

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 1981

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

I refer hon. members to the point of privilege raised yesterday by the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) concerning the matter of the Premier calling a press conference during a sitting of the House and the press gallery members attending such a conference.

First of all I point out that my role is to determine whether or not enough evidence has been presented to make a prima facie case. Our own Standing Orders are silent on this matter of the press gallery but there have been other rulings related to the press gallery in the past and I refer hon. members specifically to Hansard of December 6th, 1979. I also refer hon. members to Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, page 15, paragraph 28, and I quote, "The authority of the Speaker and the House over the Press Galley is uncertain. While technically the Gallery is under the jurisdiction of the House, in practice it enjoys a considerable degree of independence," end of quote.

So there is not much else either that can be found to assist in making such a ruling; May is silent as is Bourinot. The question is something, first of all, that occurred outside the House, that is the calling of the press conference, and despite all the powers embodied to the Speaker, I do not believe I have the authority to tell the Premier nor the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) or any hon. member of this House when to hold their press conferences. That is clearly their decision to make not mine.

MR. HODDER:

Common courtesy, decency

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

With respect to the role of the press gallery members, while the House provides them with

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): technical assistance, etc. to cover the proceedings, and they have that responsibility, and in doing so they have to, on all occasions, determine what is to be reported. If they wish to attend a press conference, again, I think that is up to them.

I also believe that they have the facilities to record and listen later to any part of the proceedings that they might miss because they may be attending a press conference or doing an interview with any hon. member or going to the bathroom or whatever, as they often have to do as I understand. But while they do not sit in the gallery all day, because doing all these other things are part of their job, they do frequently return to listen to the recordings of the proceedings and then prepare their various final reports. So this situation is not at all unusual, as I see it. As has been ruled in the House of Commons, March 10th, 1978, and in their own Legislature in the past, as referred to earlier, the member may have wished to express a view or complaint and he has done that, but no formal action can be taken by the Chair and thus I have to rule that no prima facie case has been established.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise hon. members about a gift made to the Justice Department by the hon. Mr. Justice John Mahoney of the Supreme Court of Newfoundland Trial Division, of the court books and papers compiled by the late Harry Carter, Q.C., during his years as an employee of the Department of Justice. The late Mr. Harry Carter was Director of Public Prosecutions from 1953 to 1966 and he served the department and the Province with great distinction. In 1966, upon his retirement, he presented these books and paper to Mr. Justice Mahoney who was at that time a practicing member of the Newfoundland Bar. Mr. Justice Mahoney had retained these

MR. OTTENHEIMER: materials in his possession until October of 1981, at which time he presented them to the Department of Justice in the hopes that these historically valuable documents would be retained and safeguarded as part of our legal heritage. I am grateful to Mr. Justice Mahoney for his generosity in this regard. It gives me great pleasure to know that there is a permanent record available that reflects the many years of distinguished service and legal expertise given to this Province by the late Mr. Harry Carter.

MR. ROBERTS: Where are they now and are they accessible?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: They are now in the Department of Justice library. Yes, they are accessible, yes, under supervision. I do not think they could be taken out but within the library under supervision.

MR. ROBERTS: Under the supervision of the minister?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: No.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I have a question along the lines we started to discuss with the Premier yesterday. In dealing with the fishery, Mr. Speaker, there are some areas that are clearly outside the jurisdiction of the Province, some that are clearly inside and therefore it requires cooperation from both the Province and the federal government. Would the Premier tell us specifically what presentation he has made, or his Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) has made to the federal government to look for assistance in dealing with the problems facing the fishery this year?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries could answer that as well as myself. We are in contact with the federal government and have been for the last three or four weeks on the various proposals that come to us and the requests, and the assistance and co-operation and support that we solicit from the federal government varies with the various proposals that come to us. We had early on in the negotiations and talks as it related to the merger proposal, sat down with officials from Fisheries and Oceans and requested what position that they would take on this matter and their response was, I think, that they wanted to stay out of the matter sort of completely and in time they would perhaps give some response if they so felt like it. But we have been keeping them completely informed and looking for their assistance and help through the whole bit and piece and this week we will be again in the process - I am not sure if it is tomorrow or Thursday - meeting with representatives from the federal government

PREMIER PECKFORD: as it relates to the whole question and crisis in the fishing industry. So it varies from proposal to proposal. But at the outset the federal Department of Fisheries and Oceans and the people that we were in contact with indicated to the principals who put the merger proposal together and to representatives from the Newfoundland Government that they did not want to get involved in any specific financial way in the crisis that was now besetting the industry here in Newfoundland.

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

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

MR. L. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I am aware that the industry approached the federal government and said at the present time they had made their request to the Province and that there was no role for the federal government. What I am asking is what specific proposal has this government made that the Premier was involved in or his minister was involved in at the political level or at the ministerial level? Have there been any meetings at that level, at the ministerial level or at the Premier's level dealing with this crisis that faces the fishery in this Province of Newfoundland and Labrador?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: It is at both levels, Mr. Speaker, through our committee that has been established to which the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) can respond in more detail.

Nov. 17, 1981

Tape No. 3469

DW - 2

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

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker -

MR. L. STIRLING: I did not ask the question of the Minister of Fisheries

MR. J. MORGAN: - in following up the question,

Mr. Speaker, and supplying information to the House,

as the Premier indicated, it is important -

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

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

Does the hon. Leader of the

Opposition wish the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan)

to answer the question then?

MR. L. STIRLING: No.

MR. SPEAKER: No.

A supplementary, the hon.

Leader of the Opposition.

MR. L. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, the question

was to the Premier. Do I take it from what the Premier

has had to say -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. L. STIRLING: We will get to the Minister of

Fisheries later.

MR. ROBERTS: Why?

MR. L. STIRLING: Much later, Mr. Speaker.

Do I understand from the Premier

that he has personally, on this great issue which is so

important to Newfoundland and Labrador, do I understand

that the Premier personally has had no meetings himself

with the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. LeBlanc) or he per-

sonally has had no meetings with the Prime Minister about

this very basic crisis that we are having now in the

fishery in this Province which has gone on since early

Summer?

Nov. 17, 1981

Tape No. 3469

DW - 3

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. the Leader of the Opposition does not want the information that is one thing, Mr. Speaker. We have established a committee to which the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) wished to respond and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) does not want the Minister of Fisheries to respond in that area of responsibility that he has with this government. I can just say to

PREMIER PECKFORD: the Leader of the Opposition that we have, through a team of officials who were doing almost nothing else for the last three or four months. The Deputy Minister of Fisheries, the Deputy Minister of Development and the Deputy Minister of Finance and other people from the Finance Department have been in touch with and had high level meetings with the federal government and the federal government officials. They are having them again this week, that myself and the Planning and Priorities Committee of Cabinet and full Cabinet and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) have been on this issue almost daily for the last three or four months. We will continue to do so.

Contrary to what the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) said, the merger principals had gone to the federal government at the same time as they came to the provincial government. So that it is erroneous for the Leader of the Opposition to indicate that somehow the federal government was not involved right from the start. And we have been in constant contact with them and, as I indicated, their general attitude and approach when we went to them the first time after the merger was presented to them was a hands off attitude. We are working through the Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa, and his officials of Fisheries and Oceans, we are meeting with other people in Ottawa who are involved in industrial development in the country and are trying to get the federal government to become totally involved in this issue.

Mr. LeBlanc, when he was on the Burin Peninsula, had indicated a hands off attitude to the people there. He was concerned but took a hands off attitude. He indicated to a lot of the citizens down there who came to see me that they should look to the Province rather than the federal government for assistance along these lines.

PREMIER PECKFORD: We believe that if the fishing industry of Newfoundland is going to be revitalized on a long term basis it will take co-operation and assistance from the two levels of government, plus the industry, and a lot of co-operation with the union.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order has been raised by the hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I was always of the impression in this House that when a question is asked of the Premier that if the Premier wants to yield to one of his ministers to answer and give more detailed information on that question, that the House does not have to give consent in order for that to happen in this Assembly when a minister, or the Premier, yields to the minister to answer a question or to give information.

MR. HODDER: You are just wasting time.

MR. SPEAKER: Well with respect to the point of order, I would say to the hon. member that that may be the practice but generally if it is the practice in the past it is because nobody has objected. If somebody objects then the Chair has no choice but to recognize the proper authority.

A supplementary, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MORGAN: That is a new precedent. I will not answer.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker,

MR. STIFLING: I would like to know from the Premier, who is supposed to be so concerned about Newfoundland and Labrador that he can go charging off to Ottawa on a moment's notice on some issues, how desperate does the fishery situation have to get, how many people have to be starving, what do the people in the fishery have to do in order to get the Premier to come down from his throne and condescend to go have a meeting with the federal fisheries minister? How desperate has it got to get to get him to do that?

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

MR. THOMS: He is wrong to.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I regret the day that the members of the Opposition refuse consent to allow ministers of the Crown to supplement and add to answers given by the Premier of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: You are the Premier. You are the First Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: I regret that that has occurred and that the members of the Opposition will not allow the Government of Newfoundland, through the House of Assembly which is open for that purpose, to provide information to the people of this Province. We here, Mr. Speaker, are desperately ready and eager to provide information to the Leader of the Opposition and the members of the Opposition. Unfortunately they have put up a brick wall to us giving information on the fishery and I think that is a sad, sad day. We have information to give, Mr. Speaker, but they will not allow us to give it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Shame! Shame!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Premier. Has the Premier any intention of taking a hand in the situation regarding the LaBatt's closing in Stephenville where fifty employees have been laid off? The plant has been closed, a \$1 million payroll is in jeopardy, and virtually Stephenville's secondary industry - it now makes Stephenville virtually a one industry town. Does the Premier plan to take a hand at all in this close-down, to speak to anybody? I know he was told before anyone else that that plant was closing.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, if the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) was as interested in the cutbacks from the federal government as he is in cutbacks in other areas of the Province -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - it might be worthwhile. I was aware of the close-down that was occurring at Stephenville a couple of hours before it happened -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: -before it happened, Mr. Speaker, and we had indicated to the company that we are against this kind of action being taken now given the unemployment situation in the Province. We do not control the brewery industry in the Province or the consumption of alcohol in the Province. We do not have a total control over that, Mr. Speaker. I do not think, as a matter of fact, we own a brewery.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

November 17, 1981

Tape No. 3471

ah-3

PREMIER PECKFORD: But we did go on record and try to persuade the company principals that this was an inappropriate time to take this kind of action but obviously they wanted to move ahead on their own and unless we took some legislative or other action then it would be impossible to keep the plant open that they own.

PREMIER PECKFORD: But we did try to persuade them not to take this action at this time.

MR. HODDER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HODDER: I wonder if the Premier received a report of the inquiry into the brewing industry in Northern Ontario, which I sent him? It shows very clearly that the Premier of Ontario, the hon. William Davis, in 1971 did step into the brewing industry and he appointed a commission.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER: My question to the Premier is this, Will the Premier declare a moratorium and appoint a committee to look into this problem? That is what we are asking, appoint a committee to look into this problem, because the equipment has already started to go out of that plant. The surplus equipment, the belts and the other things are starting to go out of that plant. That plant, the building was rented to them by a Crown corporation for a dollar a year and the equipment is starting to be moved out. Would the Premier considering having a moratorium placed and a commission appointed to see if there is any chance that we can save that industry in Stephenville?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, we do not necessarily take our directions from what happens in Northern Ontario, we take our directions from what happens in Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: And while the member for Port au Port might be more -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, am I allowed -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, now I again regret the day that a member of the Newfoundland Legislature takes as his cue activities that occur in Northern Ontario. I think the people of Port au Port

(Mr. Hodder) want the member for Port au Port to talk

about Port au Port and to talk about Newfoundland, not talk about Northern Ontario. I never thought I would see the day

when this very respected member for Port au Port would suddenly start talking about - waving documents from

Northern Ontario; a disgrace to Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker.

I ask the member for Port au Port to withdraw those comparisons to Ontario and start talking about Newfoundland for a change.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, I am so sorry that I offended the Premier by pointing out to him that if the Province of Ontario has the jurisdiction to interfere in the brewing industry then, obviously, the Province of Newfoundland has the jurisdiction to look into the brewing industry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER:

Obviously, the Premier missed that point. I will ask the Premier again, Is he going to take a hand in this? Will he look into it? Will he call a moratorium? Will he try to keep the equipment in that plant intact? Because my information, which is from good, reliable sources, says that there are breweries which would be

MR. HODDER:

interested and the only reason Labatt's wants to take the equipment out of that plant is because they are afraid of competition coming in.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) now has changed his tune. It is not a question of a commission now, it is a question of whether the equipment comes out of the plant. I am getting confused, Mr. Speaker, what the member from Port au Port is asking. I think it is very important that we keep a sober attitude on this, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: And I think, once I am clear on what the member for Port au Port is asking -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - once I am clear on what the member for Port au Port, Mr. Speaker, is asking, once I am clear whether it is to do what they are doing in Ontario, whether it is to keep the equipment in the plant in Stephenville or not, once I am clear, Mr. Speaker, I will drink to that.

MR. HANCOCK: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HANCOCK: The last thing this Province needs in the state it is now is another Shakespeare, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HANCOCK: I have a question, Mr. Speaker, for the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and it is something that is under the responsibility of the Provincial government and I want to see how much intestinal fortitude they have at this time. I am going to ask the minister why the plant, the crab plant that is owned by Quinlan Brothers in St. Mary's is not operating?

