

PRELIMINARY

UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD

3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 4, 1981

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

Yesterday, as hon. members will recall, I reserved a ruling regarding the tabling of certain exhibits by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). I would like to quote now from Beauchesne, page 117, paragraph 333, which states:

"Speakers have consistently ruled that it is improper to produce exhibits of any sort in the Chamber. Thus during the flag debate of 1964, the display of competing designs was prohibited. At other times boxes of cereal, detergent and milk powder have been ruled out of order."

I also quote from the Commons debates of June 16th., 1969, page 10156

"I have to bring to the attention of the hon. member that it is not in accordance with the rules or traditions of the House of Commons for members to produce the type of exhibit which the hon. member has with him at the present time. This is not a recognized practice. If we allowed hon. members to produce such exhibits, we would get ourselves involved in a position where perhaps all too often hon. members would want to table dead fish, herrings or red herrings, damp grain or wild oats. I therefore invite the hon. member to have his exhibit removed.

"This is a precedent precisely on that point when one of my illustrious predecessors ruled that members could not bring into the House baskets of peaches and similar objects."

It would appear, however, in this case that the exhibits proposed by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) fall into two categories.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): 1. With regard to the "comic book" and the "Instruction Manuel", I rule that it is in order for the hon. member to table those documents if he desires.

2. With regard to the game called "Newfoundland and Labrador Great Road Race", I rule that it is not in order for such an object to be tabled as an exhibit.

I have made the distinction based on the characteristic of the exhibit to be tabled; the former having been the characteristic of reading material while the latter exhibit falls into the category, in my opinion, of those exhibits ruled out of order in previous precedents.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: May I table the documents, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. NEARY: There is reading material inside that tube I had yesterday, Mr. Speaker. Maybe later on I might be able to table the reading part of it. I do not know if we can put the dice on the table or not.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday during the Question Period I asked two or three very serious questions to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer). Mr. Speaker, I want to make it quite clear to my friends over my left shoulder that I am not blaming the reporter in any way, shape or form in connection with this matter, but during the Question Period, when the Minister of Justice was answering the questions, the Daily News this morning reported that the minister said words to this effect that, "I have not intefferred." And in the

March 4, 1981

Tape No. 74

NM - 3

MR. THOMS:

story it goes on to say that I am quoted as saying that I am not afraid, that I am not surprised he has not inteferred. That is correct. I have checked Hansard, Your Honour, but then they go on to say that this, and I quote, "This is quite a serious matter so the hon. gentleman really should be quiet over there," was Mr. Ottenheimer's rebuke.

I want to make it quite clear,

MR. THOMS:

and I believe that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) will confirm this, that his comment that this is quite a serious matter - and the reason I bring it up is because it makes it appear as if I was treating the matter lightly, which I was not - that that was not said by the Minister of Justice in reference to my questions or anything that I had to say in the House yesterday afternoon, although Hansard, itself, of course, as well, does not make it clear that the minister was not replying to a comment that I was making at the time. Maybe, Mr. Speaker, the answer - as I say, I do not blame my friends over my left shoulder here because although they can see the government side of this House, they cannot see the Opposition side of the House. It happened once before in connection with - and it is ironic because it happened in connection with a comment made by the then member of the House, Mr. Simmons, in connection with the RCMP in Corner Brook, where I was attributed that statement. But I was going to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that maybe the answer to it is if during the regular sittings of the House, that you or this House would consider permitting the press to do their reporting from either the members' gallery or the Speaker's gallery. In that way they could not only hear the comments that were being made but they could see who was making these comments.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

If I could make a brief comment on it: Actually, it is quite right that yesterday I said something to the effect that you should be quiet, this is a quite serious matter. I was saying that not to the hon. gentleman who asked the question, but with reference to one

MR. OTTENHEIMER: of his hon. colleagues who was speaking at the time, talking to his desk mate or doing some such thing, and it made it difficult for me to hear and indeed to think. It was not with reference to the hon. gentleman's question, it was with reference to noise from another hon. gentleman; no need for me to name him.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, on the point itself, I would submit that what the hon. gentleman has risen on in the House is really not a point of privilege. I know that there are times when hon. members get up in the House to make comment by way of personal explanation with respect to certain matters both inside and outside the House, but with the greatest respect to the hon. member, I do feel that matters of this nature should be a little bit more weighty than

MR. W. MARSHALL:

what the hon. gentleman brought up because I do not think the time of the House should be taken in points of privilege of that nature. With respect to the positioning of the press and the hon. gentleman mentioning the fact that the press can see the government and cannot see the Opposition, I would just observe, Mr. Speaker, that that situation is not confined to the press. I think it is confined to most people in Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): With respect to the point of privilege -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

With respect to the point of privilege, the Speaker's role is to determine whether or not there is a prima facie case. In this particular instance, of course, there is no prima facie case; the member is really just taking the opportunity to clarify comments that were attributed to him in the press. That has happened before and our precedents are clear in that situation.

With respect to the second point or matter raised by the hon. member, I might just add that just during the past year I had discussions with the executive members of the press gallery when that very point was discussed but it was determined that they would stay where they are for the present time at least.

MR. THOMS: In that case they should be more careful.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

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

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce today the appointment of Ms. Leeann Montgomery of St. John's to undertake a study of all aspects of conditions, concerns and problems of women in the workforce.

The Department of Labour and Manpower has had this matter under consideration for a number of months and a thorough review on matters affecting women in the workforce will be undertaken in order that the department can determine if new programmes and services relating to women in the workforce should be introduced.

Mr. Speaker, I want to explain that the study will include an examination of all legislation in Canada having special reference to providing protection for women in the workforce, investigation of incidence of complaints or actions under such legislation; to examine the matter of equal opportunity of employment and promotion of women in both the public and private sector; to establish liaison with women's organizations, management organizations and the labour movement to determine the requirements for special measures to assist women in the workforce and to examine the progress and performance of women's divisions in Departments of Labour and Manpower in other provinces.

I am especially pleased that Ms. Montgomery has agreed to take on this assignment since she has both the experience and training to undertake an important study of this nature having graduated with a Bachelor of Laws degree from Dalhousie University in 1977 and articulated with the Department of Justice in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, the study will take



MR. J. DINN: approximately one year to complete during which time Ms. Montgomery will be contacting the various organizations and associations who would have an interest and input into the study. In the meantime she can be contacted at the Department of Labour and Manpower, Beothuck Building, Crosbie Place.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

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

MR. FLIGHT: We need mining inspectors appointed,  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!  
The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, allow me to say that first of all we have no objection to the two things here, one the appointment of Miss Montgomery or the purpose for which she is appointed, If, of course, this is based on necessity, we certainly would not want to see women discriminated against in our society nor any other group, So as I have said before if this is based on necessity. Quite frankly it has not been brought to my attention that in the Newfoundland society that women have been discriminated against in any real way. As a matter of fact, the statement itself indicates the broadmindedness of the government where we have Miss Montgomery herself working in the Department of Justice -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. LUSH: - a lawyer, so, Mr. Speaker, on the principle, as I have said before, we have no objection with bringing in legislation that is going to establish or that is working towards equality for groups that are discriminated against, if indeed they are discriminated against. So we certainly agree with this if it comes out of necessity and is not merely a case of window dressing and how much this particular thing is going to cost.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. SITRLING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In that connection I am sure that the six or seven thousand people who are unemployed would be glad to get a job. I have a question for

MR. STIRLING: the Minister of Education (L.Verge), Mr. Speaker, and it comes as a result of concerns that have been expressed by any number of people all over the Province at school board levels and at the teacher level concerned about the serious situation facing people involving education. There is a very real concern because of the implementation of Grade XII that the funds that have been requested and desperately needed for primary and elementary schools may suffer. The question I would like to ask the minister is can she assure us that she has a commitment from her colleagues in Cabinet that these long outstanding requests from the various school boards and from the Denominational Education Committee that are required to bring up the standards of the primary and elementary schools, that these will be given a first priority and in fact will be committed this year?

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

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, the implementation of the re-organized high school programme which has been carefully planned over the past two and three years is proceeding very well. It is being received with enthusiasm by teachers, parents and students throughout the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MS. VERGE: Resources in terms of teaching personnel and buildings as well as operating funds will be provided for the re-organized high school programme, bearing in mind that that involves the three final years of school starting at Grade X and continuing to Grade XII which will be an additional year in our school system. Offered for the first time three years from now, the re-organized high school programme beginning at the Grade X level will be phased in starting in September 1981. Additional students will be in our high schools not until three years from now when Grade XII is first taught.

The resources necessary are being provided over and above resources which will continue to be provided for the primary, elementary and junior high school grades. There has been a conscious decision on the part of government in committing ourselves to this major improvement in our senior high school to provide extra funding to make that possible over and above funding for the ongoing programmes from kindergarten to Grade XI.

The teacher allocations for the next school year are evidence of this, Recent changes were made in the guidelines -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MS. VERGE: governing teacher allocations recognizing, number one, the effect of declining enrollments which have continued for the past decade and also the need which will begin in a modest way in the next school year with the start of a re-organized high school programme. Those changes will result in 107 extra teaching positions over and above what would have been the case had we not made these changes.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

If I might interrupt the hon. minister, the question perhaps did require a rather lengthy answer and perhaps I should have ordered that it be placed on the Order Paper. But questions as well as answers should be as brief as possible and I would ask the hon. minister to consider that.

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

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

MR. L. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I think if you check Hansard you may see that there was a long preamble but the question was very specific. The specific question that was asked was not answered. The specific question was has the minister a commitment from her colleagues in Cabinet to make available to the DEC the money that they have already asked for in previous years to look after the very difficult situation they now have? The answer was not given and I was about to ask the Speaker for direction. Is it necessary for me to interrupt when we are not getting an answer or does the Speaker do it on his own?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

If I may interrupt, I have already given a ruling and brought it to the attention of both the minister and hon. members on both sides. I might point out that the rulings are not subject to debate during Question

March 4, 1981

Tape No. 78

DW - 3

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Period. If the hon. member has a supplementary, I would suggest he should ask it now.

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

MR. STIRLING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would note that the question was not answered. A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. One school that I have an intimate knowledge of is the Valleyfield School, which is a primary school, and requests have been made since 1978 for improvements to that school. The Fire Commissioner has just closed it in the last couple of weeks on one hour's notice. So that school is closed and the children are now housed in the basement of another school. Would the minister indicate whether or not that is considered the kind of funding that she is now committed to to bring that kind of school up to standard? I know she cannot commit for a specific school but the question is are emergency funds available for that kind of situation? And will she bring all schools in the primary and elementary level up to a standard this year?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, over the past decade government has provided to the DECs funding to make possible the construction of \$200 million worth of schools throughout our Province. There is a commitment from this government to the DECs to make available to them over the next number of years, as resources permit, enough funding for them to take care of all critically needed school construction in the Province.

As for the needs for the reorganized high school programme, that is being examined and funding will be made available to them to take care of needs at the high school level for extra students -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MS. VERGE: - but more important for programme expansion.

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

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please! Order, please!  
A point of order has been raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, the minister is now ignoring your direction. She has now gone into an answer about Grade XII which was not asked.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: It was a specific question having to do with primary and elementary schools. She has now ignored your direction and gone into a prepared answer on Grade XII.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. President of the Council to the point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: - has raised a point, Mr. Speaker, a point of order. The hon. minister is answering the question put to her by the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman can frame his questions as he wishes within the ambits of the rules of this House, and the hon. minister can answer the question within the same rules, and the hon. minister is doing exactly that. If he asks for a response he gets a response, but it is not for him, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS Oh, oh!



MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: - to dictate the nature or to give an assessment of the quality of the answer. If he is dissatisfied with the answer, there is a procedure on tomorrow that he can debate it.

MR. SPEAKER: With respect to the point of order, I would point out to hon. members Standing Order 31(g) which is quite clear. "A member who is not satisfied with the response to an oral question, etc. etc. may give notice that he intends to raise a subject matter of his question on the adjournment of the House." That rule I believe is understood by all hon. members.

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): The hon. the member for LaPoile, followed by the hon. the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Justice. Would the minister inform the House under what authority he has had hand delivered to Canadian National in Moncton an ultimatum, or an order, or a summons to remove all slot machines from Canadian National ferries operating between Newfoundland and Nova Scotia? Under what authority did the minister issue this ultimatum?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if you would call it an ultimatum or not an ultimatum. The Criminal Code prohibits the use of slot machines. Hon. members are probably aware we are working on a system for the licencing of games of chance. Slot machines themselves, however, are not permitted to be licenced under the Criminal Code, and naturally if organizations within the Province will need to be licenced, then certainly we cannot make chalk of one and cheese of another, and an organization like CN presumably is required to follow the law as well as anybody else.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman probably did not misunderstand my question but probably I did not make myself clear. My understanding, Mr. Speaker, is that these ships operate in international waters.

MR. STAGG: Across the Gulf?

MR. NEARY: Across the Gulf.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: And the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HOLLETT: Six miles from shore.

MR. WHITE: Twelve miles.

MR. NEARY: The three mile limit, as a matter of fact, the three mile limit is the one that is generally recognized -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - throughout the world.

Even if it was twelve miles, they are still operating in international waters. These slot machines are not used when the ships are tied up in port. As a matter of fact, when they enter the three mile limit -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - the machines are shut down.

So would the minister indicate under what authority the ultimatum has been delivered to CN, hand delivered by the R.C.M.P. a couple of days ago in Moncton, to have the machines removed from the ships before April 30th. of this year?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman uses the word 'ultimatum'. I suppose it is semantics, but I would call it an information, a direction. It is the advice of the Law Officers of the Crown that the operation of slot machines on those ships in question, and in the area in question, is illegal, is contrary to the Criminal Code, and we are requiring CN to comply with the law.

Now, I can get more details on it for tomorrow. It is some weeks since the last time I reviewed it, but essentially what we are requiring is CN to operate within the law.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. gentleman indicate if there is an opposite point of view from the Law Officers in the Department of Justice in Ottawa? Has this decision of the Province to have these machines removed from the C.N. coastal boats - not the coastal boats, the boats operating between Newfoundland and Nova Scotia - has that decision, that ultimatum, been challenged by the Justice Department or the Attorney General of Canada? The minister probably could answer this for me too when he gets up. Talking about bringing in legislation for licencing, gambling in Newfoundland, what kind of gambling are we talking about? Would it include licencing of slot machines on the ferries operating between Nova Scotia and Newfoundland?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I will take the second one first. No, it would not. For example, the licencing system would not permit us to licence what is illegal per se, you know, that which is illegal, full stop, which may not even be licenced. So licencing would not apply to slot machines, which, in our opinion, is illegal per se. That is our interpretation of the Criminal Code.

