. Speaker, this idea of people going into a supermarket and picking up an item off the shelf with the price on it and just as they pick it up along comes one of the employees of the supermarket and says, "Oh, no, put that back I have to change the price" - that is happening, Mr. Speaker - is that a federal matter? There was a time when they were afraid to do it. But since the government dismantled the Department of Consumer Affairs,

MR. NEARY: they are doing it right, left and center.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: And it should be stopped, Mr. Speaker, it should be stopped.

MR. WARREN: Tell them more about the rent free house.

MR. NEARY: We will talk about the rent free house. I am going to talk about that some more later on. And I am going to find out who paid Mr. Moore's rent in that House. It was not Mr. Moores. And the hon. gentleman has been sitting on that for the last two years and he cannot deny it, and that will surface pretty soon. And the hon. gentleman better move, and swiftly, and do something about it.

Mr. Speaker, here is another one driving up the cost of living in St. John's. I was amused there a couple of weeks ago when I saw the Governor General presenting a plaque, presenting a certificate to one of the big building suppliers in St. John's for this great Heritage project that they carried out downtown, the Murray Premises. Well, what a racket that turned into, Mr. Speaker, the Heritage Foundation. I will tell you what the Heritage Foundation is in St. John's: It is a group of individuals who got together, banded together, a handful of them, one in the building supply business, one in the architectural business, one in the plumbing business, one in this business and one in that business, and they started going around, sniffing around for projects, something that they could do to create some business for themselves and they came up with this idea of renovating and fixing up the Murray Premises.

The Chairman, no doubt, the Chairman of the Heritage Foundation no doubt supplied the material. The Vice-President supplied the architectural work. Somebody else supplied the fixtures. Somebody else supplied the plumbing, all members of the Heritage Foundation.

MR. MORGAN: Must have come from Ottawa.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, and for that, for ripping off Ottawa, for manipulating the funds from Ottawa you get presented with a plaque by the Governor General of Canada. And while they are doing this, Mr. Speaker, and buying up all the property and all the houses, the old houses downtown they are creating a housing shortage in the City of St. John's, a housing shortage and driving up the rent. Buddies of the Premier. He does not lift a finger. His buddies down buying up all the old houses in downtown St. John's and fixing them up and then selling them for double the price they buy them for, or tearing them down and creating a housing shortage.

AN HON. MEMBER: He do not want to (inaudible).

March 11, 1981

Tape No. 311

RA - 1

MR. S. NEARY: Oh, yes, he knows what I am talking about. He knows about the meetings up in Mount Pearl in the Chateau - What do you call that hotel up there? -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Chateau Park.

MR. S. NEARY: - Chateau Park, their week-end meetings when all this is planned. And, Mr. Speaker, the net result of all this is that people on social assistance, people on low income and people on high income, middle income in St. John's, cannot find a place to live because the scavengers and the moneybags and the land speculators have gone out and either bought the houses, using heritage funds to fix them up and then sell them for an exorbitant price, or they have torn them down and all you have downtown now is vacant land. Mr. Speaker, as I said last week, the number one problem in this Province is the high cost of living. It is causing more distress, it is causing more people to be forced to take tranquilizers, it is causing more physical and mental strain on people than anything else in our society today and the government do not think it is worth their while to discuss it in this House. It is all a great big joke, Mr. Speaker. I will just throw out one statistic to show what I consider to be one of the side effects of the high cost of living in this Province, because I think, myself, that the increase in vandalism and crime is brought about by the high cost of living in this Province, by people not being able to afford to get the things that they need to keep body and soul together and to get the things they need for their families.

MR. TULK: That is in the Royal Commission.

MR. S. NEARY: That is right, it is in the

March 11, 1981

Tape No. 311

RA - 2

MR. S. NEARY: Royal Commission Report. Hon. members might be shocked to find out that last year, 1980, the total offenses for shoplifting in this Province, and mainly in the city of St. John's, the total offenses in 1980 was 1,004, and the number of people involved, 952. Shocking, shocking statistics, Mr. Speaker, something that the Minister of Justice chooses to ignore. He will not accept the fact.

MR. HANCOCK: Did anyone over there get picked up?

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

MR. HANCOCK: Did anyone over there get picked up?

MR. S. NEARY: I do not know if anybody over there got picked up or not, but they should have got picked up for allowing the shopkeepers, the big supermarkets to pick the pockets of the people of this Province. It is an absolute, scandalous, shameful and -

MR. STAGG: You are not going to put up with it.

MR. S. NEARY: No, it is not a matter of me putting up with it but, Mr. Speaker, I am amazed that the government would not agree to this resolution. Now, what were we asking for in this resolution? Were we asking for anything unreasonable? What did the government do when they wanted a new flag? When the Premier wanted to set himself up as the Emperor in this Province, and he wanted his new flag, Mr. Speaker, what did he do? He appointed a Select Committee of the House. And what did the government do when the member for Baie Verte (Mr. Rideout) wanted to go around the Province checking on the holes that were left in the ground by mining companies? What did the government do? They set up a select committee, after he went across the House, his little payoff, set up a select committee and gave him a little budget and a staff and the use of the government aircraft so he can

March 11, 1981

Tape No. 311

RA - 3

MR. S. NEARY: go around the Province checking on these holes that were left behind by mining companies. But what do they do when you ask them to set up a select committee to look in to the greatest curse in Newfoundland today, the number one problem in our society? What do they do when you ask them for a select committee? They get up and poke fun at it and sneer at it.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is not true.