MR. TULK: Why?

MR. HANCOCK: Want to hear it again?

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER: The Minister of Fisheries is refusing -

MR. SPEAKER:- I have recognized the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. STIRLING: Ask the Premier -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! Order, please! The hon. member asked a question. There was no response. I recognize the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans. It is clearly in the rules.

MR. FLIGHT: I yield.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member yields?

MR. FLIGHT: I yield for a supplementary by the hon. member for St. Mary's-the Capes.

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

MR. HANCOCK: I will ask the same question again, this time to the Premier of the Province, Mr. Speaker. Could the Premier inform me and the people of St. Mary's-the Capes and St. Mary's in particular why the crab plant in St. Mary's is not operating?

PREMIER PECKFORD: The Minister of Fisheries can answer that question, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HANCOCK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

Now, the Chair can be standing up and down every five seconds. That way we get no questions, no answers or whatever. So if the hon. members would care to try to restrain themselves a little bit we may be able to get through this.

The hon. the member for St. Mary's-
the Capes on a supplementary.

MR. HANCOCK: Seeing that the Premier ordered the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) to answer, I will ask the question again, Mr. Speaker. I would like to know why the crab plant in St. Mary's is not operating. Would the Minister of Fisheries indicate whether or not he wants to answer the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

MR. HANCOCK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

The rules are quite clear for everybody to understand and if the minister does not wish to respond he does not have to but -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER:

- I am not finished, will the hon. member please take his seat. If the minister does not respond to a question that is not subject to debate or question. That is also provided for in the rules. So I ask hon. members now once again to restrain themselves. I have recognized the member for Windsor - Buchans. Does he wish to yield?

MR. FLIGHT:

I yield to the hon. member.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. HANCOCK:

Sure, Mr. Speaker, if you cannot get an answer from one minister I guess the logical thing to do would be to try to get the answer out of another minister.

I would like to ask the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) why the crab plant in St. Mary's is not operating at this time?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, the crab plant in St. Mary's is not quite under the Department of Labour and Manpower.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is true, true.

MR. HANCOCK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. member for St. Mary's - The Capes.

MR. HANCOCK:

I will ask the Minister of Finance then why the crab plant in St. Mary's is not operating at this time?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): I will have to point out to the hon. member that a question should be directed to a minister who is responsible for that particular matter. If a minister does not wish to answer then -

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

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry, the Speaker is now speaking and hon. members should know that. The question has to be directed to a minister who has that matter under his jurisdiction or responsibility, that is clear.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

If a minister does not wish to respond that is in the rules and regulations as well. If members just want to keep standing and asking questions that is up to yourselves.

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

MR. HANCOCK: I will direct it to the Premier again seeing nobody else wants to answer my question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. HANCOCK: No, I will ask the Deputy Premier. I do not know if I can ask the Deputy Premier or not seeing the Premier is there. I will ask the Minister of Forestry then, Mr. Speaker, why the crab plant in St. Mary's is not operating at this time?

MR. SPEAKER: Again the Speaker will have to rule that the question should be addressed to the proper minister in whose responsibility it lies, otherwise the question is out of order.

MR. HANCOCK: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HANCOCK: I will go back and ask the Premier another question then, Mr. Speaker.

The Premier is well aware that there is only one crab plant in the whole district of St. Mary's - The Capes and that licence is held by Quinlan Brothers and this Summer the plant was closed for some reason. The crab is being trucked out of the area to the plant in Bay de Verde. I would like to ask the Premier why the crab is being trucked out of that area and not being processed in St. Mary's?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: When the Opposition wish to co-operate with the government on the providing of information, we are willing to co-operate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. HANCOCK: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HANCOCK: I am only here just a little over a year and a half, Mr. Speaker, and this is the worst display of ignorance and arrogance that I have ever seen since I came to the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HANCOCK: Mr. Speaker, this is supposed to be the people's House and the people who are elected to come here -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HANCOCK: - have a right to ask questions and a right to get answers, Mr. Speaker, and this government is not providing them.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member has a supplementary?

MR. HANCOCK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will ask the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) why the crab plant in St. Mary's is not operating at this time?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: She is the expert on crab.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! For the same reason the question is out of order.

MR. HANCOCK: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HANCOCK: Mr. Speaker, somewhere along the line I will find out, somebody has to answer the question.

MR. THOMS: Somebody has to be responsible.

MR. HANCOCK: I would like to ask the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer), Mr. Speaker, why the crab plant in St. Mary's is not operating at this time?

MR. MARSHALL: A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order has been raised by the President of the Council.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

On a point of order, the hon.
the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, there are two. First of all neither side of the House make their own rules. Beauchesne on permissible questions; 'You may not ask a question which deals with an action of a minister for which he is not responsible to Parliament.' So the hon. member is clearly out of order by directing questions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. MARSHALL: Another point at the same time, Mr. Speaker, is that when Your Honour speaks or when Your Honour has to stand for the purpose of order, or when Your Honour speaks, a member is supposed to sit down and not persist in trying to put his point across. Your Honour immediately has the floor at that particular time and the members of the House are supposed to respect the authority of Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER: Anybody else to the point of order?

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: The reason that we have this point of order, which is not in fact a point of order, is that the government, through the Premier and the Minister of Fisheries, has just given up answering questions. The Speaker, if anything, should have ruled the Premier or the Minister of Fisheries having to answer the question. I accept the ruling of the Speaker that in this House -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: - that they do not have to answer. But, Mr. Speaker, the frustration that the people on this side have of attempting to get answers out of a Premier who will not answer basic questions about the fishery, and a Fisheries Minister who sits and sulks and will not answer the question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: With respect to the point of order: I do not believe I really should need to repeat this for all hon. members. Surely by now they would be aware of the rules that pertain to Question Period, not only in this Legislature but in any Parliament and that is a question has to be asked of the minister whose responsibility that particular matter falls under. That is clear, and for that reason I have ruled the

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): question out of order on a number of occasions when the member for St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. Hancock) has addressed the question to other ministers.

Secondly, in addition to that particular point, it is also clear in Beauchesne, and any other rules, that a minister does not have to answer a question, and that is not subject to question or debate afterwards.

So the ruling has been made. Surely the hon. member understands the ruling by now. Therefore the reason for persisting is unknown to me. I have no idea. But other hon. members, I presume, would wish to ask questions. The Chair's responsibility is to offer the opportunity to members to ask questions. And a number of other members have risen and indicated their interest in asking a question.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): So at some point in time the Chair will have to step in, especially after outlining the rules and procedures to all hon. members. It is very clear.

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

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

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) is this: My hon. friend raised a very interesting point in connection with crab licenses. Would the hon. gentleman indicate to the House whether or not this crab license was issued to process crab exclusively in the plant in St. Mary's and, if so, why is the operator, the person who has the license, been granted a license, why is he permitted to truck crab out of St. Mary's to Bay de Verde for processing? If that happens, should not his license be revoked? Should the minister not take the license away from the person who holds that license and give it to somebody who will operate the plant in St. Mary's?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. J. MORGAN: The hon. member for LaPoile usually asks good questions on the fisheries and I would not sit down and let a question from the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) go unnoticed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, getting back to some earlier questions, maybe I can tie them all in one package and answer the question on St. Mary's and tie in at the same time the representations we have been making to Ottawa in the last four months on the fisheries problems

MR. J. MORGAN: we are having in this Province -

MR. HANCOCK: Come on! It is your responsibility.

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

MR. J. MORGAN: -One of them being the crab industry, the crab fishing industry. I have on four different occasions in the past four months asked Mr. LeBlanc in telexes and phone calls and messages and letters to come to Newfoundland to sit down with the fishery industry and discuss the problems we have.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J. MORGAN: I have yet to see him here!
I have yet to see him here!

MR. L. THOMS: That is because you are blind!

MR. J. MORGAN: We have made representations for the federal government to buy up the inventories held by the companies which they cannot sell and they cannot hold them because of the high interest rates.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. J. MORGAN: The companies are hurting because of having to hold these high inventories and the high interest rates are causing problems for them financially. We have put forth proposals to the federal government asking them to buy up these inventories and in a humane fashion, a humane way supply them to those poor countries who need the food today, like Poland and Russia and other countries. No, still no response from Ottawa! Still the problem ongoes and is going on now. The crab industry is no exception. There are problems in the crab industry and the St. Mary's plant I guess is one of the plants that did have some problems this year. I understand there were some problems between the management and labour, or the union.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. J. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, I am trying to give the hon. gentleman for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and his colleagues some information. Now if I could have some quiet while I am doing it I will do it.

Mr. Speaker, the question is a very genuine one because the plant has had some problems down there. I am of the opinion, from discussions with Mr. Quinlan, that there have been some problems with regard to labour-management discussions. There is now, I understand, a union organization there in that plant. At the same time as that was happening, there was a problem with the inventories of crab being held by the company. I am now of the opinion that the inventories of crab are moved out, because I talked to at least four different crab processing companies the last four or five days and they have moved out all their crab supplies, they have gone to the market, there is a good market for crab right now. So

MR. MORGAN: I am of the opinion that this company operating in St. Mary's should not at this time have any problem with inventories of crab, it should be all sold out. If there is a problem now with the labour-management situation, I will take it up with the company and with the union to try to determine what the problem is and try to get the plant reopened.

MR. HANCOCK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HANCOCK: Mr. Speaker, Now we are getting down to the crux of the problem. The problem is with the union and the company, Mr. Speaker, and that is the truth of the matter, and I am glad that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) realizes what the problem is. But that does not solve the problem in St. Mary's. How long are we going to have to wait in that area before the Minister of Fisheries orders Quinlan Brothers to process the crab that they are presently shipping out of that area? And that is why their licence was issued, if I have to remind the minister, in the first place, to process crab in St. Mary's. Now all the crab is being shipped out. How long do we have to wait before this dispute is settled?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, as I told the hon. gentleman and his colleague in the other question, I will take it up with the company. And, of course, as the hon. gentleman is aware as well, we do have more control than the licencing in this case because that plant is also owned by the government, and although the company, Quinlan Brothers, spent a substantial amount of money on the upgrading and modernization and expansion of the plant, the basic foundation of the plant itself is owned by government and built by government and leased to that company. So we do have some

MR. MORGAN: control over the facility itself as well as the licences we issue for processing. So I have given the assurance I will take it up with the company and, if necessary, with the union to determine what the problem really is and attempt to get the plant reopened.

MR. HANCOCK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): There is time for one final quick supplementary of thirty seconds.

The hon. the member for St. Mary's

- The Capes.

MR. HANCOCK: Mr. Speaker, if that dispute is not settled in a reasonable amount of time, would the minister consider taking away that crab licence and giving it to a list? I can assure the minister the list is as long as this of people looking for crab licences in this Province. Would he consider taking the licence away from Quinlan Brothers and giving it to someone who will go in there and operate the plant with or without a union?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, of course, before I would give that kind of indication, I would have to determine first of all what really the problem is in discussions with the company, but I will be only too pleased to -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, to show that I am really co-operating with the Opposition in genuine problems of the fishery, I would even invite the hon. my good friend from St. Mary's to attend with me these meetings with the company and the union.

MR. SPEAKER: The time for Oral Questions has expired.

NOTICES OF MOTION

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Electoral Boundaries Delimitation Act, 1973."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Watch out for the election!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Sir, I wish to table in the House a letter that I sent to the Leader of the Opposition yesterday, plus a chart which I wish to table in the House now, in response to questions that the Leader of the Opposition asked yesterday related to established programme funding in the Province.

Contrary to what the Leader of the Opposition said yesterday in getting to page 45 on the document from the federal government -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - I got to page 55 and I want to table in answer to the questions that -

MR. SPEAKER: On a point of order, the hon. -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

AN HON. MEMBER: A point of order has been raised.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, yesterday in

MR. HODDER: Question Period the Premier answered each one of the Leader of the Opposition's questions. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, they should have a second chance to get up and make a speech today.

MR. STIRLING: But we cannot respond.

MR. HODDER: Because my understanding, Mr. Speaker, is when he cannot answer a question he takes it under advisement and he brings it up in this particular period. He does not get up and make a speech.

MR. STIRLING: Because we cannot respond.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, ho!

PREMIER PECKFORD: To the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): To the point of order.

The hon. the Premier.

MR. STIRLING: (inaudible) to the House (inaudible) contradict himself (inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: I had to beg (inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, earlier today in Question Period I deferred a question from the Leader of the Opposition to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) to provide information to the House. The Opposition refused. Now I am getting up on Answers To Questions To Which Notice Has Been Given to provide additional information to this House as it relates to the cutbacks on established programme funding under the federal budget, and they are refusing the government to provide that information again. I think the point of order by the Opposition House Leader is spurious, irrelevant and we should be allowed to give information to the House.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think it is significant that the Premier did not make his Ministerial Statement under Statements by Ministers where we could comment and he did not answer questions under Oral Questions where we can get at him. He decided to use the section Answers To Questions For Which Notice Has Been Given because we are not allowed to comment on it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Cowardly.