The first question the hon. gentleman asked was whether the federal Department of Justice had a contrary opinion. Two comments I would make there. Number one, we have not asked the federal Department of Justice for their opinion. The administration of justice is a provincial responsibility. Obviously, there is a shared jurisdiction. The criminal law is federal, other law is provincial. I am not aware that the federal Department of Justice has expressed any opinion on it, certainly not to us. Now, they may have

MR. OTTENHEIMER: expressed an opinion to somebody else, that I do not know, but not to us.

MR. NEARY: They have. They said it is international law.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I do know that C.N.'s solicitor says that we should not so prohibit. That is C.N.'s solicitor. Now that is a bit different from the federal Department of Justice, as the hon. gentleman is aware. So I am not aware that the federal Department of Justice has expressed any opinion, but certainly not to us. We do know that C.N.'s solicitor is endeavouring to argue the counter point and obviously, he will have his recourse, as do all people, for adjudication by the courts. Everybody has that right.

MR. NEARY: Well, what happens when it goes to the courts?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: The solicitor for C.N. has put up arguments against it, but I am not aware the federal Department of Justice has expressed any opinion, certainly not to the Province.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): I had indicated I would recognize the hon. the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe). If he wishes to yield.

The hon. the member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: A supplementary to the Minister of Justice. As I understand the Criminal Code, gambling, per se, is illegal. What kinds of games of chance are you anticipating licencing under the new legislation?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Under a contemplated licencing

MR. OTTENHEIMER: system which I am sure the hon. gentleman will agree, you know, is fairly complex and we have never had one here but, you know, which is being worked on, which a lot of work has been done on, the Criminal Code does permit the licensing of games of chance for - I think I have the exact wording here, 'charitable or religious purposes or organizations' and, you know there is a fairly broad definition under charitable.

MR. THOMS: Does it include bingo?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Matters of community - no, I am talking about the types of organizations first - matters of you know, community benefit and that type of thing is included under charity, you know, not a strict definition or what one might popularly think of as charity. Matters of community benefit are included under there.

The general purpose of such a system would be regulation so that bona fide religious and charitable organizations could participate in a lawful manner and others, merely for private profit, could not. And games such as bingo would be licensed. There is no provision for licensing slot machines and certain other games of chance as well.

MR. NEARY: If they refuse to take them off the boats?

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

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education. In view of the fact that the NTA feels that the success of the reorganized high school programme will be jeopardized because of lack of resources and completely inadequate teacher allocations for the three years of the revised high school programme, does the minister really feel that her comment that it was good the high school teachers would be challenged and that it was good that they will have some extra work

MR. ROWE: and that they will face the challenge, does she really think that this kind of a statement, Mr. Speaker, from her will make the new high school programme a success in this Province?

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

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, government has made its decision for teacher allocations for kindergarten through Grade XI for the next school year starting in September. I think that allotment provides very well for the needs of those grades and for the start of the Grade X level of the reorganized high school programme. The changes in the regulations made result in 107 extra teaching positions Province-wide than would have been the case otherwise. We are looking at spending over \$200 million dollars on teachers' salaries next year for over 7,900 teachers, compared with the spending of only \$46 million ten years ago.

The allocations of teachers for two years from now and three years from now when the broadening of the curriculum at the high school level and the extra students in Grade XII will be in our schools, have not yet been made. So it is very premature for the NTA or the hon. member or anyone else to express predictions of doom and gloom about the reorganized high school programme. The information that I am getting from the field indicates that the people in the field are quite pleased with what has been allocated for next year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. F. ROWE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary, the hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: The hon. minister did not answer the question, but in view of her public comment about extra work for teachers being good, does the hon. minister feel that teachers are being underworked in this Province at the present time?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, my remark was prefaced by the statement that enough teachers have been allocated for the needs for the next school year. And I think that teachers who are, after all, trained, educated and paid as professionals, welcome the challenge of change and improvement in the curriculum and that those teachers who are doing their job will welcome the challenge of the improvement in the curriculum at the high school level. It will mean extra work, extra preparation gearing up for new courses, but I think that is good.

MR. F. ROWE: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Final supplementary, the hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the minister has subjected the infamous comic books to a piloting project in the Province and the 'Great Newfoundland Race Game' to pilot projects throughout the Province before introduction into the schools to see if they actually fit into the school system or not, does the minister understand why such a horrendous change in the high school programmes such as the revised high school programme with the addition of Grade XII had not itself been subjected to a pilot project before introduction to the schools in the Province?

MR. HISCOCK: Shame, shame.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, the re-organized high



MS. VERGE: school programme has been planned for more than two years. There have been teams and committees of teachers and administrators, representatives of the NTA, the Federation of School Boards, the DEC's, the Parent Teacher Associations as well as the Education Department who have been intimately involved in working out the details.

The change is largely an administrative one featuring a credit system which will begin next year. There will be a broadening of the curriculum, new courses added and then, of course, Grade XII added three years from now. There is general approval and support for the concept and the plan that was finalized in the Fall, and I am confident that it will go ahead and work well in all the high schools of our Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. TULK: I yield.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) wishes to yield.

The hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The minister indicated that the teachers are completely prepared for this new programme. Would the minister care to indicate to the House what particular university courses teachers have taken, for example, from the faculty of education, or from any of the other departments of the university, to train the teachers to teach the new programme and, in fact, the Grade XII programme? What in-service training programmes, if any, have been undertaken and what have been ongoing up to this particular point and where have they been? Have the teachers, in fact, been trained formally -

MR. THOMS: Did you have them look at the comic book?

MR. F. ROWE: - in order to teach the new revised

March 4, 1981

Tape No. 83

SD - 3

MR. F. ROWE: high school programme, and if so,  
is it the university level or is it at a formalized in-service  
training type of a situation?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, the change in the senior high school programme involves a greater time period, there will be an extra grade. Material will be spread over three years rather than two years, with grades ten, eleven and twelve rather than just ten and eleven. There will be new courses added, new programmes added gradually beginning two years from now.

The qualifications to conduct and teach these programmes are similar to those now required. For example, what is needed to teach Chemistry in the reorganized high school programme is really no different from what is required to teach Chemistry now. Teachers are employed by school boards based on their academic qualifications, the courses, programmes, degrees they have received from universities and faculties of education. Their employers, school boards, carry out continuing education or inservice training programmes and the thirty-five school boards across the Province for the past two, three, four months have been involved in inservice training for their administrators and high school teachers to gear up for the start of the reorganized high school programme in September.

The Province is now, and probably will be for a number of years, short in a number of specialist areas. For example, at the moment we do not have enough teachers with specialties in Chemistry, Physics, French, Special Education, Home Economics, Industrial Arts. With the thrust that will be given to these courses with the reorganized high school programme we can expect to see more teachers either training or opting for these specialties in the first place. But basically the requirements to teach the reorganized high school programme are not much different from the requirements at the moment.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That was a good speech.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Forest, Resources and Lands (Mr. Power). It concerns a bill which he tabled in the House the other day, Bill 54. In view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that we have had two or three spray programmes in the Province, and as I understand it the Cabinet now has the power to make a decision whether to spray or not to spray, then the question for the minister is what is the purpose for bringing this piece of legislation before the House at this time?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of introducing a bill in the House is so that you can have debate on the components of that bill and the reason for it, and certainly that will be done in due course.

MR. TULK:

A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

A typical non-answer, Mr. Speaker. A supplementary for the minister, is the minister now saying that he does not have the power to implement a spray programme in this Province?

MR. WARREN:

Answer that one.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, the bill will be debated before the House in due course, as I have said.

MR. TULK:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: A further supplementary just for the record; I do not expect the minister to answer it. Is the minister now telling the people of Newfoundland that there have been spray programmes carried out in this Province illegally without the proper legislation?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Forest, Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER: No.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Mary's-The Capes.

MR. HANCOCK: I yield on a supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Yield. The hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. As I understand it at the present time, and previous to this, the decision whether to spray or not to spray was a decision of Cabinet, Cabinet has made this decision now to spray, but the difference between that and this legislation is that it gives the minister the sole, absolute discretion of whether to spray -

MR. MORGAN: Ask your question.

MR. WARREN: Close your mouth.

MR. THOMS: If the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), Mr. Speaker, would let me ask the question and come down and meet the fishermen in my district -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. THOMS: - who have been requesting it for months -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. THOMS: - then maybe he would do something.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member has a supplementary; he has just a couple of minutes.

March 4, 1981

Tape No. 84

NM -4

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, my question is, why does the minister consider it necessary that he should have full, absolute discretion in whether to spray or not to spray rather than leave it with the Cabinet?

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): Order, please!

MR. WARREN: Sit down! Sit down, boy!

MR. HANCOCK: They are wasting time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): We are all wasting time here.  
There is too much noise.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I would submit that  
a question of this nature is not at this time in order.  
This is a matter that is really on the Order Paper and will  
be debated, as the minister has indicated. As a matter of  
fact, it will be debated tomorrow.

I would refer Your Honour to  
Beauchesne, Page 132 of the 5th Edition, Paragraph 12, which  
says, "Questions should not anticipate a debate scheduled for  
the day, but should be reserved for the debate." And, you  
know, the reason is obvious. I mean, the Question Period is  
for the purpose of eliciting information from the ministry on  
matters of pressing concern and the Question Period should not  
be used for the purpose of asking questions about matters that  
are going to come up in the normal Orders of the Day because  
it is repetition and unnecessary.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, the hon.  
the member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: I would suggest the reason that we  
are not getting the answer to the question is because the  
minister does not know the answer to the question.

MR. SPEAKER: I will reserve my ruling on that  
particular point of order. I did not hear the question.  
We have a minute left. Any further  
questioning?

MR. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. BENNETT: My question, Mr. Speaker, is to  
the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett).

MR. BENNETT: In view of the controversy surrounding the two airport concept in Western Newfoundland, I am wondering what communication, if any, the minister might be having at this time with the President of Eastern Provincial, if he has any communication at this time ongoing with an effort to resolve and retain the services of both airports?

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

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I have had several telephone conversations with Mr. Steele. I have had written correspondence with the gentleman, and but for the fog that you see outside, I probably would have been in Gander right now rather than here in the House. I had planned to meet the gentleman today but could not make it because of the fog so it will be tomorrow or whatever day I can get out of the city.

MR. BENNETT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: There is time for one final supplementary.

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. BENNETT: Well, I have quite a few here so I will probably have to follow up tomorrow, Mr. Speaker.

Does the minister have any indication at this time what airport might be dropped from E.P.A. service? Or in reverse, which airport might be favoured by E.P.A. service?

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

MR. BRETT: No, Mr. Speaker. I do not know which airport the company would like to use. Of course, government contends that they should continue to use both.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has expired.



PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the report submitted to government just a few days ago, or last week, by the Newfoundland Oceans Research and Development Corporation, known as NORDCO, on the Northern cod study.

MR. SPEAKER: Further reports?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, under Section 21 of the C. A. Pippy Park Commission Act, I would like to table the annual report.

MR. SPEAKER: Further reports?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Justice has a report.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Section 18 of the Statutes and Subordinate Legislation Act, I would table the subordinate legislation which has been subordinated since November 21st.

NOTICES OF MOTION

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following Resolution.

WHEREAS the fishery is the largest employer in this Province of Newfoundland and Labrador; and

WHEREAS all the policy decisions affecting this major industry stem largely from one government source, namely, the federal

MR. ANDREWS: government; and  
WHEREAS this industry is so important to our people;  
THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this hon. House most strongly  
urge the federal Government of Canada to share its responsibility  
in the management of this most valuable resource.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Further notices?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I  
will on tomorrow beg leave to present the following Resolution.  
WHEREAS honesty and integrity in government of the public  
service is essential to an upright and honest political system; and  
WHEREAS the present government has recognized the need to  
exemplify a high standard of conduct and morality in public  
affairs and government by proposing a number of  
initiatives including a separate office of the Comptroller  
General, a new Elections Act involving election expenses,  
the strengthening of Conflict of Interest Act to allow for  
the issuance of regulations governing the behaviour of ministers  
and the strengthening of the Civil Service Act governing the  
conduct of civil servants in conflict of interest situations;  
THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED this hon. House commend the government  
for its efforts to strengthen the safeguards surrounding the  
public interest; and  
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this hon. House supports these and  
other actions which may be proposed from time to time to protect  
the public interest and inspire greater confidence in government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Any further notices?

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

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

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to a question which was raised by the Opposition yesterday with respect to a shortage of staff in the Mines Inspection Unit in the Department of Labour and Manpower. I believe it was alleged that we have only one inspector in the division at the present time.

MR. F. STAGG: That is what he said.

MR. J. DINN: I would like to correct that impression, Mr. Speaker, and to inform the House that while we do have vacancies in the staff of the Mines Inspection Unit, in fact we still have three Mines Inspection engineers, two in St. John's and one in Labrador; Roger March, Chief Inspector located in St. John's, Jim Archibald, located in St. John's, and Slavko Cocivic, a regional Mines Inspection engineer at Labrador. In addition to the three Mines Inspection engineers, we have two Mines and Inspection technicians, one in Labrador and one in St. John's.

Mr. Speaker, to allay any fears which the department places on this very important activity, I would like to inform the House that about 1980 we sought and received approval to create an additional position of Mines Inspector. We invited applications both provincially and nationally for a vacant position through the normal channels and on three separate occasions failed to receive any qualified applicants. In fact, the last time it was advertised nobody applied.

MR. FLIGHT: Why? Why?

MR. J. DINN: To compound the difficulties with staffing during 1980, two of the inspectors resigned to take up positions in the Department of Mines and Energy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Speaker, the Public Service Commission is currently conducting recruitment action to fill the three vacant positions of Mines Inspection Engineer. We are now advertising again both provincially and nationally.

