

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD:  
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.  
WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 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 order raised yesterday by the hon. the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) concerning the tabling of a letter or document under the regular routine business item, Answers to Questions for Which Notice has Been Given. In reading Monday's Hansard, it is not clear to me in any of the answers where the Premier technically took notice of a question. I may add, incidentally, that some copies of the document had already been distributed but I pointed out at that time that the document was distributed on behalf of one hon. member to the other hon. member as a practice which often occurs in this House and is quite in order, but that it was not officially tabled in the House as I had not at that time ruled whether or not it was in order.

I have reviewed previous Hansards and I find that generally speaking the practice in our legislature has been that a minister who has been asked a question on a previous day has on occasion tabled additional information on the following day in further reply to that previous question, but that has always been done, has been an accepted practice and normally no disagreement is shown. However, in precise technical parliamentary terms, Answers to Questions should be the period allowed for ministers to respond to questions which they have deferred or taken notice of. In order, therefore, to keep within our practice the simplest way to resolve the point of order would be to ask at this

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): time if there is agreement for the hon. the Premier to table the document which he referred to yesterday. Is there agreement?

MR. HODDER: No.

MR. SPEAKER: I understand agreement has not been given.

I refer hon. members as well to the point of privilege raised yesterday by the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall).

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The point of privilege raised yesterday by the hon. the President of the Council concerning rules of procedure related to comments made by members after rulings have been handed down by the Speaker and, secondly, the parliamentary rule that when the Speaker is standing or rises to preserve order he must always be heard in silence. Let me remind members first of all that Beauchesne is very specific in terms of providing the guidelines available for a Speaker in dealing with a matter of privilege and I should not have to repeat them. They have been pointed out on numerous occasions in this hon. House. I simply say that my function is limited to deciding whether the matter raised is of such a character as to entitle a motion which would have priority over the rest of the Orders of the Day. And while I would have to rule in this instance that a prima facie case in my opinion has not been established, I want to further point out that a question of privilege is a question partly of fact and partly of law, the law of contempt of parliament.

In that respect I would like to treat the matter in the realm of a question of order

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):           rather than privilege in that a question of order concerns the interpretation to be put upon the rules of procedure and is a matter for the Speaker to determine. So as the matter raised deals with the rules of procedure, I would like to deal with it as a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):           Actually there are two matters that were raised, one with respect to comments that are made by hon. members after the Speaker gives a ruling on a particular point. And let me say emphatically that this is a matter which has on occasion been a matter of concern to me. And indeed I have brought it to the attention of hon. members in the past, perhaps not forcibly enough because it does not appear to have had the desired effect. I think hon. members will agree that frequently, especially in recent times, an hon. member has often commented on a ruling after it has been given by the Speaker. I want to state now to all hon. members and bring it to everybody's attention that that habit of making comments after a ruling is certainly out of order. This practice really cannot be accepted, and with respect to the matter I will agree that there was a point of order and I bring it to the attention of hon. members now because it is the Chair's intention to enforce this very important parliamentary rule.

The other matter raised referred to the authority that have been vested in the Speaker, and it is a matter which reflects clearly on the decorum and dignity of this House and all hon. members and certainly the way the parliamentary system is supposed to operate. Let me quote from the 19th. edition of Erskine May's Parliamentary Practice as one reference, page 441 and it is entitled, 'Procedure when the Speaker rises'. "Whenever the Speaker rises to interpose in the course of a debate he is to be heard in silence and any member who is speaking or offering to speak should immediately take his seat, nor should members leave their seat while the Speaker is addressing the House. And the members who do not maintain silence or who attempt to address the Speaker are called

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): to order. A member who persists in standing after the Speaker has risen and refuses to take his seat when directed by the Chair to do so maybe either directed to withdraw from the House for the remainder of the sitting or named for disregarding the authority of the Chair."

Recently I have had to rise on numerous occasions because of frequent interruptions and exchanges. And we all know that certain exchanges and comments back and forth are certainly an accepted part of parliamentary practice and tradition. And when a member who is speaking appears to be inviting the exchanges and not objecting to them, then the Chair will not intervene unless of course the House is in disorder. However, when these exchanges and comments become loud and consistent, such as actually shouting from your seat, then the Chair will have to intervene. And I am sure that hon. members on both sides will agree that recently there have been some members who seem to be abusing this parliamentary courtesy and are being loud and continuous with their interjections.