MR. STIRLING: Now in dealing with the point of order on the Ministerial Statement, which he gives as an answer to Questions For Which Notice Has Been Given, there has been no notice given to that. But, Mr. Speaker, I concede now that I have received a letter from the Premier that says "Mr. Stirling is correct in pointing out the EPF for health and post-secondary -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Now the question here that has arisen is whether or not under Answers to Questions the Premier is tabling an answer which he had taken notice of yesterday. Obviously I will have to check Hansard to see if he did and then decide at that point in time whether or not it is permissible. If I find somewhere in Hansard, yesterday, where he indicated that he would defer or get further information or whatever, it will be allowed.

MR. STIRLING: He did not.

MR. SPEAKER: Well the Chair will look into it, if the hon. member will give me a chance to say what I am trying to say and then tomorrow I will rule on it.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): On a point of privilege. The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Your Honour has on several occasions today been on his feet and making statements and making rulings and calling to order, and on each occasion, and most significantly in the past few minutes the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Port au Port, while Your Honour was giving a ruling was doing probably the worst thing that could be done, putting comments to Your Honour on Your Honour's ruling. Now I am going to quote, Mr. Speaker, I am going to quote Beauchesne, page 38, paragraph 117.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. MARSHALL: This deals with the office of Speaker as presiding officer of the House of Commons. "The chief characteristics attached to the office of Speaker in the House of Commons are authority and impartiality. As a

MR. MARSHALL: symbol of the authority of the House, he is accompanied by the Mace which is carried before him by the Sargeant-at-Arms and placed upon the Table when he is in the Chair. He calls upon members to speak and in debate all speeches are addressed to him." Now, this is the point, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh. oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: "When he rises to preserve order or to give a ruling he must always be heard in silence. No member may rise when the Speaker is standing." Or for that matter, Mr. Speaker, when the Speaker is speaking. When Your Honour speaks, any member of this House must take his seat. When Your Honour stands it is absolutely imperative that any member sits. It is completely and absolutely out of order, Mr. Speaker, and a usurpation of the rules and the privileges of this House for Your Honour, when he is speaking, to be interrupted by a member, particularly in the way the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), who are supposed to be leaders of the official Opposition in this House did a moment ago. It is an affront to this House and it is an affront to the authority of the Chair and it can only lead to the rules and the decorum of this House sinking abysmally down below any acceptable standard.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, the hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: To that point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, first of all I would refer to Beauchesne, Page 11, under section 17 which says, "A question of privilege ought

MR. HODDER: rarely to come before Parliament." Now that hon. House Leader (Mr. Marshall) over on the other side uses every opportunity to stand on questions of privilege to waste the time of the House in order to make political points.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I was standing on my feet or if I was sitting and made a comment which offended Your Honour, I withdraw. But I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the House Leader opposite stood on a point of privilege for which there was no point of privilege. Not only was there no point of privilege, but he used the opportunity to belittle and malign the Opposition. If he can hear our comments over there, I hope he can hear all of them, because most of them are very scalding about the hon. gentleman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: One thing further.

This is a very important point. And the hon. gentlemen opposite may take it lightly, and the heehaws coming from the Leader of the Opposition is indicative of the way that he is reacting. It is not a case of Your Honour personally -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!
MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: It is not a case, Your Honour, of Your Honour personally, it is a case of the authority which is vested in Your Honour, it is a case and it is an instance of the whole decorum of this House and what this House represents. It is not a case of the Opposition, the Opposition members and what individually they may be doing, it is a case of the way in which this parliamentary system is supposed to operate. And I have seen today, Mr. Speaker, time and again from the Opposition benches, an affront to the dignity of this House and an affront to the decorum in

MR. MARSHALL: the way it is supposed to operate.

It is a very serious point of privilege.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): One final submission. The hon.
member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: If I might, Mr. Speaker, and for
once I can come to the table with clean hands. I just have
for once been restraining myself. Let me say that the hon.
gentleman for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) with his pro-
testations, as sincere as they may be,

MR. ROBERTS: reminds me of the African chief who lived in a grass hut and stowed his spare throne in the upper room. The throne came down upon him thereby proving the truth of the old morale that people who live in grass huts should not stow thrones.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: The agenda today, Sir, the rule that the hon. gentleman cited is correct and goes to the very basis of what Parliament is all about. We must realize also that Parliament is also a debating society. We are not a tea party. We are dealing with serious matters.

Occasionally feelings do get out of control, and your Honour brings us back to control and that is one of Your Honour's jobs. But I would say, Sir, the chief offender of this day, and the most recent this day, is none other than the gentleman who sits to the left, ideologically or not, to the left of the hon. gentleman from St. John's East, the Premier, who was on his feet making a statement which Your Honour has said may or may not be in order. As I understood it, Your Honour has reserved decision and the Premier persisted wilfully and deliberately in carrying on when Your Honour was standing and calling for order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: But all I will say, Sir, all I will say is that the way to bring this House down to the level that the hon. gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) seems to enjoy is for his Premier to carry on. If it is tit on that side they will get tat from here. So I think the moral of it all, Sir, is the government ought to come into this House prepared to do their job as government, we are here to do our job, Sir, and let us let the people decide it. There is no point of privilege.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): With respect to the point of privilege, I think the point that has been raised is a very important one and one that should provoke a lot of thought on the part of all members of the House, and for that reason the Chair would like to take the matter under advisement and give a ruling on the point raised at a later time.

PREMIER PECKFORD: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I was wondering, and I guess if I did do it under the wrong heading, is it appropriate - do I have unanimous consent to provide information to this House subsequent to questions asked yesterday in this House. I would like to provide the information to the House and I am asking for unanimous consent to provide it.

MR. FLIGHT: Shameless!

MR. SPEAKER: The request is -

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, providing that it should have been done in the normal place for a statement by a minister, and if he now wishes to make a statement by the minister which will allow us to respond to that statement, then we give permission. Otherwise we go back to the normal rules and we will hear the statement tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: Well with respect to the point of order raised by the hon. the Premier, the question as I understand it, is for permission to table some additional information related to questions asked yesterday. Such a request would require consent, Is there consent? That is what the Chair has to determine. Is there consent?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: There is not consent.

Any further answers to questions?

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

Motion, second reading of a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Summary Proceedings Act". (Bill No. 64).

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Debate was adjourned the last day by the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms).

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Summary Proceedings Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No. 64).

Motion, second reading of a bill entitled, "An Act To Establish The Alcohol And Drug Dependency Commission Of Newfoundland And Labrador". (Bill No. 109).

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Social Services.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. HICKEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, before I get into the detail of explaining this bill and presenting it to my colleagues in the House, I would like to make a few brief comments on the reason for the legislation and to make a few comments on the state of alcoholism and drug dependency in the Province.

I think it is fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that the problem of alcoholism, and to a lesser extent, drug dependency, is one which is well known.

MR. L. THOMS: We cannot hear you, for crying out loud.

MR. HICKEY: Sorry, my light is on. Is there something wrong?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. minister perhaps might have to stand a little closer to that microphone. I understand from the recorder that there is some difficulty with the audio on that particular microphone.

MR. HICKEY: Am I coming through now?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HICKEY: There has to be something wrong with it, obviously. I feel as though I am bellowing into the microphone.

November 17, 1981

Tape No. 3481

SD - 2

MR. MORGAN: There is nothing wrong with it, boy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, as I said, I feel it necessary to make a few comments as to the state of alcoholism and drug dependency in the Province.

The problem of alcoholism itself is well known to hon. members for quite a long time. As in any other jurisdiction, it is a very serious problem and one which is very difficult to deal with. The problem of drug dependency is one which is not as old, and possibly not as critical, maybe, in terms of proportions or in terms of population, but nevertheless one which is increasing as time goes on and one which is presenting some real problems to society and to my department and the people who attempt to -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): There still appears to be some difficulty with the hon. the minister's microphone. I am not sure if the recorder can do anything to clarify that. Perhaps if we close the screens to the corridors it might be helpful.

If the hon. the minister would like to try another microphone, I understand there would be leave granted for him to do that.

MR. NEARY: Come over here!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: While the minister is moving there, may I raise a point of order.

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

MR. ROBERTS: One of the Pages has been instructed to take things off our table. Sir, that cannot be done. I submit to Your Honour that no person, including the Speaker, including Your Honour, Sir, has any right to instruct anybody to take anything off any of our tables.

MR. SPEAKER: I do not know where the reference is for that. Let me say this, that I have just been advised that the material that the Premier tabled during the point when there was a point of order raised, subsequently was taken by the Pages and delivered and we instructed the Pages that they should not be delivered. Now, as long as hon. members are aware that they are not distributed officially - because the point is still being reserved. Okay, that is the only point.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I have already ruled on the point of order. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition has another point of order to raise?

MR. STIRLING: Dealing with the same subject.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Well, I have already ruled on the point of order.

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I hope I am being heard now.

MR. HICKEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, if I could put my modesty aside, I would want hon. gentlemen to hear what I have to say because I think the issue is a very important one. If there is consent I will move anywhere.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, is it better now?

MR. NEARY: Oh, yes, you even look better.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKEY: It is possibly another first, Mr. Speaker. I never spoke from anyone else's seat in the House and from whatever angle it comes, I hope that what I have to say is good news -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKEY: - to those unfortunate citizens who suffer from the problem of alcoholism and drug dependency in the Province.

As I started to say, Your Honour, I wanted to make a few brief comments before getting into the detail of the legislation before the House as to the state of alcoholism and to a lesser extent, drug dependency.

The problem of alcoholism is well-known to us. It has been a problem facing a percentage of our people for a long time. The problem of drug dependency, although not quite as old and not quite as great, becomes

MR. HICKEY: increasingly more difficult to deal with day by day and as time goes on; hence the necessity, Mr. Speaker, for government to take a very firm stand on this issue and attempt to wrestle with it and provide some very necessary funding to provide some very necessary treatment centres and hopefully a cure to this very difficult problem.

Mr. Speaker, the history of alcoholism in the Province is equally well-known to, I am sure, most hon. members, if not all. To the largest extent before the 1970s, the treatment and work done with regard to the treatment, identification, education and everything connected with alcoholism was done by voluntary organizations, by the voluntary sector. Government, Mr. Speaker, did very little, if anything, prior to the 1970s. It is not for me to say that enough has been done since that time, indeed I would be less than honest if I said that, but I am just attempting to draw to hon. members' attention the gravity of the problem which, to a large extent, went unnoticed and unattended for a long time.

MR. T. HICKEY: Governments, faced with so many issues, I suppose it is almost understandable that an issue such as this might well go by the boards.

However, Mr. Speaker, those of us who know anything about alcoholism and its effects would find that hard to understand and would find it even more difficult to accept. That is why, Mr. Speaker, this administration decided that, not only for future sake but because of our present situation, we must tackle this problem and tackle it in a big way.

During the 1970s, Mr. Speaker, government provided funding to the Alcohol and Drug Addiction Foundation - not sufficient monies, mind you, to do all the things that this volunteer group would want to do. And the present situation in the Province is one which we are not happy with in terms of the effectiveness of that organization and the people who work so hard on a voluntary basis and, indeed, the few people who work so hard under salary to treat those who are afflicted by this disease.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of organizations I feel an obligation to refer to who have kept the light burning, so to speak, in this Province: the ADAF, of course, is the frontrunner, but I hasten to point out as well the efforts by the Salvation Army over the years, the efforts by the Sisters who run the Detoxification Centre, Alcohol Anonymous and other interested people and groups throughout the Province.

Mr. Speaker, that is why it is such a pleasure for me as Minister of Social Services, with some responsibility for this problem in the Province, to introduce this legislation today. Because, for the

MR. T. HICKEY: first time, Mr. Speaker, it will provide an opportunity to bring all of those forces together in a co-operative effort with the necessary funding to provide at last a real chance to those who suffer this ailment. Mr. Speaker, the legislation which provides for the setting up of a Commission on Alcoholism and Drug Dependency is not new in this country. It is in place in most provinces. We have a piece of legislation, I believe, which will stand the test, because I believe it is fair to say that a great deal of work went into putting it together.

I want at this time, Mr. Speaker, to pay tribute and to offer my sincere thanks to the people connected with the committee, people from my department and the people from the ADAF, who worked very hard to put together this whole concept of an Alcohol and Drug Dependency Commission, and indeed, to bring forward this legislation that is before us.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to convey to hon. members that the problem of alcoholism or drug dependency is automatically solved by the introduction of this legislation. Indeed not! But, Mr. Speaker, what is so important about today and this legislation and this measure the government offers as a vehicle to deal with those two very serious problems, is that for the first time those who suffer from this problem can look forward to a genuine concerted effort, not only to treat those who suffer from the problem but to educate our people, and especially our young people, Mr. Speaker, in terms of using alcohol moderately if, in fact, they want to use it at all and to educate them, Mr. Speaker,

MR. HICKEY:

on what a plague the over use of alcohol and/or drugs can be, will be and the effects on the family unit and members of the family.

Mr. Speaker, it might be interesting for me to quote a few statistics and then I will get on to the details of the legislation. Too often, Mr. Speaker, we in this Province, because we have such an unique lifestyle, for whatever reason fail to acknowledge or understand the magnitude of some of the problems, some of the more nasty problems that we have in our midst. One such problem is child abuse, which has received some attention lately. It is hard to conceive, Mr. Speaker, those of us who are blessed with a good upbringing and family, that anyone in our society and especially in this Province could or would involve themselves in the abuse of a helpless child. Would it be a shock, Mr. Speaker, if I were to tell the House today that using the statistics that are applied across the country that 1,000 children in this Province suffer from some form of child abuse directly as a result of the over use of alcoholism and/or drugs? And I think I am on safe grounds in saying that in this Province the great bulk of that would be alcoholism because drugs, although, as I said, are becoming of increasing importance in terms of a problem, have not yet, at least, reached the proportions that the over-use of alcoholism has.