Mr. Speaker, although there are vacancies in the staff of our Mines Inspection Unit, no problems have been encountered up to this time. The two Mines Inspection engineers located in St. John's as well as the one located in Labrador West are available at any time for deployment to any mining area where any difficulty or dangerous practice may be perceived.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Any further Answers to Questions?

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. E. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of the residents of Red Bay, Labrador in the Straits of Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

Periodically there are points that are raised and the Chair is asked to rule on them and it is very difficult when members are carrying on loud conversations across the House. I would ask them to dispense with that.

The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. E. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of the residents of Red Bay in the Straits of Labrador from L'Anse au Clair to Red Bay. This is the community that is sixty miles down from the border of Quebec. It is also the site of the Basques whaling ship that has been found there as well as a lucrative fishing industry. Red Bay, particularly because of the twisting road from Pinware to Red Bay, is often cut off from other parts of Labrador - L'Anse au Loup, West St. Modeste, Pinware area. For example, last Fall they were cut off for two or three days, Last year they were blocked with snow for over a week or more, and as a result of washouts in the Spring and in the Fall and because of the snowstorms. So therefore they do not have a nurse in Red Bay and it is very important that the re-construction of the road takes place in the Straits area from L'Anse au Clair to Red Bay.

The people in Red Bay also feel that if this road is going to be started it should be started from both ends. The worst part of the road is from Pinware to Red Bay.

I support this petition and I hope that the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) and the government, who are responsible for deciding where the road will start from, will also support this petition. These people, the 104 people who have signed this petition are calling upon the government and saying, 'Whereas we, the residents of Red Bay in the Straits of Labrador from L'Anse au Clair to Red Bay, call upon the provincial and federal governments 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 have been used as a political football between both governments and we want an end to it. We have waiting over three years for the signing of this agreement and we cannot go another

MR. E. HISCOCK: Spring without having the road re-constructed and paved."

Mr. Speaker, it is extremely important that this agreement be signed. The Premier mentioned yesterday that he was willing to go and meet with the Minister of DREE (Mr. De Bane) at any time, that he proposed to be trying to get a meeting for March 13th. But again, neither

MR. HISCOCK: the Premier, nor the government has stated publicly that they are willing to accept the terms of the agreement laid down by the federal government, that the federal and the provincial governments have -

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

MR. HISCOCK: - sat down and negotiated.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member is beginning to enter into debate. He should confine himself to the prayer of the petition only, and the number of signatures attached to it.

MR. HISCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Hopefully, Mr. Speaker, this agreement will be signed and both governments will sit down face to face and negotiate the terms of the agreement and sign it so that we can get this road constructed, from L'Anse au Clair to Red Bay, and have a start in Red Bay going to L'Anse au Clair. Thank you.

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

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the petition presented by the hon. member on behalf of the residents of Red Bay.

If I had a copy of yesterday's Hansard, I suppose I could read it and read what the Premier said, because I can only repeat what the Premier said yesterday. There is no question that that is the worst section. That section from Pinware to Red Bay, that is the worst section of the Trans Labrador Highway, and it is the section that is obviously going to cost the most money.

MR. HISCOCK: Are you going to start in Red Bay?

MR. BRETT: There is no decision made by the department, by my department, where we would start. I do not know if we will start in the middle and work both ways, or if we will start on the Blanc Sablon end, or Red Bay. And there is no decision because we do not have an agreement with the federal government.

I have never seen any agreement. I have heard rumours that the federal government are making an offer, and the rumours that I have heard, the offer is a good one, and I have no doubt that the government will accept it. We have been ready. The petition presented today, and the one presented yesterday, indicated that these people have been waiting for three years. That is true. And so has the provincial government been waiting for three years. We have had our share of the money in place and we are ready to start tomorrow morning, just as soon as we get the agreement.

It is a very costly project and it would be - if the provincial government were to do that job on its own, then it would probably take ten or fifteen years to do it. So, obviously, we must have an agreement with the federal government. If we make any start at all, then, as the hon. member knows, we will never get an agreement.

I support the petition. And I can assure the hon. member that we have not been using the residents up there as a political football, we have been ready and willing to go and we still are.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I cannot let that pass without commenting and supporting the petition.

This government that is so



MR. STIRLING: concerned about our rights under the constitution, that road is completely a provincial responsibility—under the old constitution, under the new constitution. And I heard this minister, on radio, saying that he would not agree to a fifty/fifty contribution on that road, something that is a 100 per cent provincial responsibility under the constitution. This government that is so concerned about protecting their interests under the constitution and getting their concerns under the constitution, it is the responsibility of this Province to do that job.

MR. WARREN: It is a political football.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: The responsibility of this government is to do that road.

MR. WARREN: Right on!

MR. STIRLING: The responsibility is to make sure that the people on the Labrador coast are treated the same as the people in the minister's own district, or any other part of the Island. And it is a cop-out, Mr. Speaker. You cannot have it both ways. The prayer of the petition is for the government to get on with the job.

Now, they have refused a fifty/fifty kind of arrangement. Mr. Speaker, to this moment this minister has taken the same position on this road as he has on the causeway in my own district. He has not stated a dollar sum that they are prepared to put into that road. They have not publicly staked -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: And I would yield to allow the minister to give a dollar figure. I yield, right now.

MR. BRETT:

A point of order, Mr.

Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER(Simms):

The hon. the Minister of

Transportation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BRETT:

I am not suggesting that

the hon. the member is misleading the House, or that the hon. member is lying, I am not suggesting anything of that nature, but the hon. member is aware of a meeting in his office with the MP who represents his district, and the hon. member.

MR. BRETT: is also aware that very shortly after that meeting a letter was forwarded to Ottawa, and included in that letter were dollars and cents outlining to Mr. Pepin, the federal minister, exactly where we stood, what we would accept. The offer was put forward by the M.P. for that area. And a letter has gone out, and the hon. member knows it. So I would suggest that the hon. member to be very careful what he is saying.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please!

I believe have heard enough to know that it is not a point of order, and I am ready to rule that it is not a point of order. It is obviously a difference of opinion.

It also points out my own concern, that during the presenting of petitions no debate is allowed. And it appears that yesterday and again today there has been a fair bit of debate that should not have been permitted. And I would remind hon. members of this particular matter that is being discussed. There is a Private Member's motion on the Order Paper that will allow all hon. members to debate that matter when it comes up later on in the session.

I would ask hon. members speaking to petitions again to confine themselves to the prayer of the petition and the number of signatures attached.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. Leader wish to forego his time now, because it comes out of his time in response to the petition? Do you wish to do that or present your point of privilege? It is up to yourself

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I will use the opportunity now given me because I had yielded to the minister to deal with that specific case, and he decided to deal with the point of order.

Mr. Speaker, dealing with this specific petition and supporting the specific petition, the minister has not stood on his feet in this House and told us specifically how many dollars he is prepared to put up in support of that specific petition.

MR. WARREN: That highway, that highway. Right on.

MR. STIRLING: While I am here, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the minister stop playing games and that he speaks strictly to the point of the petition which asks that a decision be made and a commitment be made. And what the minister has said is we are not expecting to get any money, so we have not made any commitment about how we are going to start it, when we are going to start it. If they had taken the ten years to build what he has been asked, they would not be in this state now of saying we have to wait for Ottawa.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. President of the Council on a point of order?

MR. MARSHALL: No, on the point of privilege that the hon. member-

MR. SPEAKER: A point of privilege?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: There is no point of privilege.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

It was not my understanding that the hon. Leader of the Opposition was on a point of privilege, but rather he was concluding his remarks.

MR. MARSHALL: I thought he was speaking, Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, but I rise now on a point of order: then.

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

MR. MARSHALL: I will just briefly state the point of order, that Your Honour made a ruling with respect to the debate on petitions. And after Your Honour made the ruling, I say with respect with to the Leader of the Opposition, that he continued on in the same refrain on this matter, not-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: What I am saying is that I am rising on the point of order what the hon. gentleman said. The hon. gentleman then continued on in exactly the same bent and exactly the same line. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the House cannot really revolve or the House cannot work properly if when Your Honour makes a ruling, Your Honour's ruling is either flagrantly ignored or challenged. And this is in effect what - I know the hon. gentleman was not intending to do it, but that is the effect of what he has done.

MR. SPEAKER: With respect to the point of order, I would like to take it as notice and give some comments on it perhaps at tomorrow's sitting, because it is a matter that is concerning me as well.

Any further petitions?

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege now, so that the President can say something.

The Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) on a point of order came dangerously close - and you will have to check Hansard to find out if he was

MR. STIRLING: suggesting or implying that I was misleading. Now I would challenge, Mr. Speaker, to clear up this question of privilege, that the minister actually table the letter that he referred to, because I cannot prove anything unless he tables the letter. And you will find when he tables the letter that he did not specify what his government would put up. What he said in the letter was that 'we would look favourably on such a response from the federal government.' They have not in that letter specifically said that this Province is prepared to spend X number of dollars. And he has suggested, because he has the letter, Mr. Speaker, that I was either misleading or-

MR. FLIGHT: Lying.

MR. STIRLING: - maybe lying. I do not have the letter, so on a point of privilege I would challenge the minister to table the letter so that all members will then be able to judge.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): With the greatest of respect, it is not a point of privilege to request that a letter be tabled, and I would rule again that in this case there is no prima facie case but a difference of opinion.

Also it is four o'clock and

Standing Order 53 indicates that the Chair must call the Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

So this being Private Member's Day and under Standing Order 53 I call motion No. 48 moved by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary).

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; and

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

WHEREAS most of the factors involved in determining the cost of living fall under Provincial jurisdiction;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House set up a Select Committee to examine into all aspects of inflation and prepare recommendations to how the Government should proceed to cope with these matters.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I hope in the twenty minutes, the time allotted to me in this debate—twenty minutes, by the way, is not long enough to do justice to the number one problem in Newfoundland today, namely the high cost of living and inflation. You would need, Mr. Speaker, more than twenty minutes to talk about the reasons and make recommendations to help cope with the high cost of living in this Province, so I will try to do the best I can in the twenty minutes that I have at my disposal and I hope to convince hon. members on both sides of the House to vote for this resolution because as I said, Mr. Speaker, inflation and the high cost of living is the greatest curse in our society today. It is the biggest problem confronting the people of Newfoundland and Labrador today. It is the number one problem in the nation and in this Province.

And, Mr. Speaker, the disappointing part of it is that the Throne Speech which outlined government's policy made no reference whatsoever to the high cost of living in this Province—the highest cost, the highest inflation rate in the whole of Canada. Last year, Mr. Speaker, last year it cost Newfoundlanders to buy a nutritious food basket for a family of four. In this Province, it cost \$80.31 for a family of four to buy a nutritious food basket. I might point out,

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is just for food alone. And that is more than some of the staff at the College of Trades and Technology earn, that is more than they earn. If they took their whole paycheque and spent it on this nutritious food basket that cost \$80.31 in this Province, they would not be able to buy one other thing. And that is why, Mr. Speaker, today I am wearing the button of NAPE, the NAPE button and I am proud to wear it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: The inflation rate, the inflation rate in this Province, Mr. Speaker, in 1980 was 11.7 per cent, the highest in Canada. In Vancouver, Mr. Speaker, in Vancouver the rate of inflation was 9.4 per cent, in Edmonton it was 10.1 per cent, Winnipeg, 10.0 per cent, in Toronto 10.1 per cent, in Montreal 10.3 per cent, in Halifax 10.7 per cent and in St. John's Newfoundland 11.7 per cent, the highest in the nation.

At least the strikers, at least the employees in the Public Service should be given the equivalent of the rate of inflation. What they have been offered is almost three percentage points—it is more; it is 3.7 percentage points below the rate of inflation in this Province and they have my sympathy and I pray to God that they will be able to hold out until they win the battle.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of reasons why the cost of living is high in Newfoundland. Back in 1974, Beryl Plumtree wrote a report called The Food Prices Review Board Report. It was presented to the Provincial Government in 1974, to the Tory Government, and it has been put on the shelf ever since in Confederation Building to gather dust. Not one of the recommendations - yes, I am sorry, one of the recommendations



MR. NEARY: was carried out, and then the government backed off of it. One of the recommendations of this report was to set up a separate department of Consumer Affairs in this Province. The government did it, put a weak-kneed minister in charge of the department and then, Mr. Speaker, lo and behold, last year dismantled the department and tossed the Department of Consumer Affairs in with another government department. What a backward step, Mr. Speaker. That will show you how interested they are in the problems of the consumers of this Province.

All they know how to talk about is oil and gas, and in the process of talking about this oil and gas, Mr. Speaker, they have compounded the problem of inflation in this Province because their oil boom syndrome has driven up the cost of living in Newfoundland and Labrador. It was high enough as it was, but since they started all

MR. NEARY:

their chaw about oil and gas, rents have gone up, the cost of homes has gone up, the cost of living has gone up. And if you do not believe me, Mr. Speaker, I can tell the House that only today I had a call from the occupants, from the tenants down in Regency Towers, down here at the Boulevard. And I had a call last week from another group of tenants in Green Wood Trailer Court. Regency Towers, which is owned by the former Tory bagman down here at the Boulevard, sent an ultimatum today to his tenants to vacate the premises - eighty people - eighty-one, I think. There are more than eighty people. I think there are over eighty tenants in that apartment building, some have two room apartments, some have one room apartments. And they have been ordered out. And the same thing has happened at Green Wood Trailer Court. The people in there have been told they are going to have to pay more rent, a higher rental on their land, and if they do not like it, get out!

And you know, Mr. Speaker, what is causing this is the oil boom syndrome, all the chaw this crowd have about oil. The mainland moneybags, the speculators and the moneybags -

MR. MORGAN:

You hate fish, anyway.

MR. NEARY:

Ah, they are not interested in fish, only oil. The mainland speculators, and the moneybags are coming into Newfoundland and buying up these premises, buying up these buildings, these apartment buildings, buying them up and then they are turning around and increasing the rents and ordering the tenants out. And down here at Regency Towers, Mr. Speaker, the tenants are mostly senior citizens. And I say shame on the government if they allow this to happen.