I think the Chair - and I know the members would want me to - is determined not to permit these types of irregular outbursts and will go out of its way now to protect the rights of the members of this House, and I know that I will have the support of the members of the House in that regard. This, of course, is all related to the dignity and decorum of the House and I have heard members often speak about the preservation of dignity and decorum in their speeches in the past,

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): and I know you will insist in the Chair doing whatever is necessary in upholding the very essence of these parliamentary traditions.

As I have said in the past, while the Chair has been entrusted with the responsibility of protecting the rights of the members of this House and of enforcing the rules, it is, however, a two-way street as members too have a tremendous responsibility, that of adhering to these rules and of adhering to the rulings of the Chair without debate. Thus it is important for members to take their seat when the Speaker is standing, and thus the matter raised in the point of privilege yesterday by the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) has to be addressed. And I conclude therefore by quoting for hon. members Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, page 38, paragraphs 117, subsection (1), which reads in part. "The Speaker calls on members to speak and in debate all speeches are addressed to him. When he rises to preserve order or to give a ruling he must always be heard in silence. No member may rise or remain standing when the Speaker is standing."

Members should always address the Chair and take their seat when the Speaker stands and certainly one of the main reasons for that rule is to guide the temperment of the House and to try to eliminate the possibility of members debating with each other in a heated fashion during times such as Question Period. Adhering to this most important parliamentary rule I believe will assist in preserving the dignity and decorum of this hon. House and I bring this matter of tradition and procedure to the attention of all hon. members and respectfully ask for your co-operation.

And may I, while I am standing at the present time, invite hon. members to join with me in welcoming to the galleries a number of delegations and representatives from various women's organizations, church and labour groups in our Province. Welcome.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to inform this hon. House of the status of negotiations between this government and the Government of Canada relative to transportation issues presently being discussed.

Tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, officials of my department are meeting with officials of Transport Canada in Ottawa in another attempt to resolve at least some of the very important transportation matters. From the Province's point of view, the main thrust of talks that have taken place to date has been funding for the continuation of the three year highways strengthening programme which concluded a year ago.

All members of this hon. House are aware of the very poor condition of our trans-Island highway when compared to that of other provinces. The improvements made under the recently completed three year programme were significant but they are really only a start on a much needed multi-year programme to begin the highway, to bring the highway even up to a suitable standard to accommodate present and projected traffic volume.

When the original three year strengthening programme was commenced in 1978, the federal government offered the



MR. DAWE:

Province a three-year first phase of a ten year programme that would be open for negotiation at the end of the first phase. In spite of extensive talks over the past several months, the federal government is unwilling to continue with this strengthening programme unless it is coincidental with agreements to reduce and/or withdraw some transportation services presently being provided by the federal government in this Province. During the talks conducted to date by my officials as well as myself, during the three meetings with the Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Transport), a wide range of other very important transportation issues were brought forward and these included, (a) continuation of the Labrador airstrip programme.

MR. GOUDIE:

Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE:

The need for airstrips in some thirteen isolated Labrador communities has been identified by Transport Canada's Air Administration now for a number of years. Over the past three years, airstrips have been built in Mary's Harbour, Makkovik and Nain. A contract was recently awarded for the construction of an airstrip in Davis Inlet. The Province has agreed to assume operation and maintenance costs associated with these four airstrips and, indeed, for the past year we have been providing the service on the three airstrips completed to date. Transport Canada wishes to make it contingent upon the Province's receiving any additional coastal Labrador airstrips, the acceptance of the fact that the marine coastal passenger service will be eliminated to communities North of Lake Melville and reduced to communities South of Melville upon completion of the airstrips. (b) continuation of the ferry terminals agreement. In 1978

MR. DAWE: the Province was obliged to assume responsibility for six intra-Provincial ferry services. As part of the negotiated agreement for the takeover, the federal government agreed to construct new or improved ferry terminals within two years on each of the six services which were: (1) Bell Island, (2) St. Brendans, (3) Change Islands, (4) Fogo, (5) Greenspond, (6) Little Bay Island-Long Island.

To date the federal government has honoured its commitment on only two, St. Brendans and Change Islands, of these ferry services. For over a year now the Province has attempted to have these terminals completed or else turn the committed funding over to the Province. This ferry transfer agreement together with the ferry terminal construction commitments were made long before the present budgetary ceiling or envelope funding approaches by the federal government -

AN HON. MEMBER: That is not true now.

MR. DAWE: - and the Province insists on the fulfillment of these commitments with no "trade off" strings attached.