MR. HODDER:

That is where you are wrong, 'Tom', that is where you are wrong. Drugs are away ahead of alcohol.

MR. HICKEY:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman feels I am wrong, well, so be it. Let me give a few statistics, Mr. Speaker, The per capital consumption of alcohol in Newfoundland rose from 1.3 gallons in 1970 to 2.4 gallons in 1978. Is the hon. gentleman going to tell me that the abuse of drugs in this Province outstrips that kind of statistic?

MR. TULK: You do not know how serious the drug problem is in the Province.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker -

MR. HODDER: Would the minister permit just a question, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Port au Port has a question.

MR. HODDER: That figure you gave us, what were the figures of the increase in alcohol in the Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. HICKEY: The increase per capita, Mr. Speaker, went from 1.3 gallons in 1970 to 2.4 gallons in 1978, exceeding the consumption rate in Saskatchewan, Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. Researchers predict that within two years this Province will be able to boast about something we will not be so happy about boasting about, that those figures will exceed the national average consumption, which is 2.6 gallons per capita. Mr. Speaker, if that kind of statistic does not upset us, let me offer this one: Teenage drinking in this Province increased by 90 per cent between 1970 and 1978. Now, Mr. Speaker, if there was no other statistic that should bother us, I suggest that that one should bother us more than anything because what we are talking about here are the future leaders, the people who will inherit whatever we leave, indeed the people who we depend on to run this Province in future years on which there is so much depending upon. And yet we have to acknowledge, Your Honour, that at a very young age they are taking up drinking and increasing

MR. HICKEY: by percentages that are not known of in other jurisdictions. There are an estimated 20,000 alcohol addicted individuals in Newfoundland, increasing by 7 per cent each year. Accidents, Mr. Speaker, related to impairment in Newfoundland numbered 50,000 in 1978. Based on national figures, approximately 1,000 - this figure I just gave you a while ago - approximately 1,000 Newfoundland children were victims of alcohol related child abuse in 1978.

It is estimated, Mr. Speaker, that alcohol related problems contribute significantly to the half million dollars per day lost through low productivity, absenteeism, etc. in Newfoundland industry in 1979. Upwards of 50 per cent of violent crimes are alcohol related. It has been estimated, Mr. Speaker - and I preface my statement here by saying it is not mine in case I am quoted - it is estimated by people who do research in this area that life expectancy of the native population is reduced by thirty years below the national average on account of excessive drinking.

Mr. Speaker, surely I can stop there and offer no more reasons for my statement of the importance of this measure and this initiative by the government. If we are, Mr. Speaker, to survive as a society, if we are to survive as a Province, indeed if we are to prepare the younger generation, and as we work so hard to leave to them a society of which they can be truly proud, surely then it is mandatory that we do something very seriously to tackle this problem. Otherwise it can be all for nothing.

Mr. Speaker, let us get to the legislation which is before us. The commission to be set up under this legislation shall consist of the chairman and

MR. HICKEY: fourteen other members appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council on the following basis: a) one member chosen from each five regions of the Province designated by the minister; b) one member who shall be an employee of the Department of Justice, nominated by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer); c) one member who shall be an employee of the Department of Education, nominated by the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge); One from the Department of Health, nominated by the Minister of Health (Mr. House); two members who shall be employees by the Department of Social Services, nominated by the minister; four members chosen from the public at large. No persons shall be appointed to the commission or shall be a member of the commission who is not resident of the Province. The members appointed from the five regions designated by the minister shall be appointed for a term of three years.

MR. HICKEY: The members appointed as representatives of the departments, the various departments that I have just outlined, shall be appointed for three years subject to review within that time period by the appropriate minister.

MR. ROBERTS : Mr. Speaker.

I do not mean to interrupt the minister, but I wonder if the minister would permit a question.

MR. HICKEY: Sure.

MR. ROBERTS : I am interested particularly on these -

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

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Sir. - on these regions. While the minister is outlining the make-up and the powers of the new commission, could the minister tell us a little about the five regions? As I read 41(a) it is a region designated by the minister, and that seems okay to me, but what kind of region does the minister have in mind?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the minister.

MR. HICKEY: I thank the hon. gentleman for the question, Mr. Speaker. I would have gotten to it later; however, let me deal with it now.

The make-up of the commission in terms of regions will follow what is already established in terms of the Social Services regions. So that the make-up of it, so to speak, is already in place.

MR. ROBERTS: Labrador, St. John's -

MR. HICKEY: Labrador-Western, which is the Corner Brook and Northern Peninsula area, the Central area which deals with Grand Falls and out the bay.

November 17, 1981

Tape No. 3486

ah-2

MR. ROBERTS: Eastern?

MR. HICKEY: Eastern, which is the peninsula.

MR. ROBERTS: And St. John's.

MR. HICKEY: Harbour Grace, Marystown and that area, and St. John's.

MR. ROBERTS: And they would not be department or anything else ?

MR. HICKEY: Pardon?

MR. ROBERTS: Would they be employees of the minister, these regional members?

MR. HICKEY: No.

MR. ROBERTS: They would be from the public?

MR. HICKEY: Not employees from my department. No.

MR. ROBERTS: Or employees of any other department?

MR. HICKEY: They would be hopefully taken from some of the people who are involved in the ADAF. Because I think the other statement I should make at this point, Mr. Speaker, is that this commission will, so to speak, take over the ADAF. The ADAF will become a part of the nucleus around which we will build this commission.

MR. ROBERTS: So there will be nine

MR. ROBERTS: public members, if you wish -

MR. HICKEY: So to, Mr. Speaker, outside of government or outside of the department.

MR. ROBERTS: And four from - Okay.

MR. HICKEY: Right.

MR. ROBERTS: The civil servants, Mr. Speaker, probably a better way to put it, appointed from the various departments will serve for three years and, as I said, will be reviewed within that time period by the appropriate ministers of the departments.

The four members chosen from the public at large shall be appointed to a term of five years. The chairman of the commission shall hold office for a term determined by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. The commission shall hold at least four meetings a year. The chairman may call a meeting, naturally, at his discretion, or the minister may call or ask the commission to call a meeting for whatever reason.

The commission may appoint to a committee of the commission a person who is not a member of the commission. In other words, the chairman and the commission have flexibility in terms of adding to its numbers. While such people may not be members, will not be members, of course, of the commission, nevertheless they can add to their numbers by appointing two committees and setting up committees involving people who for obvious reasons have a real interest in this particular area.

It should be pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that a key aspect of the structure of this commission would be to set up advisory committees, within the regions of the Province. This will ensure that the people who have played a role through the ADAF and other organizations in the Province will have an opportunity to not only continue that role but indeed to increase their effort and hopefully to see more

MR. ROBERTS:

fruits from their labour.

Members of the commission,

Mr. Speaker, shall serve without reimbursement other than the remuneration for each meeting, in keeping with the standards policy as laid down by government applicable to other such boards or organizations.

They will also be entitled to such disbursements, coverage of such disbursements for expenses necessarily incurred by a member in connection with the work of the commission.

The chairman, Mr. Speaker, is the chief executive officer of the commission and shall direct the activities of the commission and co-ordinate its work. Notwithstanding

MR. T. HICKEY: the other section in which I said members are not paid, the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer shall be paid an annual salary to be fixed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. The commission shall elect from its membership a vice-chairman. And, of course, as in any other case the vice-chairman would substitute for the chairman whenever necessary.

Mr. Speaker, a very important, critically important, maybe the most important of all aspect of this legislation and this body, this commission, is the duties of the commission. And I would like to, Mr. Speaker, read directly from the bill because I think it says it all. "The commission shall sponsor, conduct and promote programmes for (i) treating and rehabilitating persons suffering from alcohol or drug dependency; (ii) controlling problems related to the consumption of alcohol and other drugs, and (iii) disseminating information respecting the nature and effects of alcoholism and drug dependency and respecting the recognition, prevention and treatment of alcoholism and drug dependency; (b) sponsor, conduct and promote programmes of research into, (i) the prevention of alcoholism and drug dependency, (ii) the treatment and rehabilitation of persons suffering from alcoholism or drug dependency, and (iii) the medical and social effects of the consumption of alcohol and other drugs; and (c) co-ordinate the activities of all other government funded agencies that deal with problems related to the consumption of alcohol and other drugs."

MR. T. HICKEY:

And, Mr. Speaker, that last section explains clearly what I said earlier, again pointing out the importance of this legislation and this commission inasmuch as for the first time there is a co-ordinated effort, a co-ordinating agency that will draw from all the population those people, those volunteers and those organizations or agencies that have wrestled with and worked hard in this problem area for so long. That is a key part, Mr. Speaker, of the legislation.

"The commission may establish" -
it is under the heading, 'The Powers of the Commission' -
"establish, conduct, manage and operate clinics and centres for the reception, observation and treatment of persons suffering from alcoholism and drug dependency;
(b) enter into agreement with the hospitals and other institutions for the accomodation, care and treatment of persons suffering from alcoholism or drug dependency;

MR. HICKEY: (e) enter into such other agreements with any person, association, agent or commission as may be necessary for the incidental or conducive to the carrying out of any or all of the objects of the Commission; and d) do all such other matters and things as may be necessary or desirable for exercising the powers conferred by this Act or any powers incidental thereto."

Mr. Speaker, the Commission may employ such persons as necessary, such as an executive director, such other employees as deemed necessary, such as clerical, stenographic, what have you. They will be paid salaries similar to civil servants and will be subject to the Public Service Pension Act. In other words, they will be civil servants.

The bill goes into detail, Mr. Speaker. I will not take up the time of the House to go into those details about the functioning, submitting reports - required to submit a report annually, required to prepare a budget submitted to the minister by the end of December each year. And the Commission, Mr. Speaker, with the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, may make such regulations as are necessary for the carrying out of the provisions of this act.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this act shall come into force at a time to be determined by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. And on that, Mr. Speaker, I want to say - I do not just want to leave it like that - I want to say that I am indeed proud and very pleased to be able to say today in the House that it is the intention of this government to put this legislation into effect and proclaim it at the earliest date so as to begin the work of building this Commission and putting it together so that indeed it can be made ready to function at the beginning of the next fiscal year.

MR. HICKEY:

Mr. Speaker, in moving second reading of this bill, I will reserve some other comments, some other points for closing the debate, but I would certainly invite my colleagues in the House to participate in the debate because I believe we are seeing a piece of legislation pass through this Assembly which is critically important, and which is important today, Mr. Speaker, but with the situation that we find ourselves in in relation to developments that are happening in the Province and about to happen, this is a very important day for a great number of people who today do not have a problem, Your Honour, but based on statistics and based on tradition will unfortunately have to resort to treatment from this organization and will be very happy to know that it is in place.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure and I know of no other piece of legislation that I would be more proud and pleased about because I have felt so strongly about this for so long. I move second reading.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BENNETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I certainly would like to make a few comments on the minister's statement here on this bill. The thing that bothers me at this time -

MR. HICKEY: There is something wrong with your microphone now. I cannot hear you.

MR. BENNETT: There is no problem to hear me, Mr. Speaker. I think that I have a strong voice and I can always speak up. It bothers me, Mr. Speaker, to think and to realize that it has taken such a long time to bring in a bill of this sort into the House of Assembly. The hon. minister has been minister of this department, I suspect, probably for six or more years, I think. He has been the minister for more than six, I think, probably, and I wonder why it has taken all these years to try and curb the devastating effect that alcohol is having on our people in the Province.

MR. THOMS: You guys 23 years to do nothing. Mr. Stirling you have only been in for ten years.

MR. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, when the Liberal Government was in power in Newfoundland we did not - we needed not to place such emphasis on -

MR. MARSHALL: A point or order, Mr. Speaker
I cannot hear the hon. member.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

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

MR. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, when the Liberals in -

AN HON. MEMBER: Can the member speak up?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BENNETT: If your colleagues will be quiet, I will finish what I have to say. If they would like to take the floor, I will sit down.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

When the Liberal Government was in power in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, we had quite sufficient employment to preoccupy and to keep people busy and to keep them occupied. They did not have to turn to drug and alcohol abuse such as is the case today. Today because of the idle time and the nature -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BENNETT: - of the environment that seems to have been brought about by the administration that we have in place at this time, the people have so much idle time on their hands. They have no employment, literally no employment, and it seems to me that drug and alcohol abuse has become one of the greatest problems that this Province has ever, ever, ever in its history experienced and it is getting more of a problem all the time. It is just unbelievable. And it certainly has been nurtured by the government of the day. And I can say that and support what I say and justify what I say, Mr. Speaker.

I can take you around this Province and display lounges and clubs where the population - we have a lounge for practically every hundred persons in the Province.