MR. NEARY: That is not the only case. These buildings, these apartment buildings are trading hands just like you would change hands in a bridge game. I think the government should put a freeze on rentals in this city, put a freeze on until things stabilize and level off. So that is one of the reasons why we have such a high increase in the cost of living in this Province, Mr. Speaker, it is all the chaw and all the talk and all the lip about oil.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Government of Canada. I want to congratulate the Government of Canada for the brave decision that they have taken in two instances within the last week. The Government of Canada, which is condemned by the Tories in this Province, just told the people of Canada and the people of Newfoundland that they are going to have an investigation under the Combines Act into the big oil companies for price fixing. The Government of Canada have evidence. And I have been saying that, and we have been saying that in this House for the last fifteen years, that the big oil companies were getting together in their board-rooms, and in hotel rooms, and they were fixing the price of heating oil and gasoline and fuel.

Now the federal government, Mr. Speaker, have taken the bull by the horns and I want to congratulate them publicly today for this brave step that they have taken to take on the giants of the world, to take on the oil companies that have defeated governments in other parts of the world, take on the big oil companies and have them investigated for price fixing. A step in the right direction to try to do something about the high cost of living.

And I would also like to congratulate, Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada for

MR. NEARY: taking on Alberta.

There is a question that is misunderstood.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) months

ago.

MR. NEARY: Ah, listen to the minister.

Let me say this to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr.Morgan),

Mr. Speaker, that this is the only part of the world,

the only oil producing country in the world where you

have a Tory government here in this Province

MR. S. NEARY:

that wants Alberta to charge world prices for its oil, to charge Canadians world prices for its oil. In every oil producing country in the world there are two prices for oil; one for export and one for the residents of that country. But our Tory government here and Mr. Lougheed want to charge Canadians world prices, and if he was allowed to do that the cost yesterday that went on the pumps would be a lot more than two cents. Again, I have to congratulate the Government of Canada for trying to hold down the price of heating fuel, gasoline and fuel in this country. And what does this crowd here do? Do they come to the rescue of the consumer in this Province? No, Mr. Speaker, they sock it to them on ever increasing electricity rates and they support Mr. Lougheed in his attempt to charge consumers in this Province world prices, the same price to Newfoundlanders as you charge for exporting a gallon of oil and, Mr. Speaker, that is not good enough. And I am surprised the press has not picked that up and not allowed the Tories in this Province to muddy up the water because that is the truth of it, that is the long and short of it.

And another congratulations I want to fling out today, Mr. Speaker, is to the longshoremen in the city of St. John's who are struggling for survival down there on the waterfront -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. NEARY: - who get no support from this Tory government, who are trying to get a refrigerated warehouse, a distribution centre established down here on the Finger Pier in Building No. 1, a warehouse that could hold perishables to be distributed to stores and distributors around this part of Newfoundland, being completely ignored by the Tory government of this Province.

I want to congratulate CN -

MR. ANDREWS:

Why are you not in Ottawa?

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate Canadian National on taking the gigantic step of getting into containerization, of getting into the container business in this Province. Yesterday, I understand, a meeting was held with the officials of the provincial government, CN came down to tell the provincial government - not to ask them, to tell them - that they are getting into containerization. They are trying to re-vitalize the railway and they are going to bring containers across to Port aux Basque.

MR. MORGAN: They are forcing the companies to go bankrupt.

MR. NEARY: Ah, force what companies? The shipping companies?

MR. MORGAN: The private sector.

MR. NEARY: Oh, listen to this, Mr. Speaker, listen to Newfoundland shipping's buddy, listen to Clarke Steamship's shipping buddy, listen to Crosbie's shipping buddy, who just merged recently and formed a monopoly in this Province so they can sock it further to the consumer and drive up the cost of living in this Province, got together, merged to try to grab the subsidy that was going to Newfoundland Steamship and to Clarke Steamship. Crosbie's wanted to get aboard the bandwagon so the three companies have merged, Mr. Speaker, to form a monopoly. And what does this government do about it? What did John Crosbie do about it - old chaw mouth up in Ottawa, bully boy? What did he do about it? What did this crowd here do about it? Oh, no, they are their buddies, they are not going to touch that, they are not going to have anything to say about that. They are going to allow the monopoly to proceed so that these three companies can get together and sock it to the consumer of this Province. And now CN is going to try to put an end to that. CN are going to try to re-vitalize the railway and they are going to bring in

MR. NEARY: containers and bring them across the Gulf in what they call massies and put them aboard -

MR. MORGAN: They are forcing them into bankruptcy.

MR. NEARY: - CN Rail, put them aboard and drop them off at Bishop Falls, Corner Brook and St. John's. They will be loaded on with cranes in Port aux Basques, off loaded with mobile cranes at these centres that I just mentioned. And this has not even been announced yet, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett)-who is sitting on this; who knows that this is good news from Ottawa - did not come into the House today and make a Ministerial Statement about that even though a meeting was held in his office yesterday with his officials - and I am announcing it today.

MR. NEARY: And they will be dropping off these containers, they will be using cranes to drop off these containers and I hope, Mr. Speaker, that that will lead to a downward trend in the cost of living in this Province.

But, Mr. Speaker, let me say this, I only have about three or four minutes left, let me say this, Mr. Speaker, I wish I had more time to talk on this subject.

MR. STIRLING: By leave. By leave.

MR. NEARY: But I would say the reason that people are taking so many tranquilizers today, the reason that we have so much sickness today, the reason we have so much crime today, the reason we have so many family break-ups today, is because people are unable to cope with the high cost of living and inflation in this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: And this government does not think it worth its while, they do not think it worth their while, Mr. Speaker, to even mention it in the Throne Speech. They are so preoccupied with oil and gas, they are so preoccupied with the constitution-and you cannot put that in the oven for Sunday dinner; and by the end of this year, by Christmas the Premier of this Province, along with six other premiers of Canada, or seven other premiers of Canada, will regret that he ever heard anything about a constitution. It will be embarrassing for him to bring it up. And instead of wasting money on extravagance and waste, on comic books, and lawyers and the likes of what we heard today from the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) - another lawyer to have an enquiry into women in the work force - instead of wasting their money on that sort of thing, Mr. Speaker, on extravagance and waste they should be trying to do something about the high cost of living



MR. NEARY: in this Province and help out the poor old public servants -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: - by using the countervailing savings that they would save instead of implementing these ridiculous programmes and pay the civil servants over in the College of Trades and down at the Workmen's Compensation Board a living wage.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is amusing, as he usually is, but it does not really, in effect, have any real impact on the problem at hand. Now the resolution before the House, which is a resolution that brings out very realistic concerns, is the effect of inflation and it asks for a select committee to examine into all aspects of inflation and prepare recommendations as to how the government should proceed to cope with these matters.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if there is a select committee of this House you have a select committee for a purpose. You have a select committee to look into the causes of inflation, and also it would be presumed that this select committee should make certain recommendations to this government for this government to take such steps as may be possible to curb the high inflation and the high cost of living.

Now in order for the committee to make recommendations to this government it is obviously pointless for the committee to make any recommendations unless the government had it within its power to do something and to act on the recommendations that were made by the select committee. And in this, even though the resolution raises matters that are of concern and valid concerns for the people, realistic concerns for the people of this Province, the instrument of a select committee,

MR. MARSHALL:

which presupposes that this Province has the power to act in these matters, is not really effective.

The hon. gentleman says in his resolution, he says in his resolutions, and this is where he brings in the political aspect of it but where at the same time it points out the falacy of the resolution itself, he says, "Whereas most of the factors involved in determining the cost of living fall under provincial jurisdiction." Now let me say, Mr. Speaker, that the cause of inflation in this country and in this Province, you have to ask yourself who has - what are the causes of inflation, and which government is the most appropriate instrument and has the power to deal with it?

Now one of the obvious causes of inflation in the Country and in this Province is the supply of money, is the monetary supply. If there is more money in circulation, this is one of the principle and prime factors in the cost of goods and services

MR. MARSHALL:

and in the prices. And there is no doubt as to who has jurisdiction with respect to the supply of money, that is, the federal government. One of the prime causes of inflation in this country over the past number of years has been that in order to fund the gigantic governmental expenditures that have been made for the purpose of perpetrating the present federal government in power, that the federal government has resorted to its power to increase the supply of money.

MR. BARRY: Did not the Auditor General say that spending was out of control?

MR. MARSHALL: The Auditor General has time after time, as the hon. minister has reminded me, said that their spending has been out of control. And the spending has been out of control - let us not look at it for any altruistic reasons or that - the spending has been out of control in order to keep them in power. And the way in which they have been able to spend, one of the machineries has been increasing the supply of money.

What are other factors besides the supply of money? What about interest rates? The hon. gentleman has mentioned about the cost of housing. There is no doubt that the cost of housing is a matter of deep, deep concern to this government. But what is one of the prime reasons for the high cost of housing? It is the interest rates.

Interest rates have accelerated from 7 per cent to 8 per cent. Twelve or fourteen years ago, 8 per cent was looked at as almost like a usurers rate. Then it crept up to 10 per cent, 11 per cent, 12 per cent, and now, God help us, the interest rate on a house is about 18 per cent or 19 per cent so that today, young people in this Province, and not only in this Province, throughout Canada, cannot afford basic housing accommodation. And the reason they cannot is because of the high interest rates; \$500 or \$600 or \$700 a month

MR. MARSHALL: is the order of the day for the most basic housing accommodation. And who has control of the interest rates, Mr. Speaker? Does the provincial government have control of the interest rates?

MR. NEARY: They can control rents.

MR. MARSHALL: I will tell you who has control. I will get on to the hon. gentleman afterwards, his comments, because the hon. gentleman spoke for twenty minutes and I can deal with his comments in about half a minute. So if he will bear with me, I will deal with his comments towards the end.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: As far as the interest rates are concerned, Mr. Speaker, who has control of those? The entity which has control of the interest rates in the Canadian nation is the Bank of Canada. The Bank of Canada comes under the complete jurisdiction of the federal government. As a matter of fact, the Governor of the Bank of Canada sets the interest rate from time to time, now weekly, in consultation with the Minister of Finance of Canada.

What other causes, Mr. Speaker, of inflation? And as I say, I do not derogate in any way the concerns because they are very oppressive concerns to every person in this Province and they are a matter of deep and abiding concern to this Province.

But who has control over inflation? One of the biggest elements in the high inflation over the past number of years have been oil prices. Who has control over the oil prices? The entity is quite obvious in the debate which is going on in the country today that it is the federal government which has the control over the oil prices. It happens to delude people by saying that 'We will keep the price of the tank down a certain portion.' But at the same time they sock it on with not just income tax, they have to pay the going price in effect

MR. MARSHALL: for oil because they have to import oil. Okay, so they import it. How do they pay? If they do not get it at the tank they have to get it somewhere. Where do they get it? Obviously, they have to get it from taxes. Certainly, income tax takes a certain amount of this, but there are other taxes which increase the price of commodities and goods, such as excise taxes and indirect taxes which the federal government presently levies.

Now, in this Province, one of the major concerns of the major elements in the cost of living in this Province is transportation. Now, who has the responsibility for transportation? It is obviously the federal government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no!

MR. MARSHALL: Yes, the federal government has the responsibility through its transportation policies. The subsidies that were previously paid - the hon. member made a statement to the effect that our cost of living was higher than the costs of living in other provinces, and I say,

MR. MARSHALL: Yes, so it is. And one of the major reasons is because of the high cost of transportation in this Province for goods and services coming in from the rest of Canada and from the rest of the world, and this is the responsibility of the Federal Government.

The Federal Government has responsibility, Mr. Speaker, for tariffs as well, tariff policies. All of these, Mr. Speaker—I wonder if I could have a glass of water. I am waxing eloquently here and I want to use my time. Would you get me a glass of water.

Tariffs are a big factor in this, Mr. Speaker, as well.

So the hon. member wants, in effect, a Select Committee set up in this House to examine into areas of responsibility of the Federal Government and, in effect, make recommendations. Now, how effective would a Select Committee be in this House to make representations to the Federal Government about what the Federal Government should do and what the Federal Government has not done in the past? That is the motion that is before the House. That is the motion which we are asked to consider. And we do not believe, the government does not believe that this is the effective way to handle it from a Provincial point of view.

As far as the government is concerned on inflation and the cost of living, it has done everything it possibly can, Mr. Speaker, it has taken many measures.

I suppose the biggest concern to us is the cost of food and bearing this in mind the government has—and particularly the divergence in the cost of food amongst the various sections of the Province— as hon. members know, the government has instituted in the Consumer Affairs division of the government, a process whereby the relative prices of food throughout the

MR. MARSHALL: Province are reported on a periodic basis and are made public. We are in the process of considering, Mr. Speaker, the findings that have been made, and we have found that this reporting system has had an effect. It has had a certain effect in certain areas whereby it has resulted in the downward de-escalation of prices. So that is something we have done, something we are going to continue to do.

The hon. member has mentioned about rentals. The information will be available very shortly. The hon. gentleman can -

This is an open government, a completely open government and a free government -

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: - as contrasted to the first twenty years of Confederation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: So, Mr. Speaker, that is one, I think, real effective area in which we are operating. Another effective area - the hon. gentleman mentioned about rentals and the high cost of rentals and the high cost of housing itself. Well, the high cost of rentals, first of all, I would say, right now is directly linked, directly linked in a very, very real way to the high interest costs in this country and there is nobody that can deny that. Rentals have gone up everywhere and the prime reason has been the carrying charges, the interest charges. But we are doing all we can, Mr. Speaker. We have established a Residential Tenancy Board in this Province, Residential Tenancy Boards, as a matter of fact, in all areas of the Province which are charged with looking after the interests, primarily of tenants, of looking

MR. MARSHALL: into their complaints, of seeing within the ambit of the present day economy that the tenants get a reasonable and fair deal with respect to their rentals. So the government has taken that step.

This government has also been one of the leaders in Canada, Mr. Speaker, in its Consumer Affairs legislation -

MR. HISCOCK: They destroyed the department. Did away with the department.

MR. MARSHALL: It is not whether the - the department is not destroyed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no!

MR. MARSHALL: The actions of the Consumer Affairs Division are just as effective right now as the actions of the Consumer Affairs were last year or the year before, just as effective and will remain so.

The hon. gentleman is operating under a misapprehension when he thinks that there has to be a department of something in order for a matter to be discharged, in order for a concern to be addressed and if there is not a department the concern will not be addressed. The concerns are addressed by government. Whether or not there is a department is just merely a matter of organization and how it is done.