MR. GOUDIE: Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE: (c) Standard gauging of the Newfoundland railway. The Province engaged C.P. Consultants Limited to study the operation of the Newfoundland Railway by Terra Transport and plot a realistic course of action to ensure the long term viability of the line. This study and its acceptance by the Province was completed earlier this year and it recommended the standard gauging of the existing rail line and indicated cost figures for accomplishing this upgrading over a period of years. The federal government disagrees with the Province's estimates for performing this standard gauging and we have been attempting to commence

November 18, 1981

Tape No. 3512

ah-3

MR. DAWE: a joint project between the two governments to see if our differences can be resolved and the standard gauging of our railway commenced.

It is important to note, Mr. Speaker, that all these issues are important in their own right and their necessity for completion self evident. The federal government has made all these

MR. DAWE: into a package that is contingent on further discussions to cut existing services and level of subsidy.

The Province offered the Government of Canada a mechanism through a Memorandum of Understanding that would provide the forum through which bilateral reviews and plans of transportation expenditures in this Province can be made, recognizing each government's particular responsibility and ability to pay. It is now obvious that the federal government wants no part of this Memorandum of Understanding unless the Province first agrees to accept reductions that Canada has already put in motion without provincial or public consultation. If the Province were to agree to these reductions and trade offs without full knowledge of the facts and without full involvement through a joint planning process, it would be abdicating its responsibility to the people of this Province and this we will not do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, within the last few days we have seen a good example of the federal government's unilateral action in reducing transportation services in this Province. On Monday the Province was officially notified by C.N. Marine of the withdrawal of the M.V. Marine Cruiser from the North Sydney-Argentia service.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DAWE: Next year the M.V. Ambrose Shea will be utilized during the Summer tourist season operating from June 14th to September 11th inclusive.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

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

MR. DAWE: Transport Canada's directive to C.N. Marine means that the number of crossings between North Sydney and Argentia will decrease from 132 to 78 and that passenger capacity will be reduced from 60,324 to 40,950, a decrease of 32.1 per cent. The capacity for automobiles will also be decreased but not to the same measure. Automobile capacity will be reduced by 17.4 per cent, which is still a substantial amount. In previous years, with two vessels in service, passenger and automobile space was fully booked long in advance of the commencement of the tourist season. In addition, Transport Canada's latest directive to C.N. Marine to increase fares by approximately 15 per cent defies interpretation. I fail to understand, Mr. Speaker, how Transport Canada can be so insensitive to the Province's requirements and aspirations that it would inflict upon the Province this double-barrelled blow.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, my department has been attempting to deal in good faith with the Government of Canada to define the optimum transportation system for the Province but there has been a complete lack of co-operation displayed by the Government of Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DAWE: They have the knack of presenting the Province with a 'fait accompli' or taking unilateral decisions under the guise of consultation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

Hon. members to my right will have an opportunity to reply to the statement as soon as

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

we can get through it.

I would ask hon. members to restrain themselves.

The hon. the Minister of

Transportation.

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, my department

asked the federal Department

MR. DAWE:

of Transport to meet and discuss the following proposals: Number one, an immediate three-year programme to continue the strengthening of the Trans Canada Highway at a federal/provincial cost sharing ratio that is favourable to the Province. A programme is needed immediately because of the deplorable condition of the highway and a favourable cost-sharing ratio is required because the scope of the upgrading programme is beyond the provincial fiscal capacity.

Number two, assurance that the federal government will proceed with its testing and evaluation of the Newfoundland Railway with a short-term view to reverse the decline in traffic volumes and a long-term view to standard gauging the system. Since the railway is a statutory responsibility of the federal government, the Province should not be expected to make a financial contribution to this process.

Number three, an immediate reversal of the federal plans to remove one of the two ferries on the Argentia/North Sydney service.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DAWE: Number four, assurance that the federal government will proceed with its programme of airstrip construction along the Labrador Coast.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DAWE: A moratorium on all federal plans to restrict the coastal shipping service. It is our hope that Ottawa would join with us in a joint examination of the entire coastal service. Only after this review, and if it is found necessary, should any decisions regarding the rationalization of the service be take.

Number six, an immediate conclusion of the existing federal/provincial agreement for the federal buy-out of the intra-provincial ferry terminals in the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE:

Number seven, in addition to the foregoing specific items, the federal government should abandon its 'fixed budget', 'trade-off', 'envelope' approach to transportation expenditures in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. DAWE:

It has been generally acknowledged, even by federal commissions, that the Newfoundland transportation system is significantly less developed than in the rest of the country. To hold the line on federal expenditures and to sacrifice aspects of an undeveloped system for improvements elsewhere is tantamount to condemning this Province to a second class transportation system.