MR. BENNETT: Over in the district of St. Barbe, there is one small area that I am quite familiar with, 600 people and six liquor licenses. It has been a wholesale onslaught to supply people with drinking establishments primarily for the government to collect tax revenue. The price of liquor has been increased substantially through taxation. The government has not been able to stimulate employment in the Province, Mr. Speaker, so they could get sufficient revenue. They have had to flog such things as alcohol to collect revenues, cigarettes and alcohol. Cigarettes is a form of drug. People become addicted. People have to have gasoline to burn in their vehicles to perform their daily duties, and all of the things that people seem to have a leaning towards, needed to function properly, be it drugs or alcohol or gasoline to get them to their jobs, these are the things that this government has flogged, inflicted their heavy tax structure.

I would think, Mr. Speaker, that because of the high welfare state of the Province consequently we have high drug and alcohol abuse in the Province. They seem to work hand in glove. Where people have full employment and where they are so totally

MR. T. BENNETT:

occupied, occupied with making a living instead of becoming resigned to not having employment as they seem to be in this Province at this time, but where people have leisure, be it on welfare or otherwise, drug and alcohol abuse seem to come in and take effect on these people's lives.

The minister is suggesting he is going to tackle this problem in a big way and I hope he is sincere. I hope he does tackle it in a big way. It needs to be tackled in a big way. And, Mr. Speaker, as I suggested before they do run hand in glove with society generally, and I think the rest of his colleagues in government will have to co-operate and co-ordinate employment so that people can afford to spend more time on their jobs and less time in the taverns.

Drug and alcohol abuse in this Province is a disaster. It is a disaster, Mr. Speaker, and it is shameful! And there is no reason to have such abuse as we seem to have in this Province. Now I am wondering what percentage of the tax revenues the Liquor Commission collects or the Treasury collects, what percentage of those tax revenues will go back to assisting those who become afflicted by becoming alcoholics? The way this government operates with the advertising and the relaxed approach to liquor outlets reminds me of one flogging a horse and expecting it to stand still. The government continually flogs the industry through advertising. They continually flog it and they expect it to stand still. It is not going to stand still, it is going to mushroom, it is going to get worse. It is going to get worse, Mr. Speaker!

MR. BENNETT: The figures the hon. minister put forward, he said 1.3 per capita in 1970 and in 1978 the per capita - I am sorry, 1.3 gallons of consumption per capita in 1970 as opposed to 2.4 gallons per capita in 1978. Now that is a substantial increase.

MR. HOLLETT: Highest beer consumption in Canada starting at age fifteen.

MR. BENNETT: My colleague suggested that it is the highest beer consumption in Canada starting at the age fifteen.

MR. HOLLETT: Accomplished by the Newfoundland Liquor Commission.

MR. BENNETT: The national average is 2.6, the minister is saying, gallons per capita. The minister is suggesting that 1,000 children suffer because of direct alcohol abuse. I would certainly question that 1,000 figure. I would say it might be 10,000. He may have dropped a zero. I would be very surprised if it is only 1,000 children who suffer because of alcohol and drug abuse.

MR. HOLLETT: Those are the only ones he knows of.

MR. BENNETT: It might be the ones that the minister is personally aware of, but I can assure the hon. minister there are more than 1,000 children who suffer in this Province because of drug and alcohol abuse. You will find that in a smaller town than St. John's - 1,000. You will find more than 1,000, I am sure, children who suffer because of alcohol and drug abuse in the city of St. John's.

Nov. 17, 1981

Tape No. 3491

DW - 3

MR. T. BENNETT: It has far-reaching effects. And, like I said, Mr. Speaker, it is a social disaster to this Province. And if this government does not haul up its socks and create employment in the Province there will be very few people left on the rock to drink or to indulge in alcohol.

MR. D. HOLLETT: Then the government will go bankrupt.

MR. BENNETT:

And unless the government is going to be able to support all of us as unemployed citizens of this Province, unless the government can employ all of us, then we are going to have no money in our pockets to buy booze. The minister suggested that teenage drinking increased by 90 percent between '70 and '78 and I note the minister refers all of these figures to his own term of office and to this government's term of office. It would be interesting to see the increase in alcohol and drug abuse and how it has increased in the last ten years as opposed to the thirty or so years since Confederation. I know that alcohol is more readily available all around the Province. We might scoff at the liquor book in Smallwood's day but it certainly had a certain amount of wisdom, in my opinion, when there was restraint and restriction on it. I am not suggesting we go back to that, but the legislators of that day certainly seemed to have a handle on it and did not want it to get out of hand. But it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, there is no handle on it at all today and it is most certainly out of hand and it is many, many years late for the minister to be bringing on this bill but I suppose it is better late than never.

It is going to be interesting to see those who will be appointed to the commission. It is going to again, Mr. Speaker, and I do not want to tread on too many corns when I suggest this might very well again get to be a lot of political patronage to give a few people jobs. I might sound a little unkind in suggesting that but I have seen so much of it - political patronage - since I have been a member that I doubt very much if people's politics will not be screened before they get jobs in such positions as the commission that would study and make recommendations to the minister.

The minister suggested 20,000 alcoholics in the Province, a 7 per cent increase annually. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that some of these figures are like our employment figures. In the district of St. Barbe we have about 50 per cent unemployment. It is not the figure that we are

MR. BENNETT: hearing on radio, and television. We have more than 50 percent unemployed in the St. Barbe district brought about primarily by an inactive government, a government that did absolutely nothing to stimulate employment. All it did in the district of St. Barbe, all it stimulated in the district of St. Barbe has been liquor licences and clubs.

So along with the bill that the minister has before the House today, Mr. Speaker, will have to run parallel a lot of other things to help curb the drinking problem of this Province. The minister suggested the broken homes, the numbers. I doubt very much if anybody can put a handle on the devastating effect to family life of alcohol, especially the abuse of alcohol, and the broken homes as a result. Every day of my life I run across them myself in my exposure and contact with people. It is a sad, sad situation: The drinking age has been lowered, the hours of operation for clubs extended, the number of clubs, the advertising, the onslaught generally; people are bombarded all the time by advertising and encouragement to consume booze. And the only restraint, Mr. Speaker, placed on people's drinking habits is the high cost of booze through taxation.

A bottle of booze I would like to believe costs less than \$2 for twenty-six ounces.

MR. MOORES: To make. To make.

MR. BENNETT: Probably. I stand to be corrected. But I suspect a bottle of twenty-six ounces of hard liquor costs around \$2.

MR. MOORES: To manufacture. Yes.

MR. BENNETT: It would be interesting to see what percentage of profit is made by the Treasury, by the Liquor Commission, and handed over to Treasury. It would be a real eye-opener. 1,000 per cent profit in lots of cases, on liquor.

Gouging, Mr. Speaker, we complain and condemn high interest rates, and I have to agree with anybody when they suggest high interest rates have a devastating effect on our economy and on our people, but I think such things as this government nurtures and collects revenue from, like alcohol, has a more devastating effect on our society than any of the things that we continually flog and bring to the attention of people, such as high interest rates.

MR. MOORES: \$15 million a year.

MR. BENNETT: It will certainly be interesting to see, Mr. Speaker, how the government moves on prevention of alcohol and drug dependency, and it will be interesting to see what treatment is forthcoming for alcoholics, and drug addicted people. It is going to be interesting. I am most anxious to follow this. I am most interested in following as we go along to see what the government will do to curb the 7 per cent increase the minister speaks about.

MR. BENNETT: The number of 20,000 alcoholics in the Province might be a conservative figure. I doubt very much if we have not got more than 20,000 people, who are dependent on alcohol or some form of drug, of our 600,000 population.

MR. MOORES: Doctors.

MR. HOLLETT: 200,000 he meant to say.

MR. BENNETT: Yes, 200,000 might be a more realistic figure. It might be a little bit high just the same. But it is going to be most interesting for me to follow this and see what the government is prepared to do, what percentage of the money goes back for use of this commission and to aid those people who need help, those who are afflicted by abuse of alcohol and drugs and who pay this government so much money while becoming afflicted and dependent on these drugs.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few comments on this bill. First and foremost I wish to say it is not very often we get the opportunity on this side to congratulate a minister for bringing in a good piece of legislation, but at this time I believe most of the members on this side, and a lot of the people in Newfoundland and Labrador, are quite pleased to know that this piece of legislation is coming before this House.

However, as my colleague from St. Barbe (Mr. Bennett) said, it is surprising that the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) has waited two and-a-half years in this administration, and six or seven years in the previous administration, without even considering bringing in such a bill, that would be of the utmost importance to many Newfoundlanders and Labradorians.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I would venture to say maybe one of the reasons -

AN HON. MEMBER: How about the twenty-three years?

MR. WARREN: We talk about the twenty-three years before that, Mr. Speaker, liquor was not \$17 a bottle, liquor was \$5, or \$6 a bottle twenty-three years ago. And now it is \$17 a bottle, of which the government is getting about 80 per cent profit. That is why the minister never brought it in before, because the government was taking \$50 million or \$60 million from the pockets of Newfoundlanders. That is the reason, Mr. Speaker,

MR. WARREN:

to bring this bill in before, because the government wanted to take \$50 or \$60 million from the pockets of Newfoundlanders.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to reveal some astonishing facts that the minister may not be aware of, and a lot of people in this hon. House are not aware of, and that is a report that was presented - I believe the government does have a copy, and it was presented by the Happy Valley-Goose Bay Alcohol and Drug Abuse Advisory Council. This was presented last year in December 1980, and I am going to quote some facts from this document, Mr. Speaker, I am sure many of us will realize what government has done, what government has done to destroy people and in particular I am thinking about people along the Labrador coast and, more particularly, the Inuits and the Indian people in my district, what government has done to basically destroy their lives.

MR. MOORES:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, just to give you some examples. Yes, Mr. Speaker, it was the influx, the influx of one example, Mr. Speaker, in the community of Hopedale, up to two years ago, when the beer licenses were taken away from the individual gentlemen, up to two years ago, Mr. Speaker, the average person, the average person in Hopedale was drinking fourteen bottles of beer per day, per person. Now, Mr. Speaker, why should that be allowed? It was allowed because of the regulations, the Liquor Control Act. The regulations in the Liquor Control Act have to be changed, have to be made applicable to the areas associated with alcohol, Mr. Speaker. I am going to let some other facts be known.

On page 6 - I will use Hopedale as an example. In October 1978, when beer was available, for the month of

MR. WARREN: October 1978, September and October, Mr. Speaker, there were twenty-eight assaults. In September and October 1979, one year later, for the same period, the same two month period, the number of assaults had been reduced from twenty-eight down to eleven because there was no beer available, no commercial beer available.

Mr. Speaker, in Nain in 1978, 166 assaults, as compared to 1979, for a part of the year when there was no beer available, when there were eighty-five. Now, Mr. Speaker, we can see that this government, whether they admit it or not, are, under the Liquor Control Act, sucking the money out of people, who, in a lot of cases, as I will illustrate a little later on, are living on Social Services, are living on money supplied by the Department of Social Services, and this government is just taking it back from them again in the sale of alcohol.

AN HON. MEMBER: Can you not buy liquor or beer at all in Nain now?

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, you can buy beer and you can buy liquor at a lounge in Nain but I must say this much, that at the present time there are regulations associated with this lounge, that it is controlled. It is controlled much more than the beer was controlled in Hopedale where, if you had a wheelbarrow, you would go up and get a wheelbarrow full; or if a guy can carry ten cases he can get ten cases.

MR. WHITE: That is the way it is here.

MR. WARREN: And, Mr. Speaker, in fact that is the same thing that is done around St. John's, and any other place in the Province.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, when this government know and they realize - they have the statistics, the Department of Social Services has all the statistics - when this government realize that there was \$614,000 spent in social services in Nain in 1978, when they realize that there was \$614,000 spent in social services in one community in Labrador , and then on the other side of the coin they see the revenue that is collected from beer sales, they must realize that it is the same money changing hands, money that has been paid to clothe and feed families that are on social services. But meanwhile , the government is taking it back in taxes and I think it is ridiculous, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to quote from this book: A young fellow by the name of Ken Jararuse Ken has spent as much time down in Her Majesty's Penitentiary in St. John's as probably any other two or three people in Labrador. And here is what Ken Jararuse, a prisoner some years ago - by the way, I think he has seen the light at the end of the tunnel, because he has gone the other way and presently he is in training to be an aircraft pilot, so at least I think he has finally got the message that alcohol was a bad menace.

Here is what Ken Jararuse said, Mr. Speaker, and I quote: "Alcohol is certainly destroying our lives and something has to be done about it." That is what an ex-prisoner, Mr. Speaker, said in this report: "Alcohol is certainly destroying our lives and something has to be done about it."

Mr. Speaker, about three years ago, the people of Hopedale and other communities, by the way, signed a petition that they did not want any liquor or beer in their community. Now, Mr. Speaker, the community voted by a large percentage that they did not want any beer or any liquor in the community; however, those wishes of

MR. WARREN: the people could not be implemented because this government would not go along with it. That is why it could not be implemented, because this government would not go along with it, because the Liquor Control Act does not state that you can cut a community off from alcoholic beverages.

Now, why not, Mr. Speaker?