MR. W. MARSHALL: So that is the situation, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman, the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), when he was addressing this matter - I do not think I really need to go through what he said, I mean he was obviously, you know, speaking to the galleries, as it were, he was not addressing the point - I do not think he once mentioned a select committee. He introduced the measure before this House to have a select committee and I do not think he mentioned the words 'select committee' once when he was speaking. He did not even address himself to his own motion.

The fact of the matter is, what he wants in this motion, Mr. Speaker, is a select committee to look into matters which are primarily and principally within the jurisdiction of the federal government. It is - number one, I would not expect any Legislature to have a select committee to look into matters which are the responsibility of another jurisdiction. We have already had to shoulder many of these responsibilities, Mr. Speaker, such as the dockyard in St. John's. He mentioned CNR fondly. Make no wonder he would mention CNR fondly and the federal government. We have already had to, as I say, assume certain basic responsibilities of the federal government within the Province of Newfoundland and we are not about, Mr. Speaker, to assume the responsibilities of the federal government, the government of all of Canada. When we get Newfoundland on the plane which it should be, on a firm foundation to which it is being directed and which it is going, maybe we will look at our brother Canadians and see what we can do. If they want to be governed from St. John's rather than from Ottawa we will be quite pleased to do it.

MR. W. MARSHALL: But in the meantime, Mr. Speaker, these are concerns for the federal government and they are very real concerns for the federal government and they should be addressed. The hon. gentlemen have the where-withall to do it. They have their five fine fellows sitting in the backbenches - or one in the front bench and four on the backbenches in Ottawa - they have them sitting up there not saying a word with respect to the interests of the people of Newfoundland on offshore, on the transmission of oil and on fishery matters. So perhaps they might like to take their resolution, Mr. Speaker, and bring it up to one of their members in Ottawa and get them to introduce it on the floor of the House of Commons in Ottawa and ask the Government of Canada to recognize the fact that our cost of living is very high and for the Parliament of Canada to appoint a select committee to look into the high cost of inflation and in particular the higher cost of living that pertains in the Province of Newfoundland.

So if the hon. gentlemen wish to do a service to the people of Newfoundland, if they wish this resolution to be effective, I would suggest that they should go to their friends in Ottawa -

MR. L. THOMS: Why did you not do it when Joe Clark was in power?

MR. W. MARSHALL: We went very effectively when Mr. Clark was in Ottawa, Mr. Speaker.

MR. L. THOMS: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. W. MARSHALL: What we did then, if the hon. member will recall, was we went to Ottawa and we got our basic natural rights on the offshore with the hon. gentlemen opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. MARSHALL: What we did also, Mr. Speaker, is we went to Ottawa and we stood for Newfoundland, no matter of the fact that there were colleagues in our own party, and we took our position up there with respect to the Northern cod stock on the part of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. MARSHALL: So if the hon. gentlemen want to stand up for Newfoundlanders and for Newfoundland, they will take these concerns as well as the other concerns to their five silent friends in Ottawa and see if they can get them motivated. If they do that, Mr. Speaker, we would be much farther ahead.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W. MARSHALL: Now, I only have about a half a minute remaining, I believe, so I shall now proceed to

MR. MARSHALL:

deal with the remarks by - now, can you imagine a person introducing a motion in this House to appoint a select committee, getting up and speaking for twenty minutes and not even mentioning the select committee? He is not interested in a select committee, he is not interested in the prices, he just wants to make cheap little political points.

MR. HISCOCK: Shame!

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman, when he got up, he said nothing really that requires an answer. He did applaud the longshoremen for their pressure for the freezer down on the dock. Here again he could take that up with the federal government and his friends at Canadian National.

MR. AYLWARD: What about the synchrolift and the National Harbours Board?

MR. MARSHALL: I mentioned the synchrolift, the dockyard down there. They could take that at the same time. He talks about the container - how inconsistent - the containerization and applauds CN for the containerization. He says the freezers are what the longshore - he applauds the longshoremen and does not realize that what the containerization is going to do is cancel out the longshoremen. So here again he is inconsistent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: I have nothing further, Mr. Speaker, to add except to say that this is a motion for a select committee of this House to enquire into matters that are not the responsibility of this House, they are the responsibility of the Parliament of Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: For this reason we will vote against it. If the hon. gentlemen wish to amend their

MR. MARSHALL: motion to provide that we pass a motion to the effect that we request the Minister of National Revenue in Ottawa and his four colleagues to pass a similar motion, or to present a similar motion to the House of Commons in Ottawa, we would certainly consider it. Because that is the place, Mr. Speaker, where this motion should be. It is a matter of grave concern, inflation, the high cost of living. This government is grappling with it within its means, through its food prices review in the various parts of the Province, through its tenancy legislation, through the Consumer Affairs Acts, as I say, which are second to none in Canada and are very, very effective.

But the hon. gentlemen there opposite do not seem to understand that the causes of inflation are obviously the monetary supply, they are obviously the interest rates, they are obviously transportation costs and the other concerns as well that I have mentioned: The supply of money, interest rates, of course, the oil prices, tariffs, transportation, these are concerns and these are concerns of the federal government.

And it is all very well for the hon. member to get up and make a humorous speech, as he does from time to time, he is full of humour, Mr. Speaker, but when he gets up he is not making real sense. Because the fact of the matter is, if the hon. gentlemen there opposite really wanted to do a service to the Province of Newfoundland, I say they would take this resolution, they would give it to their five friends who will not support Newfoundland on ownership of the offshore, who will not support Newfoundland on the transmission of power, will not support Newfoundland on

MR. MARSHALL: on fisheries, who will not support Newfoundland on the synchrolift, they will bring the resolution to them, they will say to them; 'Now, gentlemen, we would appreciate it if you woke up. Here is a resolution that has been expertly drafted by the Dean of the House of Assembly in Newfoundland, we suggest you substitute the words 'House of Commons' for the 'Legislature of this Province' and you add words, 'That you look into inflation with particular reference to the higher inflation in Newfoundland'. If he does that he will be doing a service to this Province, and to his country, but he does nothing by this resolution, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an honour to be able to follow the Minister of the Privy Council, because he did say in his closing remarks that there was not much sense made by the member who introduced the resolution.

Well, I would like to tell the hon. member that I have a little girl home five years old who has much more common sense, and can show much more common sense than he has shown in this House today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: Is she adopted?

MR. WARREN: Yes, she is. And I am not ashamed of that either.

MR. BARRY: I am sorry, I did not know.

MR. WARREN: Okay?

MR. LUSH: You have put your foot in your mouth again.

MR. WARREN: That is what happens when a guy says something.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, when the hon. -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

Order, please!

I am having difficulty

hearing the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

When the hon. member for

LaPoile (Mr. Neary) introduced this resolution, I believed that he had every reason to do so. Because for the last seventeen or eighteen months this government have been taking the bread off the people's plates. This is what this government has been doing, my friends, they have taken the bread and the butter from the plates of the Newfoundland people.

MR. WARREN: Now, Mr. Speaker, just to explain that, here we have the NAPE employees, employees of this provincial government, and some of them are living on less than a person on welfare can get. You have some eighty or ninety employees living in Labrador receiving Northern allowance less than even a town council can give them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to go back to what the Minister of the Privy Council said. He said, 'this government' - the President of the Privy Council - he said, 'this government is concerned'. Okay. Here this government operates five retail stores in Northern Labrador. I want to give you an example of how concerned they are for the average human being. In 1978 - I am just going to give you one example, and this will show the concern of this government - in 1978 they sent in a shipment of vegetable soup. It went into the stores in Northern Labrador and it was selling to the customer for twenty-four cents a tin in 1977 - I am sorry, 1977.

Now, all that vegetable soup did not sell the first year. They sent in too much soup. The next year it did not sell. So now that vegetable soup, which is three and a half years old, this government is selling to the consumer for fifty-one cents a tin.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. WARREN: Now, that is what you call government concern for the average human being.

MR. NEARY: That is compassion for you.



MR. WARREN: Now that is compassion. That is a government that have put up the price of the vegetable soup to about 120 per cent instead of reducing it, and the soup has been there for the last three or four years. Now this is what you would call a government with compassion.

Mr. Speaker, I agree that we should have a select committee set up on the price structure and the consumer affairs of this Province. Let us look at the oil prices along the Labrador Coast. Let us look at the oil prices. The oil prices along the Labrador Coast: \$1.30 in Nain; \$1.49 in Rigolet; \$1.79 or \$1.69 in Mary's Harbour and so on. The prices fluctate and still and all it is bought from the same oil companies. So, Mr. Speaker, I think we need a select committee. At least the price of fuel oil and gasoline should be stabilized.

MR. STAGG: That would not be Mr. Woodward raising the prices like that, would it?

MR. WARREN: No, Sir, Mr. Woodward would not do that kind of thing. I think it is somebody connected with the local Progressive Conservative Government of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, -

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT): Order, please!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, why would you walk into a store in St. John's and pay \$1.49 for a dozen eggs, and walk into a store in Nain and pay \$3.55 for a dozen? Is that Mr. Woodward's fault?

AN HON. MEMBER: It is government operated store.

MR. WARREN: Through a government store, Mr. Speaker.

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible) cannot control the eggs.

MR. WARREN: No, that is right, Mr. Speaker, he does not control the eggs. But this government should control the eggs. They should control the price of the eggs. This government controls the Newfoundland Egg Marketing Board.

MR. HISCOCK: They talk about controlling offshore (Inaudible) controlling offshore.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, it is like my hon. friend said -

MR. NEARY: They cannot even look after the egg prices let alone the gas -

MR. WARREN: - they cannot even look after the egg prices not to talk about offshore oil and gas.

Mr. Speaker, let us look at the Department of Social Welfare -

MR. STAGG: No such department, No such department.

MR. WARREN: The Department of Social Services, Maybe that might be more clarifying and the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) might understand it clearly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN: In Labrador there is a fuel allowance for social welfare recipients, a grand total of \$24.00 a month - those are for people on social assistance.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one drum of fuel oil in a community such as Hopedale costs \$58.00, \$58.00 for one drum of stove oil, and a drum of stove oil in the middle of Winter roughly lasts about seven or eight days. So this means that this individual family will need three or four drums of stove oil at an approximate cost of \$200 a month. Well, this government is quite pleased to blow their horn and say, 'look, we are giving them \$24.00 a month!'

MR. WARREN: Yes, that is compassion. That shows they are concerned about the cost of living.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, if a person is unable to work because he is mentally or physically sick

MR. WARREN:

then that person cannot work. And I assure the minister that there are people in my district who would do a good day's work if they had the opportunity, much more so than the member has done today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG:

Is it the long-term you are talking about? No short-term at all?

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, there is no alternative because of this government. That is why there is a short-term. Because this government has not put any jobs in place in these places, that is the reason. It is not the individual's reason. That is why. That is why the community council in Hopedale was looking for a road for three years, to employ some people. But this government said no. That is why there are more people on welfare, because of this government's lack of concern for the individual, Mr. Speaker.

MR. STAGG:

You want to talk about not having things. If you got what you wanted you would have nothing to talk about.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I can understand the hon. the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), he is awfully upset. The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) just put his foot in his mouth and I am sure the member is going to do likewise very shortly.

Mr. Speaker, I want to relate another thing, another example of this government's concern. It is about those people involved in the fishery. For example, last year in a fishing company here in St. John's a salmon web cost \$42. A few days ago I had a call from a constituent of mine. He wanted to buy two more salmon webs. He said, 'They were \$42 last year. Maybe,' he said, 'they should be somewhere around \$45 or \$50 this year.' I called the companies and they were \$59 one place and \$62 the other place for the same kind

MR. WARREN: of salmon web that he had the year before.

MR. MORGAN: Is that right?

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Minister, that is right.

Now, this is where this government is lacking concern for the individual. This is why there should be a Select Committee set up to go around the Province and check as to why the prices are going from \$42 to \$60 . It is because this government does not care, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HANCOCK: The hon. Minister of Fisheries is up to blow again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, this government is so concerned about offshore oil and gas, the transmission of hydro power, the Northern cod fishery -

MR. MORGAN: We are concerned about it, sure.

MR. WARREN: You are concerned about it, yes. You are concerned about it, but what are you going to do about it? You have not done anything so far, for the last nineteen months, so what are you going to do in the future?

Mr. Speaker, I have to mention this.

Mr. Speaker, I did not want to embarrass the administration of the Province, but I have to mention this. Mr. Speaker, the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Marshall) said that Mr. Clark was going to give him everything, Mr. Clark was going to give Newfoundland everything.

Last weekend, Mr. Speaker, there was some kind of spectacle on television and on the television screen I think I read across the screen 714 supporters of Mr. Clark's government, or the P.C. Party of Canada, voted against Mr. Clark. And this is the man who was going to give the provinces everything.

AN HON. MEMBER: I think Crosbie had 200 there for sure.

MR. WARREN: So, Mr. Speaker, I would say there must be something afoot that is causing -

AN HON. MEMBER: The only ones from Newfoundland who voted against (inaudible) were Mr. Crosbie's buddies.

MR. WARREN: Yes. Sure he came out publicly and said he was definitely going to support him.

MR. STAGG: But he (inaudible) for Newfoundland.

MR. SPEAKER (BAIRD): Order, please! I am having difficulty hearing the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren).

MR. WARREN: Okay, Mr. Speaker. If the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) would keep his trap shut for about five minutes I may be finished. But if he keeps interrupting, Mr. Speaker, then I am afraid that, you know, there could be something serious.

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible).

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, why should you go into a small grocery store in Manuels, the home of the hon. member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Butt's) and buy a dozen oranges - just listen to this now - buy a dozen oranges for

MR. G. WARREN: \$2.20 a dozen? Oranges for \$2.20, not a bad price. You go into the store in Makkovik and you pay \$5.80 for a dozen oranges.

MR. THOMS: In a government store?

MR. WARREN: In a government store - \$5.80 for a dozen oranges.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. WARREN: Now, Mr. Speaker, and this is a government that is operating their own stores.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. WARREN: Oh, yes, right. Those were black oranges or green oranges or yellow oranges.

MR. SPEAKER (BAIRD): Order, please!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I will tell you this much, the oranges never had any offshore oil and gas in them.

MR. STAGG: You know nothing but fruit.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, a member of the Privy Council said that the rents were caused by the interest rates.