I would like to make it quite clear that this government cannot and will not be a party to an 'envelope' approach which requires that we trade-off minimal services in one area for basic services in another. The rest of Canada has already transportation systems far superior to ours. Our Terms of Union gave Canada a constitutional obligation for many of its transportation expenditures in this Province. These expenditures should not be part of the 'envelope' system. It seems, Mr. Speaker, that the approach by the federal Department of Transport to these matters is to have this Province lose in areas of essential services to gain in others, and this philosophy, Mr. Speaker, is unacceptable to this government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.



MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the member for Bellevue has five minutes.

MR. CALLAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.  
Mr. Speaker, I want to make four or five observations on the statement just made. Number one, it is nice to see the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) got the opportunity to make this statement. Yesterday the Premier made a fisheries statement. And, of course, last Spring in Hodges Cove, again it was the Premier and not the Minister of Transportation who went out to Hodges Cove and announced some paving and road projects which, of course, one would expect to be announced by the Minister of Transportation.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) issue

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. THOMS: What was going on in Bellevue at the time?

MR. SPEAKER: Order! Order, please!

MR. THOMS: What was going on there at the time? A by-election, was it not?

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, a second point I want to make is that it is difficult to make any indepth or very much of an indepth statement about this statement by the minister because it is six pages long and I just got a copy of it five minutes ago. So, as I say, it is difficult to say very much about it, not knowing until five minutes ago what the minister was going to have to say.

Mr. Speaker, another observation I would like to make is that this, again, I believe, is typical of the way that this Province carries on its negotiations with Ottawa. We are told that the minister and his officials will be in Ottawa tomorrow to negotiate and here we see the Minister of Transportation today doing some fed bashing and interfering, I suppose, with the

MR. CALLAN: negotiations before they even get started.

Mr. Speaker, how much of what the minister just had to say is fact and how much of it is fiction and how much is P.C. propaganda is difficult to tell. Some of my colleagues on this side were shouting across at the minister that some of the things he was saying were untrue, especially as it pertained to the Labrador. I do not think that my colleague, for example, from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) would be bawling at the minister as he was unless he was basing his facts on facts rather than fiction, as the minister was doing.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion all I have to say is this, that we on this side are happy to see the negotiating team back in Ottawa tomorrow. We hope that something fruitful and useful comes out of the negotiations. However, let me say that the construction season has passed now, the time is gone now, and the minister has a long and, by the way, a hard winter to carry on and complete these negotiations so that we can have something substantial and concrete when the Spring comes. It is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that the provincial government did not put very much of its own funds into its own provincial

MR. CALLAN:

roads this past season which would have given some employment and would have stopped some of the construction companies from going and experiencing the bankruptcies that they have over the past several months.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that negotiations go well and all I have to say is that I am certain that a Liberal Government in this Province would be in a much better position and would be looking forward to negotiating a far better deal than I am sure that the minister would get with his fed bashing and we look forward, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN:

and we on this side look forward to the day, Mr. Speaker, when we will have the opportunity to go and negotiate with Ottawa as a Liberal Government in this Province and the people can be assured that when we go we will go negotiating looking for the best possible deal for this Province and we look forward to that day as soon as the Premier has the intestinal fortitude to call a general election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question for the Premier, Mr. Speaker, and it involves the Constitution and the request from the various women's organizations in this Province as presented to the Premier. And as the author, as the

MR. STIRLING: person recognized nationally as  
the author of the new accord and the new Constitution -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMS: I wonder (inaudible)

MR. STIRLING: As the -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

Order, the hon. member for

Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms).

MR. STIRLING: As the author of the new con-  
stitution, can the Premier tell us why he removed women's  
rights from the Constitution?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am very humble  
at the most complimentary remarks from the Leader of the  
Opposition and the members of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: I find it very difficult to  
speak, Mr. Speaker, after receiving such accolades from  
the opposite side of the House. No doubt they have just  
entrenched for another ten years the PC Party into the  
Government of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: I thank the Leader of the Opp-  
osition. Beware of Greeks bearing gifts, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

November 18, 1981

Tape No. 3516

EL - 3

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, could we have order?