Frobisher Bay in the Northwest Territories - in 1972, when I had the opportunity to work for a year in the Northwest Territories, I passed through Frobisher Bay and at that time there was a liquor store in Frobisher Bay and it was pretty well the same thing as is happening now in Happy Valley - Goose Bay and on the Coast. Because Frobisher Bay was the central part of Baffin Island and people from other places such as Pengarton and Igloolik and so on would send someone out to Frobisher Bay and get a case or two of liquor and take it back to the community. The same thing today is happening in Labrador, the money is spent either on charter flights, in some cases, or by one passenger going from either Davis Inlet or from another community, going out to Goose Bay and getting half a 'plane load of heavy liquor, beer, wine, whisky and rum and so on and bringing it back to the community and then there is a big drunken spree. And this is happening today right under the government's nose. And, Mr. Speaker, until there is something put into the Liquor Control Act to control - Liquor Control Act, Mr. Speaker, that is what the act means, Mr. Speaker, control. What is the point of calling it the Liquor Control Act when it should be called the liquor abuse act; it is more appropriate for it because that is exactly what is happening.

MR. FLIGHT: The Minister of Health approves of everything that is going on.

MR. WARREN: In Frobisher Bay, Mr. Speaker, in 1974, the Northwest Territories Government decided because it was a request of the people, that 'We will close down the liquor store in Frobisher Bay.' And up to this day, Mr. Speaker, there is no

Nov. 17, 1981

Tape No. 3496

DW - 1

MR. G. WARREN: liquor store in Frobisher Bay.
And as a consequence, Mr. Speaker, as a consequence
the cause of bodily harm, assaults pretaining to
booze has been reduced over 56 per cent in the Northwest
Territories, in the Baffin Island region, Mr. Speaker.
Now that is what is happening!

MR. FLIGHT: Is there any bootlegging
going on?

MR. G. WARREN: Maybe there is bootlegging
going on, Mr. Speaker, but the ordinary person on
social services cannot afford to pay for it.

Mr. Speaker, there have been
some changes taking place. In Nain there is a
Nain women's group which, during the past two years,
Mr. Speaker, has helped tremendously in combatting this
terrible, terrible disease. And, Mr. Speaker, let
me tell you, let me tell you the disease in my dis-
trict, the disease of alcohol in my district is much
greater than cancer is. It is a greater disease,
Mr. Speaker, in my district, the disease of alcohol.

Now, Mr. Speaker, until this
government can come to grips with it, until this
government can realize and just take this book
and look at the consumption, Mr. Speaker, look at
the consumption of alcoholic beverages in that section
of Labrador, there are going to be sad days ahead.
For example, Mr. Speaker, in Hopedale in 1974/75, a
population of less than 500 people, 622.5 gallons of
alcoholic beverages -

MR. D. HANCOCK: Per person per year?

MR. G. WARREN: Per person per year. No, no,
for 450 people, 622.5 gallons.

MR. G. WARREN: Now, Mr. Speaker, is that not a little astonishing, a little astonishing to know, that 30 to 50 per cent of the revenue collected is going back into the coffers of the provincial government?

Mr. Speaker, I want to give you some other figures that could illustrate what happens with people who are on social services when there is no beer or no liquor for sale. For example, Mr. Speaker, and these are comments from Dr. Miriam Mackey who was the with the university doing a food survey along the Labrador coast, she stated in this report that in one month last Winter, when the lounge in Nain was closed, the food sales in the stores increased 33 per cent. Just imagine, Mr. Speaker! What was happening? One month the lounge was closed and, Mr. Speaker, food sales increased 33 per cent. Now, what does that tell us? Mr. Speaker, that tells us one thing, that the recipients of social services were using the money and leaving their kids - a lot of the time abusing their kids - and the rest of the family and spending it in that lounge.

And, Mr. Speaker, I think we have to look at those kinds of figures. And when the minister brought in this bill today - I hope that he will have the intestinal fortitude to get this report. If he does not have it, I can send him over a copy. He should make sure that when he brings this bill in it will not be a piece of paper having twelve people on an advisory council or something, that it will be a regulation that will definitely make changes to the Liquor Control Act and look at how this Province

MR. G. WARREN: has been destroyed by the whim and the will of this government in trying to collect taxes off the poor people of this Province. And that is exactly what is happening, Mr. Speaker. Here is an example of how this government is trying to - instead of charging all those surveyors who are plugging holes all over Labrador and all over the Province and only charging them two dollars each for a permit, it would be better if this government would charge them \$100 and not try to make it from the sale of alcoholic beverages.

Mr. Speaker, there are other ways to do it and this government

MR. WARREN: is using a manipulation tactic of saying, Look, here is a great chance. Here is our opportunity to get money for the Treasury. We will charge it to those people who are drinking, charge it to those people who are drinking. 'And this is why, Mr. Speaker. It was only just two weeks ago that the liquor in the liquor stores was increased in price. All it does is give the government more money.

Mr. Speaker, one of the recommendations - in fact there were five or six recommendations, Mr. Speaker, that the advisory council did make and those recommendations have gone into the hands of the Minister of Social Services and for the record of the House, Mr. Speaker, I am going to read two or three of those. The advisory council would like to know if any or all of the following options can be exercised under the Liquor Control Act. All they are asking in their recommendations is to know if those five options can be exercised under the Liquor Control Act. Number one, I already mentioned, Prohibit all liquor in a community. If a community in this Province - I would like to have that question answered by the minister sometime before he closes this debate - if any particular community in the Province has a majority vote saying that they do not want any liquor in a community, whether it is Placentia, whether it is down in Gaultois or whether it is in Hopedale, if that community signs a petition and says, look, we, by majority, say we do not want any liquor in our community, now can the Liquor Control Act - that is a question I would like for the minister to answer before he closes this debate - can the Liquor Control Act prohibit all liquor from going into that community?

MR. WARREN: Now, Mr. Speaker, it is a very simple question, yes or no. If they say no, if they say no, Mr. Speaker, I will go back to my original remark saying that there is something wrong with the Liquor Control Act, it is a Liquor Control Act no more, it is a liquor abuse act.

Mr. Speaker, another thing that was thrown open by the Advisory Council was to limit the amount of liquor that may be purchased, possessed or brought into a community in a given period. They have thrown open five or six different things and they want to know if any of those can be answered. Limit the type of liquor available in a community. That is if the community says, 'Look, we only need beer, we do not want any rum to be sold, can the Liquor Control Act do that?

Local committee approval needed for each purchase of alcohol. Now, Mr. Speaker, that comes to a very valid point. The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) - here we are asking for a local approved committee for each purchase of alcohol. Now, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Fisheries was planning to put a community stage in Salvage, Bonavista Bay, for example, I would think, Mr. Speaker, the first thing the Minister of Fisheries would consider, would look at, is meeting with the fisheries committee in that community.

MR. MORGAN: Oh, yes.

MR. WARREN: Right, He agrees with me. Okay, that is number one. Now, Mr. Speaker, why not the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) or the minister responsible, probably the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) - is he responsible for the Liquor Control Act?- whoever the minister is, why not that minister, as requested by the advisory

MR. WARREN: council, meet with the local community committee or have the local community committee's approval for the purchase of any alcohol for that community?

Mr. Speaker, I am asking a simple question, that if a community has a committee set up, Mr. Speaker, in a community, and if this committee has recommendations from the community saying we do not want any liquor in the community, the least thing the minister responsible could do is meet with the committee.

And, Mr. Speaker, here is one that has caused quite a bit of concern. Mr. Speaker, if my hon. colleagues do not stop talking, I am sorry, - between the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and my colleagues there is just too much talking going on.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

The member wishes to be heard in silence. If his colleagues on his side of the House could restrain themselves.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, here is a very thorny issue in the community of Nain. It has, in the past year or so, been diminished to a certain degree but not completely. Alcoholic beverages are limited to paying guests only at a hotel or lounge. Mr. Speaker, what they are saying there is that if an hotel in Nain or, again we could say down in Gaultois, has an hotel there, the hotel is there for one purpose, the lounge is to look after guests, accommodate guests. Now, the people of that community do not consider themselves guests of that hotel but still and all the lounge is open to anybody. So they can at least consider - and all they are asking is very simple question, is there anything under the Liquor Control Act where, any of those could be exercised? Now, Mr. Speaker, with the introduction of this bill - and as I said at the beginning, Mr.

MR. WARREN:

Speaker, I support this bill. This bill, at least as far as I am concerned, has been two and a half years overdue. And, Mr. Speaker, if the minister shows as much enthusiasm when he is closing this bill as he did when he introduced the bill, then I hope, Mr. Speaker, the minister will see fit to take a page from this book that is presented by the Happy Valley/Goose Bay Alcohol and Drug Abuse Advisory Council, and look very seriously and I believe he will find in that book some very important factors that could determine whether this bill will be able to produce the results that most of the people in Newfoundland and Labrador are waiting for.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird):

The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak a few minutes on this bill, "An Act To Establish The Alcohol And Drug Dependency Commission Of Newfoundland and Labrador", and say that I am very happy to associate myself with it, as I have been involved as the Minister of Health with the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) in this particular study and in this particular bill.

The previous two speakers - of course, I have some sympathy with some of the statements that have been made. The member for St. Barbe (Mr. Bennett) made some remarks about the job creation and I just want to remind him that in the liquor licences years ago, it was a very select group of people who used to get jobs in the dispensing of liquor.

MR. MARSHALL:

If the hon. member will permit.

They also used to get even whole liquor stores, if you can remember that.

MR. HOUSE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. So I just want to point out that this is something we have not - I do not think there has been any restriction on people wanting to get licenses and I question - I do not know - I question whether, if you have five beer licenses in one community or three, whether the amounts of liquor being

MR. HOUSE: consumed is in relation to the number or not, I do not know, I cannot say that.

MR. HANCOCK: If there is one you can charge at one. If there are three you can charge at three.

MR. HOUSE: Yes, well the other thing I just want to mention, some of the statistics, I was listening to the minister when he was giving his report and he did mention the thousand that the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Bennett) was talking about, the thousand children who were directly affected because of alcohol abuse and that was referring specifically, as I understand it, to the fact that the children were abused by their parents while the parents were under the influence of alcohol. And I think that is a national standard, that is a national figure that was given there.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do have considerable sympathy with the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren). Of course, I have visited a lot of these communities that he talks about, and I have also -

MR. THOMS: What was it like to be sitting in the House during the last session?

MR. HOUSE: What has that got to do with it? Why are you talking about the last session?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. HOUSE: The hon. member should have been out in my district when we were out there with the Cabinet just to see what kind of support -

MR. THOMS: That is only because there was plenty of free booze.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HOUSE: Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I will have the privilege of at least serving two terms, that is more than I would say the hon. gentleman will get.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, my, oh, my. That is good Wally.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (BAIRD): Order, please! Order, please!
Order, please! As interesting as the speaker might be in
the other conversation, the hon. Minister of Health
(Mr. House) has the floor.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear,hear!

MR. THOMS: (Inaudible) dinner in Grand Bank.

MR. HOUSE: The relevancy, and the point
about it, I will say that the Liberals from Bay of Islands -
was it? - held their annual meeting in Humber East and they
had five people turn up.

MR. THOMS: (Inaudible) turned up (inaudible).

MR. HOUSE: I do not know if they know
where it is or not.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKEY: Those are better statistics
than I gave.

MR. PATTERSON: Three turned up in Placentia.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, in getting back I
just want to say that I was -

MR. PATTERSON: Your district will (inaudible) redistribution.

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. HOUSE: - very sympathetic to the
statements by the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren).

MR. THOMS: You are gone too. You are gone.

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. THOMS: You are gone, you are gone, and
you are gone.

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. THOMS: St. George's is gone. Burgeo-Bay
d'Espoir is gone.

MR. POWER: He has to get a seat somewhere.

November 17, 1981

Tape No. 3498

RA - 4

MR. SPEAKER(Simms):

Order, please!

MR. HOUSE:

Mr. Speaker, can we have the
whimp from Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) silenced.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. HOUSE:

I am going to carry on. Now one of the things that bothers me about the statements made by the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) is the fact that he is ready to start placing restrictions on people. And I think we are quite happy to see a decrease in alcohol consumption. The main fact of putting this bill before the House is evidence of that fact, that is the whole purpose of it. But the way we want to do it is through - of course, number one, I think the first important part of this bill is talking about the curative aspects, to try and deal with the problems that exist and I do not think they exist because of the way that government or anybody else dispenses liquor. People are going to get it. We have had that in the blue laws, that people got access to liquor. The argument used is that the higher the price should be a deterrent. As a matter of fact, this is what people are advised it is, a deterrent.

MR. FLIGHT:

What?

MR. HOUSE:

The high price of liquor is a deterrent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. HOUSE:

Yes, it is a deterrent. And you can ask a number of people who are operating bars today and they will tell you that the high price is a deterrent.

MR. THOMS:

How gullible do you think we are?

How gullible?

MR. HOUSE:

So, Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this, as I said, is try to put things in place to help people who have problems. And the other aspect, of course, is to do education and to join with other agencies in working to help people who are addicted. So I do not think the answer is to go out and prevent and try to prevent people from dispensing liquor, it is to try and educate people in the proper use of it in this respect.

Mr. Speaker, I have to say that from the Department of Health's point of view, and I have talked to it all depends on which group you talk to, hospitals - I talked to one hospital, and that was a hospital in a fairly affluent community

MR. HOUSE: in the Province, who tells me that perhaps 60 per cent of the acute problems they have in hospitals are alcohol related.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HOUSE: That is a sobering thought to say the least.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HOUSE: That is one of the problems.

As the Minister of Health certainly we promote this. We do not go around grabbing a hold of people and saying you cannot drink, we are going to try through the process of education and, of course, the curative aspects, to eliminate some of the problem.