MR. STAGG: The rent is caused by the landlords.

MR. WARREN: The rent is caused by the landlord and therefore is passed on to the consumer. Mr. Speaker, I think the people of this Province who are renting are just taking the average consumer right to the cleaners and it is because this government, in its rental control agency board - or the board that they have set up, is not monitored properly. That is the problem, that board is not monitored properly, It is not the federal government or the provincial government, it is that the board is not monitored properly.

MR. STAGG: We are all bored over here.

MR. WARREN: Yes, I agree, Sir. Now, that is good. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am sure some of the members are bored and, however, I know why they are bored. The reason they are bored is because we are finally beginning to say to you

MR. WARREN: people. 'Get off your posteriors and try to do something.' That is the problem, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I presented a petition in the House last year from some 100 civil servants working in Labrador. They want their Northern allowance increased to offset the cost of living. The member of the Treasury Board, the minister responsible to the Treasury Board, got up and he never heard about it in his life before, government officials signing a petition, should never be heard of, and his comment was to the effect that this is not going to happen any more and they are not supposed to send in petitions.'

Now, here we are civil servants working for government who are looking for a decent living, and are not allowed to petition the government.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. WARREN: They did! Sure they did! And I hope they will again. Because if they do not fight for their rights I am sure this government is not going to fight for their rights.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. WARREN: Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you something else now about how government operates its stores. Here is a good one now, I will give you a couple. The cost of old goods, you know, went up last year, I think, around 30 per cent in some of the stores so I asked the minister. Why did the cost increase?

MR. LUSH: They were antiques.

MR. WARREN: Yes, I agree they were antiques.  
I agree.

MR. HOLLETT: Their Leader said to them yesterday that they are re-cycled.

MR. WARREN: Now, he came back with the answer and said, 'Well, the cost is roughly 23 per cent per year for handling



MR. WARREN: and storage'. Now, Mr. Speaker, whether they are old goods that came in ten years ago or whether they are goods that come in tomorrow, you are going to use the same warehouse so the cost of extra facilities does not even come into place, you do not need extra facilities because the facilities are already there.

MR. HOLLETT: And they are paid for.

MR. WARREN: And the facilities are paid for - 90 per cent by the federal government, by the way.

MR. HOLLETT: And there is no 18 per cent interest charge on it.

MR. WARREN: And there is no 18 per cent interest charge on it and still and all the oil stock had to be increased roughly 23 per cent. Now, Mr. Speaker, if that is a reasonable answer to receive from a Minister of the Crown as to why the government is charging fifty-one cents for a tin of tomato soup four years old, there must be something wrong with the government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I do not want that crowd - in supporting my hon. and able friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) in bringing in this resolution, I think this resolution is long overdue. In fact -

MR. NEARY: The government, they are allergic to the cost of living over there, they do not want to talk about it.

MR. WARREN: In fact, I am surprised that when the resolution went to go on the Order Paper, when the hon. the Lieutenant-Governor opened the House, that a member from the government side did not say, well, let us get the jump on the Opposition today. Let us get a jump on them today, let us bring in a resolution. And I was expecting the member from Stephenville (F. Stagg) would have brought in such a resolution as this.

MR. STAGG: I brought in the one on the Constitution.

MR. WARREN: Oh, you brought in one on the Constitution.

MR. STAGG: A very important one.

MR. WARREN: An important one?

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible)

MR. WARREN: Yes, well, Tory St. John's thought the Constitution was nice and they agreed with-

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. WARREN: And, Mr. Speaker, I want to go on record in supporting this resolution. It is straightforward. It is straightforward. There is no - in fact, I believe that we should conclude today and set up a Select Committee because it is very important. It is important, that is the concern. It is so important that we should not even have to wait until next Wednesday, that we should not even have to wait until next Wednesday, that we should - right after twenty minutes of six today the hon. member from LaPoile (S. Neary) should be given permission to close the debate and the government members, along with the Opposition members, will support, will support that the House set up a Select Committee to examine into all aspects of inflation and prepare recommendations on how the government should proceed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is an ordinary, simple request, a simple request and all we are asking - look,

MR. WARREN: the poor people, the people who have to depend upon this Province for their bread and butter, why do we not try to help those people? Why do we not try to help the people that are on strike for \$148.50 a week? Why do we not try to help the nurses who are having trouble with the government? Why do we not help the teachers who are in a turmoil with the Minister of Education(L. Verge)? Why do we not help the social welfare recipients who are driven to the poverty line? This is all we are asking, Mr. Speaker . All we are asking is that all members of this House join together for the betterment of the people of this Province and for the betterment of Newfoundland on the whole. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, now we are going to hear it.

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. STAGG: Well, Mr. Speaker, after having a breath of hot air from the other side I think it is time for some cool and rational debate so, therefore, I am constrained to enter into the debate. Now, the President of the Council (W.Marshall), I allowed him to go first because he is a stranger to debate.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. STAGG: Ordinarily on Private Members' Day one of us would have the first crack at this resolution but I decided I would let him go first. Little did I know that he would use up almost all my material so I will have to restate the obvious and restate it in my own style, some of the things that he said.

The cause of inflation in Canada is brought about by - inflation is brought about by any number of

MR. STAGG: factors, all of which ultimately trace their way back to the Federal Government and its policies that have been unsuccessful in Canada since 1968. And you date the political epochs in Canada from the Diefenbaker era, the Pearson era and the Trudeau era, Well, the Trudeau era began in 1968 when the entire budget of Canada - Canada managed to conduct all its affairs with a total spending of under \$10 billion dollars. And in the budget, the estimates that were presented last week, irregularly presented before the House of Commons, finally presented, the total expenditures for Canada are something like \$68 billion dollars. So, you have gone from about \$8 billion dollars up to \$68 billion in the space of twelve years. And I suggest to hon. members, is the general public of Canada any better off, appreciably better off, in those twelve years than they were then? And I suggest that real income and the net, if it were possible to go back and look at

MR. F. STAGG: exactly where we stand in terms of 1968, I would suggest, that the spending of the federal government over those number of years whereby we have something over \$100 billion worth of national debt, would indicate that they have been very poor managers of the economy of this country. These are the gentlemen that hon. members opposite like to prostrate themselves before on occasion. When they go up to Ottawa on their hands and knees, it takes them a while to get there because they have to slither their way up. But that is the kind of people who are in the Liberal Party, These are the kinds of people that you support. Now, there is one noticeable exception - two noticeable exceptions over on the other side of the House - there is my good friend and colleague, my learned friend from Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) who has the audacity, I suppose, within Liberal circles, and certainly I considered it was a heroic act on his part, to publish his views on the offshore oil and gas question. He wrote a letter to the editor, wrote a letter to all of the editors and he indicated in clear and concise terms where he stood. Now, he did not say that Newfoundland should have control - Newfoundland should only be entitled to the provincial type revenues from the offshore like Mr. Rompkey did nor he did not indicate that Newfoundland does not have the ability to control its offshore oil and gas as Mr. Rompkey did in Corner Brook at a meeting of Liberals. I think it was a very small meeting but he did get a chance to meet there in Corner Brook some time ago with some Liberals, basically saying that Newfoundland is not strong enough, it does not have enough ability to look after the offshore. That is the position of the Liberal Party. That is the position of the Liberal Party. They would prefer to keep the profligate spenders, these drunken sailor-type spenders in Ottawa in control. And where do

MR. F. STAGG: they spend all their money? They do not spend it in Newfoundland. They fight inflation on the backs of the Newfoundlanders. The great inflation fighter, Mr. MacEachen, to whom all hon. gentlemen opposite are adherents to his economic philosophy, he manoeuvred the bringing down of the Clark government last year largely on the strength of the government stand on an eighteen cent a gallon tax on oil - on gasoline, rather - which is oil. What is the cost now? Forty cents a gallon it has gone up in the past year. Forty cents a gallon. We are paying more for gas now than we did back in February of 1980. Eighteen cents versus forty cents. And it is all brought about by the federal government's inability to manage its affairs, whether they are spending the vast amounts of money on Central Canada and depriving Newfoundlanders of the services and the benefits that we should have. I will give another example of it.

The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and I were talking with some West Coast news media today about this matter of the withdrawing of the Arctica from fisheries patrol. Some twenty Newfoundlanders who are now working with the federal government, have been working with them for years, are going to be laid off. Their jobs are going to be transferred to Romeo LeBlanc's district in New Brunswick. The jobs are going to be transferred, the man years are going to be transferred, but the Newfoundlanders are going to be laid off. That is how the federal government is fighting inflation in Newfoundland, that is their example of the gulf management zone.

MR. F. STAGG: I indicated in December that as far as I was concerned the new gulf management zone was a make-work project for New Brunswickers and there were a few inhales of breath at that time saying, 'There he goes again, he is making these outrageous statements'. Well, this is an indication that my instinctive feeling at that time was accurate. This is the policy of the present Minister of Fisheries (Mr. LeBlanc). It is to sure up his sagging political fortunes in New Brunswick on the backs of the Newfoundlanders, and I am not satisfied with it. And not only am I not satisfied with it, I am outraged at it.

Now we have other indications of why the federal government is unable or unwilling to tackle the problems of inflation. As a matter of fact, in 1976, the Prime Minister said they had wrestled inflation to the ground, inflation had been wrestled to the ground. Well, I guess we know who was on top when inflation was wrestled to the ground. Who controls the money supply in Canada? Who turns on the presses and puts all the extra money into circulation? Who does it? The federal government does it. Who undermines - if you had a dollar in 1970, you need two dollars in 1980 to replace it. If you had one dollar in 1960, it was worth four or five 1980 dollars. How did that come about? How did that come about in one of the greatest countries with the greatest natural resources in all of the world? And comparatively speaking, with 25 million population and with vast areas, the vast natural resources that we have, it has been a pure example of ineffective leadership from the economic point of view.

And it was exemplified by hon. members opposite who were in power in Newfoundland for a short time. The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), who was then the member for Bell Island, he used to be the Minister of Social Services in the previous admin-

MR. F. STAGG:                    istration. In those days, from  
1966 to 1971, there was practically a negative growth in  
jobs in Newfoundland during that period. Negative growth  
in 1976 to 1971.



MR. STAGG:

Between 1979 and 1984 we will see a growth in Newfoundland of some 40,000 jobs in this Province, a net growth of 40,000 jobs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: That was our political promise. Statistics Canada keep them. Statistics Canada are certainly no friends of the Newfoundland government so we would have to say that they are, at best, impartial. And sometimes we wonder whether they are actually impartial. And there is a bottom line on the number of jobs that exist. It has been wise management of our natural resources that is fighting inflation at the provincial level. We are doing our best with our limited resources. We are doing our best with our minimum control in the fishery. What control do we have over the fisheries in this Province? The control we have over the fishery is after the fish gets ashore we have some jurisdiction over quality control, we can do something with ice making machines and matters of that type - fisheries access roads and a few other things. That is all the constitutional jurisdiction we have over the major resource.

Now, how did Canada get control of the offshore? let me ask. Canada was given control of the offshore by Newfoundland bringing it into Confederation. And I am saying to hon. gentlemen opposite that this is an area that is right for, and hon. gentlemen should be supporting Newfoundland's quest for jurisdiction and control, or, at least, shared jurisdiction in fisheries.

MR. THOMS: Oh, it is shared now?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shared?

MR. STAGG: Shared jurisdiction, yes.  
The government is on record as to exactly what it wants, what shared jurisdiction.

MR. THOMS: (Inaudible).

MR. STAGG: You should read the material. Read the material. That is all we are looking for.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) shared jurisdiction now.

MR. STAGG: Read some of the Premier's speeches. Yes, read some of the Premier's speeches because you hon. gentlemen might be educated. I would suggest to hon. gentlemen that they would be much better advised to spend more of their time in support of policies that this government is espousing because the policies that this government is espousing are the policies that used to be liberal policies. Small 'l' liberal, or even big 'L' Liberal, they were the policies of the Liberal Government between 1949 and, as I say, 1962, before it became fat and unweildly and Mr. Smallwood started to go down hill. But the policies of this government are liberal policies, they are to the left of centre, surely. And hon. members are to the right, they are right wingers, the hon. members are the Tories. The Tories of this House of Assembly are hon. members opposite. Tories are generally epitomized as being to the right. Well, hon. members opposite are the Tories and we are the - small l - liberals over here.

AN HON. MEMBER: Where is your button?

MR. STAGG: Where is my button? I have my button. Here it is. Here is my button. 'Women for NAPE', it is, 'Women for NAPE'. "Women for NAPE" and 'NAPE for Women', that is what it says.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. STAGG: I have my button. The hon. member will wear any button. He will wear any button. But there is one button he will not use, the one that he should be using for his lip. He will never use that one.

MR. NEARY: I will never use the blue and white either.

MR. STAGG: No. There are certain members opposite that we would accept on this side of the House. But I would suggest that if the hon. members opposite wanted a mass evacuation of the government side, then they could send the hon. member over and we would go.

Now what about energy?

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

MR. STAGG: There is no point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): On a point of order, the hon. member for Lapoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I just -

MR. STAGG: I have said nothing out of order, Mr. Speaker, so you cannot recognize that hon. gentleman.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order, the hon. member for Lapoile.

MR. NEARY: I am sorry if I insulted the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker. Politics is so unpredictable you should never say 'never'. I withdraw that remark.

MR. SPEAKER: There was no point of order. The member just took the opportunity to attribute remarks taken by the (inaudible).

Carry on, the hon. member from Stephenville.

MR. STAGG: Well, what did he say, Mr. Speaker? I did not hear what he said. If it was a good insult I might have had a good, appropriate retort.

What about energy in this country? Here we have the peculiar situation where the federal government seems to be willing to pay the sheiks, Sheik Yamani and all the other sheiks of Arabia and the Mexicans and the Venezualans, they are willing to pay them. \$40 a barrel for oil yet they are not willing to pay Peter Lougheed under \$20 a barrel for oil. I cannot understand it. Maybe hon. members opposite who have inside information, or they are cheek to cheek, jowl to jowl, and who knows what to what with the members in Ottawa, maybe they can explain it, but it does not seem to make sense to me. It does not seem to make sense to me. I believe what it is is that the federal government fears the growing power, they fear the growing power of some of the provinces. One of the provinces that they fear, one of the provinces that they fear most is Newfoundland.