MR. S. NEARY: It is true, Mr. Speaker. Not one member who spoke from the government side of the House addressed himself to the resolution, Not one which has to do with the high cost of living in this Province. And I guarantee you, Mr. Speaker, they will pay the price in due course.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY: I could go right down the ranks now, Mr. Speaker, and I could name fourteen members and fourteen districts on that side of the House that will not be back here after the next election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY: And I will do it in due course. I could do it today if I had the time, starting in the upper end. Fourteen that will not come back to this House Mr. Speaker -

MR. STAGG: Do it now.

MR. S. NEARY: No, I do not have the time now, but I will do it later on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY: -because the government, Mr. Speaker, could not get their priorities straight. All they can think about is art councils, all they can think about is women's libber's, all they can think about, Mr. Speaker, all they can think about is medals, flags, coloured pictures of the Premier.

MR. HANCOCK: It is a wonder he is not concerned enough about it to speak on it.

MR. NEARY: And the hon. Premier, as my hon. friend indicated, was so concerned about it that he did not think it worthwhile, Mr. Speaker, to talk about this. Well, he can get aboard, now, his nice warm car, compliments of the taxpayers of this Province, and he can drive up to a nice home, about \$750,000 of taxpayers' money into it, and he can sit down and have the servant bring him in his dinner and he can go to bed, Mr. Speaker -

MR. MORGAN: Oh, the jealousy! Oh, the jealousy!

MR. NEARY: Oh yes, kind of jealous.

Mr. Speaker, let me say this -

MR. MORGAN: You will never make it there, my son.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Let me say this, Mr. Speaker, that when somebody accepts something from the public treasury, paid for by the public treasury, they have to be prepared to accept the criticism or the praise that goes with it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: And he will heave off in a bed provided by the taxpayers of this Province. Maybe he will get in the shower or in the bathtub and something will occur to him and he is so tensed up and so full of energy, he might have to jump out and make a note and jump back in the bathtub again. I hope, Mr. Speaker, while he is doing this, and while he is enjoying a nice heated home, compliments of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young), nice bright lights, and he can go to bed secure knowing that there is around the clock security there, and he will get up in the morning and his car is heated up for him, I hope, Mr. Speaker, while he is enjoying all this, while he is enjoying this, that he will think of the many thousands and thousands of ordinary Newfoundlanders who cannot cope with the cost of living, who cannot heat their homes,



MR. NEARY: who cannot buy proper food for nourishment for their children.

AN HON. MEMBER: We should all take a cut in pay.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, that might not be a bad idea, but we do not have to. All we have to do, Mr. Speaker, is cut out the extravagance and waste and get our priorities - Mr. Speaker, all we have to do is to cut out the extravagance. We have got the most expensive Premier in the whole history of Newfoundland. I would say that Premier is costing us, costing Newfoundland, in some of the things I just mentioned plus support staff that is unnecessary, plus an airplane, plus helicopters, plus all the trips that he takes - he spends more time out of the Province than he does in the Province - Mr. Speaker, if you cut out all this stuff, cut out the extravagance and waste, if you put all that together, added it up, I would say you are talking about \$1.5 million to \$2 million. The most expensive Premier ever, in this Province. And I would not mind paying him that, Mr. Speaker, if he would do something about the real problems facing the ordinary people of this Province, number one of which is the high cost of living in Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please!

In accordance with Standing Order 53, it is my duty now to put the motion. Is it agreed to dispense with the reading of the motion?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed.

You have heard the motion then.

Those in favour of the motion say 'Aye'. Contrary 'Nay'.

In my opinion the 'Nays' have it.

MR. MOORES: Could we have a division.

MR. SPEAKER: Division. Call in the members.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! You have heard the motion. Those in favour of the motion please rise.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Mr. Moores, Mr. Flight,

Mr. Hodder, Mr. Frederick Rowe, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hollett  
Mr. Warren, Mr. Tulk, Mr. Neary, Mr. Hancock, Mr. Hiscock.

MR. SPEAKER: Those against the motion please rise.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame! Shame!

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

Order, please, so we can hear the Clerk, please.

The hon. the Premier (Mr. Peckford),  
the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry),  
the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), the hon.  
the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey), the hon. the  
Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Brett), the  
hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth and  
Minister of Environment (Mr. Dawe), the hon. the  
Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn), the hon.  
the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor), the hon. the  
Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), the hon. the Minister  
of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer), the hon. the President of  
the Council (Mr. Marshall), the hon. the Minister of  
Transportation -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

- the hon. the Minister of Rural,

Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie),  
Mr. Andrews, Mr. Walsh, Mr. Butt, Mr. Rideout, Mr. Stagg,  
Mr. Carter, Dr. Twomey, Mr. Doyle, Mr. Patterson,  
Mr. Stewart.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

Results of the vote: in favour  
of the motion, eleven; opposed, twenty-three. I declare  
the motion defeated.

Is it agreed to call it six  
o'clock? Agreed?

MR. HODDER: No. No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: We have fifteen seconds.

No agreement?

MR. MARSHALL: The point is - the rules,

Mr. Speaker -

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

MR. MARSHALL: - and the hon. gentlemen opposite  
obviously do not understand or abide by the rules by the  
way in which they operated during the division, but the  
rules are on Private Members' Day at six o'clock, I believe,  
Your Honour leaves the Chair automatically to adjourn  
until the next standard time which is tomorrow at three,  
so you do not have to put a motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Absolutely correct. The only  
reason I put it was because there was one minute remaining.

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