I want to pay tribute to a lot of the organizations, of course, that have been involved with this and I think in terms of the Harbour Light here, the Sisters of Mercy, the De-tox Centre and the Drug and Alcohol Foundations across the Province. I remember just last year addressing a group in Labrador City where I am sure some of the people there are going to be very happy to see this bill being presented here today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: What about AA?

MR. HOUSE: Yes, and AA is another group.

That is a tremendous group that is doing untold wonders for people who are addicted with alcohol.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HOUSE: There is a fair amount of it -

I was in the schools for a number of years and we used to find in schools that Monday was a bad day, young people in high schools were coming back after the weekend with hangovers, the productivity from young people in classrooms was matching what it was matching in the various industries, because industry, again,

MR. HOUSE: suffers in certain times of the week, and Monday is one of these times.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think this kind of thing that we are doing today of trying to come to grips with the problems that exist and putting funding into it I hope, and then, of course, trying to get something into the schools and the education programme, not only relating to, of course, alcohol but ther other bad influences, perhaps, that we have in our society, such as smoking. These kinds of programmes, I think, with proper legislation and a proper emphasis by all of us, will go a long way to alleviating the problem.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. THOMS: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to have a few words on this particular piece of legislation that is going through. As my friend for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) said, we are supporting the legislation. I think probably alcohol and drugs, I guess all over the world today, is one of the saddest

MR. THOMS: families go hungry. That happens. Now, I have only seen this once. Once in two years have I seen this and I saw it at nine o'clock in the morning. And it was very difficult, Mr. Speaker, very difficult indeed, for me to have any great sympathy for this particular person.

Now, I am not one who can sit down and talk to people about the evils of alcohol or the evils of smoking. But on this particular occasion I did say to the lady, I said, "Clean up your own act first before you ask me for help. Before you ask me to go to the social services representative, then clean up your own act first. Do not ask me to come here and ask for my help when all I can see - the beer bottles alone must have gathered twenty or thirty or forty dollars if they had been taken, enough for a week's groceries. And the ask trays, Mr. Speaker, were unbelievable. Now this is not a scene that is unique to one district in this Province. You can go anywhere in this Province and you can see such situations. And I believe it is up to us, it is up to the churches, it is up to the different agencies, some of which have been mentioned here this afternoon, to try to educate these people into getting their priorities straight, that a person's priority is the welfare of his children,

MR. THOMS: or her children. The priorities are not to have several cases of beer for a Saturday night or a Friday night or several bottles of booze. That is not the priority, there are things that come before. There are those who believe that alcohol and cigarettes should not come at all and I respect that opinion and that position. But I just wanted to relate this particular incident. And I think for the first time in an awful long time, I felt obliged to talk about the abuse of alcohol to this particular woman.

But the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) mentioned that education - I think one of the biggest crimes that was ever committed by this administration and by the previous administration and the previous administrations before that - and I can stand here and say this, I was not a member of any of the previous administrations, I have not been a member of any administration so far, although Saturday night I thought I was a member of the administration when they were demonstrating, I thought I was a member of the government, but, Mr. Speaker, I am not a member of the administration - but I believe that one of the biggest crimes ever perpetrated by any administration, and I am not just pointing the finger at the present administration although the present Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is equally to blame because he has not done anything about it, but every year in this Province the people of this Province spend some \$30, \$40, \$50 million - I think the figure last year was something like \$39 million or \$50 million - on alcohol in this Province, purchased at the government owned liquor stores. It is the biggest money maker that this government has or that any previous government has had.

But look at the financial statements, Mr. Speaker. The profits go directly into the

MR. THOMS: some of the profits, enough of the profits are taken and go directly to educating our people and our young people into the dangers of alcohol. We supply it to them, Mr. Speaker. We make it available to them. The liquor store in Churchill Park is owned by the government of this Province. The liquor stores right across this Province are owned by the government of this Province. The government of this Province is responsible for what I saw two or three weeks ago and they are not accepting their responsibility. They are not accepting their responsibility and it is about time that somebody, somebody in government, be it a Liberal Government or be it a Tory Government, it is time that somebody had the guts or the intestinal fortitude to say to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), to say to the Cabinet, look I want \$5 million earmarked to educate the people about drug abuse and the dangers of alcohol and the danger of drugs. I believe, Mr. Speaker, it would be a very popular move. Now, I would not want to suggest anything that would get this crowd back into power after the next election, but I think it would be a very popular move. I think it would gain as many votes as the blacktop would.

MR. HOLLETT: It would gain respect for all the politicians.

MR. THOMS: That is right. That is another point, it would gain an awful lot of respect for us as politicians in this Province. And believe you me politicians in this Province need to gain more respect than they already have.

MR. MORGAN: It depends on what party we are talking about.

MR. TULK: Now, see, there you go, look, that little bit of partisan politics coming in there again.

MR. HANCOCK: 'Morgan', I doubt if you would even get (inaudible).

MR. THOMS: Does the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) - is it Humber West?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. THOMS: Yes. Does he not agree that we should have a better education programme? Does the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) not? Is there anybody on the other side, is there anybody, let him stand up if there is anybody on the other side of this House who does not agree that we should put more money into education of the dangers of alcohol and drugs in this Province? Is there anybody? Let him stand up if there is anybody over there, let him stand up. I will sit down and I will let him stand up if there is anybody over there against educating the people of this Province, and the young people particularly of this Province, to the dangers of alcohol and drugs. I can only assume you are all for it. Then do it.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we are too free in lots of cases in our licensing policy. I will not go to the extent of saying that if 51 per cent of a community says there is going to be no alcohol then there should not be any alcohol. I do not believe that this is one of the situations where the majority opinion should be imposed on the minority. I will not go that far. But I had an interesting little tidbit when I was flying down on a plane one time. Saskatoon is a city, the comparable size of St. John's. They both have about 100,000 people. Saskatoon has twenty drinking establishments in that city. Twenty! You go from Patrick Street, in St. John's, down to the Hotel Newfoundland and you have somewhere between 140 and 150.

MR. MORGAN: And you have been in them all.

MR. THOMS: I have not been in - I have been in some of them but I have not been in them all. But everyone I have been in, Mr. Speaker, I have met the Minister of Fisheries.

Now, here is Saskatoon, a city comparable to the size of St. John's with five and six times fewer drinking establishments than we have here in St. John's. I mean the proliferation of drinking establishments in St. John's is just something fantastic. I mean, you can float from Patrick Street to the Hotel Newfoundland. You can actually float down there. And some of them are nice. There are some of them, I do not know what they are like inside, but they are so bad outside I would not go in.

MR. BAIRD: They must be some bad.

MR. THOMS: They are.

MR. THOMS: Indeed they are. Indeed they are.

MR. LUSH: You need a dory to go downtown.

MR. THOMS: So I think - yes, there is.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) on George Street.

MR. THOMS: - room for improvement, there is room for thought as far as the giving out of licences to establishments is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the minister. As I say, we are supporting the legislation creating the commission. Having said that though, I think it is probably the piece of job creation legislation brought before this House.

MR. TULK: The only piece.

MR. THOMS: It is certainly - it may not be the only piece, we may have had pieces of legislation that created less jobs.

MR. TULK: Or did not create any.

MR. THOMS: But this will create more Tory jobs, more Tory jobs, because let us not kid ourselves -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. THOMS: - this administration is not going to go out and look for a Chairman of this Commission with Liberal colours.

MR. BAIRD: I hope not.

MR. THOMS: There we have it right from the horse's mouth, usually we get it from the other end, this time we got it right from the horse's mouth.

AN HON. MEMBER: The other end is speaking.

MR. THOMS: But it is the -

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes, that is true.

MR. THOMS: - piece of job-creation legislation that we have had in front of this House for a long time. We have, I do not know, twelve members of the Commission, we have a full-time, I assume it is a full-time, although it may be

MR. THOMS: a part-time, and the only reason why I say it is a full-time is because there is going to be an annual salary paid to the Chairman of the Commission, although I suppose it could be a part-time job and you pay him \$20,000 or \$30,000 or whatever the case might be.

But one of the funniest - well, it is passing strange, as the Premier likes to say, one of the passing strange clauses in this legislation says -

MR. MORGAN: Speaking of passing strange (inaudible)

MR. THOMS: - that members of the Commission shall serve without reimbursement. 'Members of the Commission shall serve without reimbursement'. Now, I believe that members of the Commission should serve without reimbursement. I think that members of the Commission should serve without reimbursement.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Speaker wants to (inaudible)

MR. THOMS: What is that? Does the Speaker wish leave? The Speaker did not ask for leave.

Clause (8) - did the Speaker wish to - I am sorry?

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The Speaker does not wish to interrupt the hon. member but if the hon. member wishes to sit, I have a gentleman in the gallery I wish to recognize.

MR. THOMS: Oh, by all means, Your Honour, I would allow.

MR. SPEAKER: Okay. I would like to take this opportunity to welcome to the House on behalf of all hon. members a former member and minister who is now the President of the Alcohol and Drug Addiction Foundation, Mr. Tom Doyle. Welcome.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Why do you not give him a job?

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, under Clause (8) of this particular piece of legislation it says, 'Members of the Commission shall serve without reimbursement'.

MR. THOMS: Now, if section (8) stopped right there - certainly goodness, Mr. Speaker, in this Province we can get people to serve on this type of Commission without reimbursement. Certainly we can get them, Sir, without reimbursement. I am sure that if we really tried, we could get members on this Commission who would serve for the good that this Commission will serve.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. THOMS: Clause (8) - He is just bothered with what is across Canada. Newfoundlanders are different. We are good, honest people.

MR. TULK: as they keep saying -

MR. THOMS: 'Members of the Commission shall serve without reimbursement', and that sounds great until you read on, and it says, 'That members of the Commission shall serve without the reimbursement other than' - it is passing strange - 'other than (a) such remuneration for each meeting of the Commission a member attends'. So on the one hand he is going to serve without reimbursement and on the other hand he is going to serve

MR. THOMS: without reimbursement except he is going to get paid for every meeting.

MR. HICKEY: That is a nominal amount.

MR. THOMS: It does not say anything here about nominal amounts. Presumably it can be any amount as may be prescribed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, any amount that the Cabinet wants to pay to these people to attend, the same as other boards. This could be \$150, \$200. The Chairman of the Rent Control Board, for example, gets about \$200 a meeting.

And then it says, 'Notwithstanding' - I do not know why they say this - 'notwithstanding section 8 the chairman shall be paid a fixed annual salary to be fixed by the Cabinet, by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council'. Now, am I to assume that we are going to have full-time commissioner? I assume we are going to have a full-time commissioner, are we? He is going to be full-time.

MR. WARREN: Who is it, 'Tom'?

MR. THOMS: So as I said, Mr. Speaker, this is the best piece of job creation legislation that has come before this House since I have become a member of the House. The first twelve jobs of the 40,000 jobs promised by this administration in June of 1979, we are now seeing them. The first twelve jobs of the 40,000 that were promised in 1979, we are now seeing them. Okay? Like I say -

MR. STIRLING: Be fair now.

MR. THOMS: Yes, I have to be fair. There has been the odd one where we created commissions and this sort of thing.

MR. STIRLING: The (inaudible) women had a job.

MR. THOMS: That is right.

So we have twelve jobs being created, sort of, on the commission side of it, and then we have an executive director of the commission which is to be employed, and such other employees as are deemed necessary by the commission for the purposes of this act.

MR. THOMS: So I may be wrong here, it may not be just twelve jobs being created. I mean, we could be creating 100 jobs here, we could be creating 100 jobs, because under this particular piece of legislation the commission can employ as many as they want to. But, Mr. Speaker, my main purpose of speaking to the bill is to again try to impress on those opposite, who can do it, to make sure that a certain sum of money is taken directly out of the profits of the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation and earmarked for education in this Province in relation to alcohol and drug abuse.

There are certain amounts throughout - I can recall during the budget estimates, where there were certain amounts under one heading, \$500,000 here, \$80,000 there, \$60,000 here. I do not know if the minister has the figures or not, and I do not know what the total is, but I am sure it does not come to more than \$500,000 or \$600,000. And most of it, of course, is earmarked for the education with respect to natives, so-called natives in this Province. Well, Mr. Speaker, I want you to know, I want this House to know that the woman I talked to, an awful lot of those who abuse alcohol and abuse drugs, are native Newfoundlanders. They are native Newfoundlanders. When you look at it from the point of view of what we as a Province - what is put into the general revenue of this Province, when we look at the \$40 or \$50 or \$60 million a year that we take out of the pockets of the people of this Province, when we look at that and we look at the miniscule,

MR. THOMS: the less than half a per cent or quarter of a per cent that we put back trying to cure the problem that in a sense we have created, then I think that we as a Legislature, all of us, every elected member of this Province, every elected member of this House of Assembly should hang their heads in shame and we should be on our feet day in and day out demanding that a greater amount of money go into education, educating the people of this Province and those who are afflicted by the dangers of alcohol and drugs. And I will continue, Mr. Speaker, to say that for as long as I am a member of this House. Thank you.

MR. ROBERTS: Well said!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. HANCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: You are going until six o'clock, are you?

MR. HANCOCK: No, I am not going until six o'clock.

Anybody else want to go? I only have about five minutes.

Do you want to go?