MR. STAGG: Newfoundland is feared and Newfoundland, in some quarters, is revered. Newfoundland is feared and Newfoundland is also revered. Now I have some other material here - where is it? Here is an indication, "Newfoundland is still considered a beggar", a beggar, "by many Canadians". This is an article by Ed Kirby of The Telegram. It is in today's Telegram, and it is about a gentleman, John Fraser, who used to be with The Telegram and he now writes for the Toronto Globe and Mail. But he said - I will just make a quote from it here - "Under Smallwood", he said, "Newfoundlanders were seen by other Canadians as poor, ignorant, benighted people lucky to have been taken into Canada with all its social benefits". And how often we hear this sort of thing now from hon. members opposite. If you dare to suggest that you might not be getting a good deal from Ottawa, well, you are called a separatist. You are called a separatist or if you do not agree with the Liberal policy on the constitution you are immediately a separatist. Well, I will say, gentlemen, that it gave me great pleasure last week, and a certain amount of the feeling that what I had said was correct, in supporting the Premier on his policies on the constitution, when the Premier was awarded the Vanier Award as a young Newfoundlander and a great young Canadian. And he is up there, he will be receiving it tomorrow night, and in the same breath - well, not in the same breath but last week and the week before there was a campaign on the go led by the Leader of the Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition wants to paint the people on this side as separatists led by -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) PCs and capitalists.

MR. STAGG: - led by - the capitalists.

The hon. member wants to make a statement concerning the Jaycees, does he?

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) capitalists.

MR. STAGG: The capitalists? And what is wrong with capitalism?

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. STAGG: What is wrong with capitalism? Is capitalism a dirty word? Where is the hon. member taking his cues from? Does he get his speeches written in Moscow or what? Capitalist, what is wrong with being a capitalist? What is wrong with being a capitalist?

MR. NEARY: There is nothing wrong with them except that they should not be running the country.

MR. STAGG: Who should run the country?

AN HON. MEMBER: The (inaudible).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STAGG: Should the government run the country?

MR. NEARY: The people should.

MR. STAGG: This is what you believe, the government should run the country. This is why -

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. STAGG: - we have inflation -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. STAGG: - because the government, because the government -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STAGG: - is getting into business. And what about Petrofina?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I think the member may be going astray a little bit. I would ask him to go back to relevancy.

MR. STAGG: Well, the Speaker may think I am going astray but I am talking about

MR. STAGG: going astray, but if talking about energy and it is relevance, and the Constitution is going astray then, Mr. Speaker, I suggest I am going to be going astray considerably. But I will try to make my remarks more relevant.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. STAGG: Yes, hon. gentlemen opposite, they want the governments to own everything. They agree that the government should own all of the oil companies in Canada, I suppose.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. STAGG: Yes. The government should own all of the oil companies, yes. And how should they purchase them? On the backs of the taxpayers. For every - we are buying Petrofina now, and Petrofina is going to cost \$1.5 billion. Does the government have any money? No. Does Petro Canada have any money? No. They are raising money the same as any other company. So who is going to pay for it? The taxpayer of Canada is going to pay for it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STAGG: Yes, three cents a gallon.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STAGG: Three cents a gallon.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER: Shame.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. STAGG: Oil companies rip off - (Inaudible)

The Evening Telegram. Well maybe they did. If the oil companies ripped off Canadians then the oil companies should be punished for it. But that is why we set up a system of cheques and balances. But if somebody rips you off does that mean that you should take them over? If you should

MR. STAGG: take them over then do you do the ripping off? Well, that is what the hon. gentlemen would do. The Liberals have been ripping off Canadians for years.

MR. FLIGHT: Tell us about BRINCO.

MR. STAGG: You tell us about BRINCO. Let the hon. gentleman tell us about BRINCO.

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible) BRINCO.

MR. STAGG: Let the hon. gentleman tell us about BRINCO.

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT): Order, please!

MR. STAGG: Let us talk about the flaring off of gas.

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible).

MR. STAGG: The hon. gentlemen opposite have been flaring off gas for years. But I want to talk a little bit about the flaring off of gas on Hibernia and how that could fight inflation, Mr. Speaker.

The Leader of the Opposition yesterday was indicating that Newfoundland should have nothing to do with, and we should give up our fight to have fixed platforms offshore and the oil and gas brought to shore in pipelines. It is a foolish idea, and it is not engineeringly feasible, he said. And from whom does he take his -

MR. FLIGHT: The best experts in the world.

MR. STAGG: The best experts in the world brought here by Mobil. One of the companies that the hon. gentleman -

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible) oil directorate.

MR. STAGG: One of the companies that the hon. gentleman would buy.

MR. NEARY: What about your buddy, Millan?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STAGG: We provided the forum for these people to state their opinions, but we maintain that we are going to state our opinions as well.

MR. FLIGHT: And insult them too.



MR. STAGG: Yes, and insult them. I will insult anyone. I will insult anyone that tells me that because it is practical and feasible for them to take our oil and gas and to take our oil into the St. Lawrence -

MR. NEARY: ... George Hees (inaudible) green coat on the Constitution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, I think that I should have extra time, these people opposite have been interrupting me.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please! I would like to remind the member he has half a minute.

MR. STAGG: Half a minute. Well, I think, Mr. Speaker, that if perchance we wake up in the morning and the Leader of the Opposition were Premier—suppose we all went out on GNL and got killed tonight or whatever, or we all resigned, well the Leader of the Opposition might become Premier, The first thing he would do is say, all right, no pipelines, no pipelines for gas, no pipelines for oil, and off you go, you tanker it off and off it goes elsewhere. It may very well happen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STAGG: It may very well happen, Mr. Speaker. It may very well happen. But I would not give it up, I would not give it up just because some expert who may indeed have a vested interest in his opinion, because experts

MR. STAGG: are purchaseable you know. You can even purchase the opinion of lawyers. You pay me enough I might even given an opposite opinion, who knows. But I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that only by taking over and managing and controlling and getting every cent we can out of our natural resources will we be able to fight inflation. And the hon. member's select committee is a - well he did not tell us about the select committee really, all he wanted was a forum to get up and spread some of his vitriol concerning the government and how much he hates being in Opposition. Unfortunately, because of his standard of political behaviour and his inability to persuade the general public of Newfoundland that his party is worthwhile and should be back in power, I am afraid that he is going to be unsuccessful in this motion as he has been unsuccessful, politically, for the past ten years or so.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. HISCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will try to keep more relevant to the point on this resolution that we set up a select committee of this House with regards to the high cost of living in this Province. I am also a little bit bemused that we have started a new session and we see now the tone that we are going to have for the full session and probably for the rest of this sitting of this Legislature or Parliament. And that is, any time there is any question that needs to be solved always put it back on Ottawa, the Liberal Government in Ottawa. Well I, for one, am quite proud that I am a Liberal and I, for one, am quite proud that we do have a Liberal Government in Ottawa. I would ask the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Marshall); today with the high cost of living in the world what would the high cost of living be in Canada if it was not for the Liberal Government in Ottawa that brought in Medicare? How much more it would cost if we had to pay our own medical bills, how much more it would cost if we never had Canada Pension

MR. HISCOCK: Plan for our senior citizens and Old Age Pension Plans for our senior citizens.

The former Minister of Finance (Mr. Crosbie) did not want to give the senior citizens an increase of forty dollars because it would mean an extra \$600 million on the taxpayers of Canada. And when Mr. Trudeau ended up getting re-elected again and we did give the \$40 million what ended up happening? The Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) here, did he pass that on to the senior citizens into the homes? No. He only passed on five dollars to those people.

With regard to other programmes that we have seen, social programmes that have been brought in by the Liberal Government, if it was not for these programmes how much more the cost of living would be. The President of the Privy Council (Mr. Marshall) ended up pointing out that the federal government controls the monetary situation and so it does. Has Canada decided to bank up the Canadian dollar which was down to eighty-two cents or a little below eighty-three cents last night and the night before? No, we have not increased it artificially. And as a result what have we seen? We have seen an increase of \$8 billion in our surplus of our payments in the last quarter. The reason why most of the jobs are now in Canada and the reason why, if this Tory Administration meets their quota of 40,000 jobs, it will not be because the Minister of Labour (Mr. Dinn) ended up bringing in this quota, or the Premier, it will be because of the tax dollars. The federal government, the Liberal Government has failed and said they will not increase this artificially. As a result we export more iron ore, more timber, more pulp and more fish products. That is the reason why we are increasing these jobs.

MR. HISCOCK:

And with regard to the oil and gas I would like to remind them on that side that the first permit ever given for the drilling of oil and gas in this Province came from a Liberal Government under Mr. Smallwood and every bit of drilling that has taken place out off the Grand Banks, on the Labrador sea, is the result of tax incentives that the Federal-Liberal Government has given. And if it was not for these tax incentives these companies would not have drilled. They would have drilled in other parts of the States as they are now doing because they have failed to live up to - now the federal government is saying, "We are going to give you tax incentives but we are going to put certain criteria on it". And, of course, what is happening is that these companies do not want that.

With regard to - the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Marshall) ended up saying, "It is not important to have a Department of Consumer Affairs because it is in another department anyway". Did not this

MR. E. HISCOCK: same government criticise the federal government because they had Fisheries and Environment together, that the wishes of the fishermen in this Province could not be looked after by having the two names, the two departments coming together? And did not the federal government end up changing it and bringing it back to Fisheries and Oceans and looking after Environment in another one? Well, I would say to the government now, and this Opposition will be standing by it, that we will not rest until we have the Department of Consumer Affairs re-established into this Province to look after the needs of consumer affairs for our people. Instead of having this high publicity style of our Premier. The Premier's basket-spotting and basically around St. John's, the high cost of food. I would ask him to come down to Labrador or Northern Newfoundland or the Southwest coast of Newfoundland and find out what the cost of food is in those areas.

The former Minister of Consumer Affairs and the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) brought in a study on oil and gas and petroleum products in this Province. One of the recommendations was that a further study be done on the coast of Labrador to find out if it is Mr. Woodward see if it is him, see if it is Mr. Strachan, or see if anybody down on the Labrador coast is the reason why we have these high costs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. E. HISCOCK: I will say this if there are two former Liberals or three former Liberals, if the high cost is being passed on to the consumers unjustly, then it is up to this government to turn around and find out this. And I for one still continue to demand this inquiry to be done on the Labrador coast.

MR. E. HISCOCK: So, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to asking for a select committee of this House on the cost of living, when a study that is recommended by the government to ask for a further study into the high cost of oil and gas products in Labrador, what happens? The Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer), who is now responsible for Consumer Affairs, turns around and says, 'No, we cannot have another study. We cannot have another study because one study recommends another study and another study recommends another study, so, therefore, we will not have it.' In the meantime, down in my district in Port Hope Simpson and other areas, we are paying \$1.93 a gallon for gas. And again the people are asking down there, and I am asking, why is this so, and why is it that the government who says it is the champion of our people in this Province now, why do they not have this further study?

Another point I would like to bring up and that is as I said before -

MR. F. STAGG: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): A point of order, the hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. F. STAGG: Now, Mr. Speaker, this (inaudible) I may have (inaudible) -

MR. E. HISCOCK: Oh, you may have, you may have.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. F. STAGG: The hon. member has mentioned nothing about inflation, he has related to this not at all. He has not mentioned the select committee so the hon. member is being irrelevant, needlessly repetitious and I think he should be told to take his seat, Mr. Speaker.

MR. E. HISCOCK: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, the hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. E. HISCOCK: I find that it is a little bit irrelevant that when we have a Parliament of this Province that we have some - I do not know if it is unparliamentary - nitwit person who turns around and does not even listen to what is being said comes in, basically because he is trying to make a mockery of this House of Assembly, he comes in and brings in a point of order. A point of order is always okay when it is from the government side. But when this side is making something relevant, what is happening to us, and we will see in this next session that we are going to see that this government is trying to muzzle the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): To that point of order. There is no point of order. But I would like to remind all hon. members that they should refer to other members in the House by their district or their portfolio.

The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. E. HISCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is very hard to refer to the hon. gentleman for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) with flattering terms because I do not believe in speaking something if I do not feel it.

With regard to the select committee of the House that I mentioned several times, I would like to go as far as to say, Mr. Speaker, instead of turning everything over on the federal government why does the provincial government not turn around and bring in some changes that it can help itself? No doubt that the federal government has a large responsibility and as I pointed out thank God we do have a Liberal government there that has looked after the Canadian people of this nation and that we do have the lowest rate of inflation, that when the bank interest did go up in this country it went up twenty-two cents in the United States and the federal Liberal government and the Bank of Canada did not

MR. HISCOCK: let it go up over seventeen or eighteen cents.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recommend certain things. And one of the things I would like to recommend, particularly with regard to St. John's, because I think if the St. John's Tory members are going to keep their seats it is very important that they look after the low salaried people in this city and also those on social services, and that is that this government should get into buying land banks. We should buy land around this city and other large urban areas so that we do not get the real estate people speculating and driving up the cost of land far beyond the average consumer. We did it by way of Newtown, we did it in the Northeast Land Assembly and I suggest, as in Saskatoon, Saskatoon has a very well-planned city and the reason why they have this is that they ended up buying up the land years ago and keeping it down at a comfortable rate.

MR. THOMS: They only have eighteen bars and it is the same size as St. John's, eighteen bars and we have 107.

MR. HISCOCK: : So, Mr. Speaker, I say that this government can buy up the land around the city thereby keeping the land down out of speculating.

Also, with regard to the air subsidy on food on the Labrador Coast, I think that this should be increased to help the people down on the Labrador Coast. With regard to the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) and the Minister of Consumer Affairs, I wrote last year asking that people on the Labrador Coast, because they had to come over to Sandy Cove on the Northern Peninsula by way of longliner, we should get that subsidy on one or two longliners instead of having it on the airplane. And, of course, what did the government say when they could help the consumers in that part of our Province? They said, "no."