MR. SPEAKER:

Yes, on both sides of the House,  
please, order!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to  
read into the record, if I may, the following press state-  
ment that was issued this morning.

PREMIER PECKFORD: "Premier Peckford announced today that the provincial government has indicated in a telegram to the federal government that Newfoundland supports the position that the override clause should not apply to section 28 of the charter providing for the constitutional equality of the sexes."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: "However, the Premier has confirmed his support of the federal government's position that the wording of the resolution, signed by the federal government and nine of the provinces, cannot be changed without the unanimous consent of all signators."

"The British Columbia Government has proposed that section 28 be excluded from the legislative override. The Government of Newfoundland supports this proposal."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, it would be much easier if the author in writing it up did not take the women's rights away in the first place.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes, why did they do that?

MR. STIRLING: Now can the Premier tell us whether or not it was his intention, as the author, to intentionally take away the women's rights or did it happen accidentally?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, the record of this administration as it relates to equality of the sexes is well known. We are the government. It was this government and only this government that had the courage to establish a Status of Women Advisory Council on the concerns of women -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

- which has a budget, I understand -

MR. THOMS:

(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

- which has a budget, I understand, which is the embarrassment of many other wealthier provinces, who do not provide to their councils near the financial support that we do and we are very proud of that. I am proud of the work that the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) and other ministries have done as it relates to the affairs and the problems that are encountered by people, especially women, in the work force.

The negotiations leading up to the constitutional accord, as most hon. members know, was a difficult and trying one on all the First Ministers that were there. We came away from that meeting with an accord that was signed by nine premiers and the Prime Minister. There has been since that day a number of negotiations by the delegations for those ten governments and through those negotiations there were indications from a number of the governments of their concern about the whole question of equality of the sexes and the legislative override. We were not one of the Provinces who had any concerns about it and were eager to see no legislative override.

However, there were others who did not feel as strongly as we did. Hopefully now, Mr. Speaker, because of the negotiations and talks that have gone on over the last couple of days, it will be possible for all the nine governments and the Government of Canada to agree so that we can include this in the accord and the resolution when it goes before the House of Commons. We fervently hope so.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. L. STIRLING:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER(Simms):

A supplementary, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. L. STIRLING:

I gather that the Premier is now saying that he and the other Premiers agreed to take this out of the constitution and it was not done accidentally, it was done intentionally. Now the Premier has taken very firm stands in the past. Will he now take a very firm stance, supported by every member on this side of the House, that he will withdraw his accord unless women's rights are restored to the old rights that they had under the original draft of the constitution?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, obviously the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) does not understand and it is very difficult to get him to understand.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The accord is signed by ten First Ministers. It was an accord agreed to by nine Premiers and the Prime Minister. And I support the view put forward by the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Chretien) in the Government of Canada that that accord cannot be changed by one or two of the signators to it. That would be unilateralism! That would be totally wrong! That would be arrogant! That would be breaking something that we agreed to sign and all the rest of it. So what has to happen now is negotiations so that this can be included without a legislative override.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have already sent a telegram to the federal government supporting the legislative override being removed. We have already indicated it to the other provinces.



SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the

members of the Opposition -

MR. THOMS:

You are trying to get yourself off the hook.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, if the members of the Opposition were as supportive, now that there are people in the House on this issue, were supportive two or three weeks or two or three months ago on our Terms of Union as they ostensibly are now on this particular issue, we might have gotten a lot further.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Where was the Opposition? Where was the Opposition on the Terms of Union? Where was the Opposition on mobility rights? Where was the Opposition on native rights? And where was the Opposition on women's rights before today?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. L. STIRLING:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. L. STIRLING:

Mr. Speaker, the Premier stood up in this House the last time he tried to convince the galleries that what he was doing was in their best interest was the last time he brought in strike legislation. They booed him and walked out of the galleries. Now unless he is looking for the same kind of booing again he should also tell the truth -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

You have a supplementary question?

MR. L. STIRLING:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question.

MR. L. STIRLING: But it has been very provocative when the Premier abuses the rules -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! Order, please!  
The hon. member is on his fourth supplementary and generally speaking there should not be too much preamble allowed. I have allowed some and I would ask him now to address his supplementary question, please.

MR. L. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, the Premier knows that eventually you will interrupt and therefore he provokes by going off into another subject.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. L. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, we have established a number of things in the first two or three questions: one, that the Premier intentionally took women's rights out, it did not happen accidentally. Two,

MR. STIRLING: he does not feel strongly enough about it -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: - and the supplementary question, the Premier must have splinters so far up his rectum from trying to straddle the fence on his telegram -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

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

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

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, this is the Question Period and our classy Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) I think can now get on and show his real class and ask a question and not make a speech.