MR. ROBERTS: Can I go then?

MR. HANCOCK: Yes, sure. Go ahead. I will yield to my friend, my colleague from the Strait of Belle Isle.

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

MR. ROBERTS: I want it to be understood that if my friend wishes to speak later he has not forfeited his right to speak in the debate. I want to be relatively brief but I would like to say a few words on the bill. It is a good bill and I gather we are supporting it.

MR. WARREN: Oh, yes, all the way.

MR. ROBERTS:

But there are one or two comments I want to make and one or two features that I would draw to the minister's attention because I suspect they have come, I hope they have come in inadvertently because they are certainly contrary to what this government has always proclaimed as being their policy and what they have, I think it is fair to say, from time to time implemented. Let me touch on one or two of those first.

I notice that the members of the commission are to hold office at good behavior. Now that goes directly against the principle that this administration used to say it enshrined in the law, and I think there are examples where it did enshrine it in the law. It is found in sub-clause 5 of clause 5. And I know Your Honour is familiar but just so we are all familiar with the difference, a member who holds office during good behavior really holds it at the pleasure of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. Oh, we can talk around with he has got to show bad behavior before we can put him out but, I mean, who determines what is good behavior and bad behavior? The answer is the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. So, in effect, those words are precisely the same as holding office at pleasure. Whose pleasure? The Lieutenant-Governor in Council's pleasure, the Cabinet, in effect the minister. And I do not think that is a power that the minister would want and, I venture to suggest, it is a power which he ought not to have. And I would say to him it is a power that this administration and its predecessors - about 1970 we started changing these acts. People hold office for a set term and they can always be removed for cause, of course they can, just as a member can be thrown out of the House for cause, and there are precedents. The hon. gentleman and I are both familiar with precedents of that sort. You know, public servants

MR. ROBERTS: hold office on good behavior during pleasure but there should be tenure in these boards. And I want to make that comment because I think it is wrong and I would simply draw it to the attention of the minister. I do not think it flaws the bill fatally but I think it is an area that the minister might wish to draw his attention to. Now if it has been put in as a matter of policy, Mr. Speaker, then all the minister has to do is say that and he and I will have to disagree on the point.

I suspect this is probably like most things in most bills, this is simply the product of the draftsmen, my old friends, the draftspersons. The minister gives instructions as to what he wants in a general way, but these are not the types of matters that are the subject of ministerial instructions as a rule. So I draw that to the minister's attention particularly and invite him to comment upon it either when he closes second reading or when he deals with the bill at Committee stage, if he wishes.

Now, the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Power), I am sure what he is saying is interesting for a change. He is going to be here at seven o'clock in the morning and I hope he is paid by the hour as opposed -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I realize he is not paid what he is worth, Sir, but there is a minimum wage law in this Province so it is a benefit.

I do want to raise a couple of other points, Mr. Speaker, relating to the House's relationship to this bill - or not to the bill, I am sorry, to the commission which is to be set up under the bill. The commission is not, if I have read the bill correctly, a department, it is a corporation, It is much like the

November 17, 1981

Tape No. 3505

IB-4

MR. ROBERTS: Housing Corporation or the
Computer Corporation. By clause 3 it is made a body
corporate and that is the thread running throughout the
bill. Now, I am no objection

MR. ROBERTS: _____ to the government using the corporate vehicle. I mean, there is nothing inherently right with something being done by a department per se, there is nothing inherently wrong with something being done by a commission per se. I think you look at the need to be met and if the minister and his colleagues have decided on the advice of their officials that he should tackle this problem by means of a commission, then I am game to go along with it.

Medicare is being run by a commission, I think very successfully.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) raising funds.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry?

MR. HOUSE: Raising funds.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, the minister has mentioned raising funds, and I commend them, but I hope for his sake that he does not hold his breath waiting for the Commission to raise funds. I suspect they will not. They may try.

MR. HOUSE: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: And the minister says, let me say again I hope his hopes are realized but, you know, I am from Missouri on that one, I think I will have to be shown. Some of my best friends are in industry, to use the old line, but I do not think for a moment that industry will come through unless the minister can persuade his colleagues, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Dinn) to take whatever steps the minister may properly take to have the Workers' Compensation Board accept alcoholism in some cases as being an industrial disease. There is some jurisprudence to that effect now, I am told, in Ontario, and that is quite a breakthrough. I think it came up in the mining context there, where a man who had worked in a mine and

MR. ROBERTS: became an alcoholic was able to convince - whatever the WCB is called in Ontario - they have a body the same as ours, it may be a different name, I do not know - was able to convince them that his alcoholism was the result of work induced stressed and accordingly they compensated him. Now if that were to be so then industry would have to come to the feast because, of course, that compensation ups the charges for that class and since the WCB is a self-financing mechanism in that way, the cost is passed on to the industry.

Well, I welcome, you know, the minister's news that they are going to try, the Commission is going to try to solicit funds. I urge him not to hold his breath. Politically, if he wishes, hold his breath, but I urge him - I mean, I have nothing against the minister in any sense other than a partisan row from time to time, and unless he suddenly wants to make his heirs at law richer he should not hold his breath waiting for industry to give any money in or for anybody else to give money in.

What I am saying is I have no objection to a commission but I do want to make a comment or two on the fact that this commission is operating at arm's length from the House, and it is no defence to that statement to say that other commissions also operate at arm's length. To me the whole system is flawed. And one of the points, one of the cardinal points that this government or any administration in this Province should bring in, if they are genuine about reforming - we hear a lot of talk from the Premier about reforming, we hear a lot of talk sometimes from other members of his administration about reform, but if they are genuine one of the great reforms that should be made, to bring back to this House the control over these commissions or these corporate bodies, not always called commission with a capital 'c'. We have these huge, huge bodies, we have quite

MR. ROBERTS: a multiplicity of them, I am not sure I could name them all, Hydro is obviously the cardinal one. Hydro, in an administrative sense, is a monster out of control. It answers to nobody and nothing. I am not saying it is a monster in itself, but administratively, and I use that word, 'Hydro, Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro is an absolute monster. It is as bad as the CBC or the CNR or any of these bodies nationally. They are persons at law, they are people at law, not real people but legal people.

And the same scheme comes up here.

This Commission, well, the petroleum and - there must be fifteen or twenty, and more and more areas of our public life are outside the control of the House. The bill appears to have some safeguards in it, and I think they are put forward in good faith. I am not for one moment suggesting that the minister is trying to derogate from the authority of the House, or trying to put one over on us. I am not doing that. If I thought he was, he knows me well enough to know I would say that I thought he was. But the only control is, Clause (19) 'The expenses shall be defrayed out of moneys appropriated therefore by the Legislature'. That will be one line in the minister's estimates. We will never get a breakdown of the salaries as we get with the Public Service at large. We will never get a breakdown of their expenses. In fact, we may even never get the audited reports. The Auditor General will audit the Commission, and fair enough, that is his job and it is necessary that it be done, but there is nothing saying that that audit will be brought before the House. The Auditor General may choose to include in his report to the House. What I am saying is that here we are setting up a body that will be funded out of public funds, be doing a public job, and yet the public will have no control over it. The minister may or may not, and that will depend upon individual ministers. The present

MR. ROBERTS:

present minister has made a great interest in this. He has become involved. He has made it an item of policy with him and well and good, but his successor may just have no interest in this, may be concerned about something else. The solution in my suggestion, Mr. Speaker, is not to necessarily bring everything back to the House. I am not sure our present estimates procedure, committees or no committees, but the present format of the estimates is particularly suited to effective parliamentary control. I have been in the House long enough and I have been at enough vantage points, I think I can say that with some authority. I have seen it from most angles, Sir. But the solution, I would suggest, is a standing committee of this House of Assembly empowered with supervising these Crown corporations and a standing committee with teeth, a standing committee like the Public Accounts Committee, a standing committee with the power to subpoena or the power to summons these corporations. We would not want a standing committee in which the president of a corporation, it does not matter which one, would come before it and say I am not going to tell you. My directors, who are ministers or public servants or private citizens, as the case may be, say I am not to give you any information, it is confidential. I mean, nothing should be confidential from the House. Nothing should be confidential from its committees, nothing dealing with the public business. There may be a need for in camera sessions. There are all sorts of precedents for that. I am not sure that we have ever had them here but there are certainly precedents in the parliamentary sense, both in Canada and in Westminster for in camera sessions if in fact there is some information that must be kept secret. But, of course, most things that are marked confidential are simply confidential because it would be

MR. ROBERTS: embarrassing if they were to come out. And there is a world of difference, as Your Honour will appreciate, between embarrassment on one hand and on the other hand the need to keep something secret.

The need to preserve a ministry's political virtue, tattered as that may be in the case of the present honourable government, the need to preserve a ministry's political virtue has nothing to do with the need to secrecy. And, of course, the freedom of information law which has a number of wide holes in it as we demonstrated when the bill was debated in the House, that will show us when that law comes in and we start using it. And all the items that ministers opposite will not answer now I am sure my friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) will have a plethora, a veritable plague and a plethora, a reign of notices coming down on the heads of gentlemen opposite and ladies opposite and we will maybe get some information instead of the dumb insolence which has characterized their posture to date.

Mr. Speaker, I would most seriously commend that to the minister. This commission is yet another example of a body that is being set up that will operate almost entirely beyond the reach of this House. And we are going to end up now talking more and more about less and less. And that is the story of the House of Assembly. And the hon. gentleman for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), whom I believe to be sincere when he talks about the need for reform and about making the House meaningful - and I am even prepared to show what an act of Christian charity I am prepared to indulge in, I am even prepared to accept the Premier as being genuine when he talks of reform although he has done more to stultify free discussion in this House and free bargaining and so forth in this Province than any one of his predecessors, the other

MR. ROBERTS: fifteen or sixteen
or seventeen men who have been Premiers of this Province.

But -

DR. COLLINS: Rubbish.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) knows rubbish, Sir, he knows rubbish, he evidences rubbish, he lives rubbish, he is rubbish, his budget is rubbish and he will soon stand up and admit that his budget last - when was it? - April.

AN HON. MEMBER: April.

MR. ROBERTS: - was the biggest pile of rubbish - and I could use a stronger word except Your Honour would quite properly rule it out of order - it is the biggest pile of rubbish and blank, blank, blank, blank, and you could fill in whatever blanks your want, Your Honour. And the minister would be well advised, Sir - there are some who think the Minister of Finance is a fool, Sir, but if he kept his mouth shut we would not know it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: I say to the Minister of Finance, if he cannot tend his own knitting better than he has he would be well advised, Sir, not to try to tend anybody else's knitting. The financial affairs of this Province have never been as mismanaged as during the tenure of the Minister of Finance, never, not ever.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: He will not even tell us, that man, that honourable gentleman, will not

MR. ROBERTS: even tell us - in fact, he may not even know the financial position of this Province. He may not know. And I am as certain as I morally can be that if he knows, he does not understand it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: Now let me come back to the alcohol. We are talking about an Alcohol and Drug Addiction Foundation, we are not talking about a foundation for childishness, so the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) need have no concern. Now let me come back -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: I will deal with him when he gets up the intestinal fortitude or he is driven to the desperation of telling us the truth about the financial position of this Province. Then we will deal with him, but until then let him bide quietly in a corner contemplating his navel and making his peace with his Maker, making his peace with the people of this Province.

Now, where was I before I was so rudely interrupted by the hon. gentleman?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Ah, you know -

DR. COLLINS: (Inaudible) a good year.

MR. ROBERTS: Attend the House, Sir?

I attend the House as faithfully as any hon. gentleman. More than that, More than that. Unlike the minister and the empty kettle over here, I attend it effectively. You know there is an old saying, Your Honour, doubtless heard it -

MR. HANCOCK: You never get (inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: -'That empty' - Your Honour grew up in Grand Falls, a fine city to produce such a fine native son.

MR. STIRLING:

He cannot take it.

He is leaving.

MR. ROBERTS:

'That empty kettles make the

most noise'.

MR. STIRLING:

He cannot take it. He is leaving.

MR. ROBERTS:

And, Sir, 'The proof of the

pudding is in the eating'.

MR. HANCOCK:

You only get in trouble when

you open your mouth 'Morgan'.

MR. ROBERTS:

If we want to talk - last year when

we told the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) of some of the troubles, he laughed at us. Now who is laughing?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS:

The thousands of people

in Newfoundland who are without jobs, in part because of the abysmal, political policy ignorance. Now, Your Honour, I hope I have not driven Your Honour out of the Chair. It is six o'clock. I move that the debate adjourn, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

I was about to remind the

hon. member of the bill we were debating. I thought maybe he might be -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh! .

MR. ROBERTS:

I was simply responding -

Quinlan Brothers got you

MR. HANCOCK:

right where they want you.

MR. ROBERTS:

- to the unbearable provocation,

unbearable provocation which is contemplated, which is presented by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), Sir.

MR. HANCOCK:

Who owns 'Morgan'?

MR. ROBERTS:

I want Your Honour to know

that he is out of order, he is speaking out of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order!

MR. ROBERTS: He does not even know what he is saying most of the time.

MR. HANCOCK: He is owned by Quinlan Brothers. He is owned by Quinlan Brothers.

MR. ROBERTS: I move the adjournment of the debate, Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) adjourns the debate.

The hon. President of the Council.

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

On motion, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 18, at 3:00 P.M.