MR. HISCOCK: With regard to one thing that I mentioned and, Mr. Speaker, I ask leave of the Chair to mention it because it is not to do with this resolution but it is with regard to the Gulf management zone that was mentioned by the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg). I, for one, support entirely moving it to Moncton. And I said it in my district and I will say it here now, that if we had a genuine concern about the management of that stock, we would have it in the middle of the Gulf and that we are not, as Canadians, not concerned about Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, PEI or the Gulf stock itself and that nobody turns around and says it, that the office in Corner Brook is going to be increased, that research is going to be coming out of the office in Corner Brook and we are making small political hay by suggesting that the reason why the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans for the Federal Government wants to have the Gulf zone stock managed to help the fishermen in my district, to help the fishermen in Port au Port, to help the fishermen in Burgeo and in other areas is because he wants to look after the stock. And here we are suggesting - the Minister of Fisheries and the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) -- the reason why we want management of the Gulf stock is because the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans can pay off his political debt. How ridiculous, Mr. Speaker, how ridiculous and naïve and low as to suggest that we have a Minister of the Crown in the federal government that stoops so low in politics as suggested by the members.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. HISCOCK: So, Mr. Speaker -

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible) do with the jobs  
(inaudible).

MR. WHITE: Go away, boy.

MR. HISCOCK: - and with regard to the twenty men losing their jobs, I would like to remind the people of St. John's that we have 250 jobs here in this Province

MR. HISCOCK: as a result of moving the Taxation Data Centre from Ottawa and bringing it to St. John's.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. HISCOCK: So we cannot have it both ways. So, Mr. Speaker, this government itself have basically, and they do not want to admit it, that they do not want to be part of this Canada, they want to have their cake and eat it too, They want basically to have everything that is there but when, for the greater Canadian good, something has been changed no, Canada is turning around and punishing us then.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. HISCOCK: And with regard to Labrador and any other things down there, I can look after my own district and I invite anybody to come into my district to find out how things are being looked after down in Labrador by this government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

Order, please!

MR. HISCOCK:

So, Mr. Speaker, with regard to other problems of high inflation, of the cost of living, again if it was not for the Canadian Government- One of the things we do not particularly like is that the cost of gas has gone up as a result of the taxation by Mr. Trudeau as a result of Mr. Lougheed. But that does bring into reality for the past several years \$3.5 billion are still being paid each year to subsidize oil consumption here in these provinces of Atlantic Canada and it is only now passing this six cents on, or two cents on, that is making the people realize that we are being subsidized by other consumers in Canada. So, Mr. Speaker, if this government is concerned with the select committee of this House, if they are concerned about the high cost of living in this Province, they will establish this committee and they will not throw up their arms and say 'we cannot do anything we have not got control over the dollar, we do not have control over the interest rates, we do not have control over this, it is always the federal government'. It is very easy to throw up your arms and say, 'Well, let the Federal Government do it'. I am beginning ask the question now, is it better not for us to turn around and have a unitary stake in Canada if we are going to have the wishes of the Province as turning around and saying, 'We cannot do anything it is Ottawa's fault'? Surely if that is going to be the question here in this Province now by this government, that let Ottawa do everything, give up your responsibility, call an election and let us turn around and have it and find out who will look after their wishes and the needs and the responsibility and the cost of living in this

March 4, 1981

Tape No. 108

RA - 2

MR. HISCOCK:

Province.

MR. THOMS:

Hear, hear! Call an election boy.

MR. HISCOCK:

So, Mr. Speaker, hopefully

this government will turn around and appoint this select committee just as they turned around and appointed a select committee on the resources that was brought in by a member of this opposition who went over on the government side. And because he went over on the government side, the committee was formed and struck. I would go as far as to say that if this resolution was brought in by this government we would have a select committee. But because the interest is in the constitution and the oil and gas and all the other problems that are up in the clouds and are not concerned with the bread and butter issues of this Province, it shows that it was not brought in on the Order paper as a resolution because the government are not concerned with the day to day running of this Province, concerned about the long-term issues that are going to basically look after the areas that need to be looked after now, and we do have to go after the long-term. And this government-and this opposition has pointed out in the past how we have gone at it and what we have done. But, Mr. Speaker, it is too easy to turn around and say, 'Let the federal government do it! So if they want to let the federal government do it, then turn around and give the responsibilities back to the federal government. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird):

The hon. member for St. John's Centre.

DR. MCNICHOLAS:

Mr. Speaker, I share the concern of the member from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) about the high cost

DR. MCNICHOLAS: of living and inflation here in this Province. I think any reasonable person would. We are all very well aware of it. But it is not unique in the Province of Newfoundland. The hon. member from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) mentioned figures about 9 and 10 and 11 per cent. To my mind 9 per cent is too high. We all know that the cost of living right across Canada has gone up tremendously and is going up. And I think I saw a news item yesterday that there is a projection that we are going to have a twelve per cent increase in this coming year and that is not in Newfoundland, that is across Canada. We know in the U.S. that the prices have gone sky high. Possibly now with the Reagan administration, we will have some correction. Certainly with the Trudeau government in Ottawa, we are certainly not going to have any correction in that rate and it is going to go higher and higher.

SOME HON. MEMBER: That is right.

DR. MCNICHOLAS: I think if you look around the world; in Britain the prices have really gone sky high and generally all over the world. So this is a fact of life that I think we will just have to live with and try to do the best we can. I think the things that we should be looking at here and everywhere are the real basics and to my mind these are food and shelter and clothing. Now, why do we have higher food prices here than the rest of Canada? I suppose the reason, basically, is that practically everything is brought in here and our transport charges are very high. Possibly, to a minor extent, we have not a big distribution and because of that prices are higher than they are in a lot of other places. I was very pleased last year to be invited to a meal at the Newfoundland Hotel

DR. MCNICHOLAS: sponsored by our local Department of Agriculture, and I think it is very encouraging to see what our local people are doing to encourage and promote food production in this Province. I am also very pleased with the Department of Consumer Affairs, what they are doing, and they are trying their best to keep prices under control. I do not know what the Opposition would like us to do. Would they like us to bring in legislation to control the price of every bit of food in this Province?

The next important thing that I think we have to consider is shelter. I hear a lot of talk about rents. We have the Landlord and Tenancies Board that does, to my mind, a pretty good job in keeping rents reasonably under control. But let us be honest: If you look at the interest charges on new buildings, a builder is not interested in putting up apartment buildings at the present time. Here in St. John's it is compounded because the City takes 30 per cent of the rent of any apartment. In other words, if a tenant pays \$300 a month the first \$100 of that is given to the City and the \$200 remaining is given to the landlord. Again, if you take buildings, that have skyrocketed, would you go out and try and build a three-bedroom house today? By the time you buy the materials and on top of that go to the bank and pay them, perhaps, 18 to 20 per cent interest; from what I can see, it is practically impossible to turn out a house and make a profit for less than \$50,000. The other big item in shelter is fuel. We all know - we might talk about our local oil and what you like, but the basic cause, as we all know, of the increase in fuel is the OPEC prices that we have absolutely no control whatever in. We just have to get used to the fact that we are going to pay higher prices in the future. Electricity, that is going up with

DR. MCNICHOLAS: increased costs all around,  
increased fuel costs in Holyrood and elsewhere.

The other item that I think is of paramount importance to the average man in the street, is the cost of clothing. We have here adjusted the local 11 per cent taxation to help in clothing. All of our clothing is imported and that is an item that we have no control over.

I am very sympathetic with what the member from Lapoile (Mr. Neary) stated about this tremendous increase in the cost of living. I think this is a thing that should be addressed to the people who can control it properly and that is the federal government. To a large extent it has nothing whatever to do with the provincial government, and what the provincial government has to do with it, they are doing a very effective job in my opinion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. MCNICHOLAS: For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I certainly cannot support the resolution of the member from Lapoile.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. BENNETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to support my hon. colleague, his resolution, Mr. Speaker. And a few comments - I know I probably will not get enough time, the clock is ticking away on us here.

There are many, many ways, in my opinion, where runaway

MR. BENNETT:

inflation eats into the heart and soul of people who have to bear up beneath it. There are many, many ways in which to attack any problem, Mr. Speaker. All problems are not the same mind you but many, many problems are similar. And in my opinion the running of a Province or the running of a government must be looked at from a real business point of view like any, any other business, be it a paper industry, be it a tourist business. Generally speaking it is based on the same principles. From what I can understand, from where I see it, and some of the dilemma that this government seems to find itself in, they have so very little managerial ability. We have all kinds of engineers. We have all kinds of professional people on both sides of the House. With all due respect they have their own capabilities in their own endeavours and in their own expertise, but, Mr. Speaker, when it comes down to the grassroots management, in my opinion, it leaves a lot to be desired. And there are quite a number of instances that I could relate to. Today I started to ask questions.

MR. STAGG: Tell us about DREE and the fish plant that they were supposed to (inaudible).

MR. BENNETT: Okay I will just change my subject.

MR. STAGG: Tell us about that.

MR. BENNETT: I will change my subject. I just asked the hon. Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Goudie) for a few words in his ear and he is going to help me because I explained to him a situation where a constituent of mine called me last night telling me that he had been rejected, his application for a loan of \$5,000 in development of agricultural land. But DREE has just approved a \$300,000 grant in a similar area, in a different field of endeavour, where they stand not to make the same kind of returns, the relevant returns that your government would make in supporting a \$5,000 loan. Now this constituent of mine has cleared seventy





MR. BENNETT:

said something about rentals. I would like to correct, he said, \$300 a month, and \$100 of it goes to the city. That is not correct. Three hundred dollars a month rent, if 30 per cent or one-third goes to the city - it is one-third that goes to the city after the cost of operating that apartment house. If the tenant is paying \$300 a month, the landlord pays many, many of the other things like snowclearing, garbage collection, all of this.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) nonsense.

MR. BENNETT: Well, I can give you evidence where an apartment house is collecting in St. John's \$1,200 a month, I can give it to you-evidence - \$1,200 a month and that apartment house pays to the city \$182. Now, that is not one-third. So let us not blame it on the landlords for collecting all of the rent, and blame it on the city. Let us not blame it on the city. Let us take it and examine it and lay the blame where it belongs. If it belongs with the government, lack of knowledge about the situation, let them take the blame. And if I am wrong in my statements here I am satisfied to retract it. I can bring forward the evidence.

MR. TULK: You are not, you can tell by the way they are listening.

MR. BENNETT: Well, that is the fact of the matter. But as long as you continue to insinuate that you must give the City of St. John's one-third of your revenues from housing you shy away prospective apartment house builders. You shy them away. They are afraid to get into it because they know, they feel, they will have to give one-third of the prospective revenue to the City of St. John's, which is wrong. Tell it as it is, then you may encourage people to invest

MR. BENNETT: their dollars in apartment houses that we so desperately need in this city.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is why we call him the shiek.

MR. BENNETT: When the next election comes around I want then for the hon. gentlemen opposite me, and the government of the day, to then come on and explain to the electorate more fully the Municipalities Act that was brought into this House last year, inflicting unbearable burdens on people in rural Newfoundland, and denying them the services that they need in water and sewerage and decent roads and snowclearing, and making the communities drive themselves into debt to buy snowclearing equipment that they can so ill-afford.

When the next election comes around tell it as it is. Explain to the people about that Act that came into this House and you people put through on the backs of the taxpayers in the communities at the expense of rural Newfoundland, to the detriment of Newfoundland rural lifestyle, trying to crowd people into the urban areas where services already exist, where the tax structure is already in place.

The cost of living we are debating, we are talking about today. I have not seen or heard very much from our Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) and over on our coast we have a question that I hope to follow up on tomorrow about the concept of two airports. And when we have to drive an extra 100 miles or 200 miles from Baie Verte out to Stephenville, we are again relieving Eastern Provincial of the responsibility of burning gasoline out of Deer Lake, and we are replacing it by the persons who have to drive out that distance either to Stephenville or to Deer Lake or vice-versa. If I have to drive an extra

MR. BENNETT: 100 miles to Stephenville from Deer Lake from my district, then I am subsidizing Eastern Provincial Airways indirectly.

I wish the minister - and I hope to ask further questions on this - and I just hope the minister will reveal to us tomorrow further information on how much consultation has gone on. And if the minister and this government do not have a clout with Eastern Provincial, when I see by this report here it is something like \$5.4 millions, I think, guaranteed by the government for Eastern Provincial - so I think that Eastern Provincial has got an obligation to the people and to this government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BENNETT: So I would certainly like to pursue that question before Eastern Provincial decides that they are going to be permitted by this government to get off, if this government has any say in the matter, I think that they should make their thoughts known, every person, every hon. person in the House of Assembly.

There are so many things, Mr. Speaker, that we could talk about with regards to the cost of living. I started off by suggesting I would like to see government run in a businesslike manner, probably because I, myself, had a business background, I do not know. Probably if I had spent my lifetime in the woods I would talk around that circle too, of how to get lumber out of the woods. If I had been an engineer I would tell fellows how to run water through a community.

But when you get a little bit uptight into a business you do not start laying off people the first stroke, right off the bat like we are doing in this government. We are laying off our highroads. We are letting old, obsolete equipment stay broken down by the side of road rather than clear the snow so that people

MR. BENNETT: can get to their woodlands. We are cutting down.

Now, there are certain areas where you are able to cut down, but you do not dare cut down at the expense of the economy of the country, of the province. And I wonder sometimes when I see how this government is cutting down and how they are not keeping roads in position and in condition so the people cannot perform properly - the Normans built roads - the lifeline is roads. You have to have roads to move pulpwood and to move fish. You have to have ferries. This government is prepared to slice the subsidy off the Bonne Bay ferry, and the people in that area then have to drive fifty or sixty miles to get around. I do not think there was enough thought given by the minister before he made his decision, and I hope that he will reverse that decision, to slice off the subsidy on that ferry.

There is a way to blend or to downgrade or to reduce the amount of money you put into a thing, but when you reduce it on one hand, you have to allow for it and bring it up on the other hand. Twenty-five or thirty years ago that ferry was charging \$2.50 an hour for crossing, and when the government subsidy came in, there was a \$1.50 charged for crossing.

MR. HISCOCK: Adjourn the debate, boy!

MR. BENNETT: It looks like the clock is running out on me, Mr. Speaker. I would like to carry on -

AN HON. MEMBER: So adjourn the debate.

MR. BENNETT: So at this time I would like to adjourn the debate. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Is it agreed to call it 6:00 o'clock?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed.

It being 6:00 o'clock this House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, at 3:00 o'clock.