MR. NEARY: What is the point of order?

MR. MARSHALL: The point of order is the hon. gentleman is making a speech, Mr. Speaker, and a bad one and in bad taste as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Well with respect to the point of order, I now direct the hon. Leader of the Opposition to please address his supplementary question.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: Do I take it, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier is not prepared to say to the Government of Newfoundland or to the House of Assembly or to the people of Canada or to the women of Canada that he is prepared to withdraw his accord unless the original intention of the full protection of women's rights is put back in the Constitution?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I regret that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) would take a low road on this issue and make the comments that he has made about me personally in trying to ask a question. I think it is too bad but I am sure we will let our performances speak for themselves. Mr. Speaker, I have signed in good faith, as have the other First Ministers of Canada, an accord. I am prepared to see that accord amended to take away the legislative override that is there as it relates to the equality of the sexes. And I am willing to go further than that, Mr. Speaker; I cannot break a contract unilaterally myself, but I am willing to go further than that as it relates this Province to show just how sincere we are on this matter. I am willing to indicate now that we will give in writing a firm and solemn guarantee as long as this government is in power that no legislative override would ever be used if in fact we are unsuccessful in getting that legislative override out before it goes to the House of Commons.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. STIRLING: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: I have a new question, Mr. Speaker, which will require a preamble.

Mr. Speaker, what the Premier has now said in accusing me earlier of not understanding, he does not understand that this is the very thing that the women and all the rest of the citizens in this country want to avoid - the right of a Premier, who took away their rights by admission, now to say that he is going to guarantee something in writing. That is the very point that the women of this country, the citizens of this country want a Charter of Rights for.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I have a -

AN HON. MEMBER: What is the question?

MR. PATTERSON: I bet it is about matrimonial property act,

MR. STIRLING: The question, Mr. Speaker -

MR. THOMS: Ask the lawyers downtown, They make a fortune out of it.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: Did the Premier receive the advice of his Status of Women Council? Did he consult with them and what advice did he receive from them before he took the rights out of the constitution?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if it is worthy of an answer, really, because obviously the Leader of the Opposition is trying to, you know, is blatantly indicating that I have taken rights away from somebody.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Here is the Leader of an Opposition who would not support us on keeping the rights that we have in the Terms of Union! Here is the Leader of the Opposition who opposed us in having amendments on mobility rights. I suppose now the Leader of the Opposition tomorrow will suddenly get all excited about native rights. I have not heard him mention that today. There is a great concern about that in the constitution as well. Let me just indicate to the Leader of the Opposition that there was an accord signed, a solemn accord signed between the Prime Minister and nine Premiers. We are trying, those Premiers and the Prime Minister, to change that accord with the agreement of all so that that legislative override does not apply to the equality of the sexes. I am committed to that and I believe it fervently and sincerely and will do everything

PREMIER PECKFORD: I can to see that that legislative override is removed. If it is not removed now-I am just conjecturing -if some province still objects and we cannot change the accord, it is in that event that I am saying that we will as a government indicate that we will never exercise that legislative override as long as it is there in the constitution. And if it remains there, we will, after the constitution is patriated and we have it here under the amending formula of seven out of ten, work as hard as is humanly possible to see that legislative override is removed for all of Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I take note that the Premier did not answer the question that, although appointing a Status of Women Council he did not consult with them or take advice from them and he has not been prepared to say what their advice was. Let me ask another question to the Premier that also deals with fundamental rights, fundamental rights completely under his control, not having to do with the constitution, The fundamental right of the people of Trinity-Bay de Verde to have a representative. And the Premier promised to have an by-election called in October or November.

MR. MORGAN: It was your man resigned.  
SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: Would he now tell us -

MR. HODDER: He called Walter Carter's in a week.

MR. STIRLING: He is on the record, very clearly on the record as saying -

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR.SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: - he calls them quickly. Would the Premier now tell the people of Trinity-Bay de Verde why he is delaying their right to have representation in this House of Assembly?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I note with a great deal of satisfaction that a number of years ago when the Leader of the Opposition with our representative in the federal cabinet made a statement that we were going to get a lot of money from the Upper Churchill because of changes to the constitution, he was wrong. I note with a great deal of satisfaction that the Leader of the Opposition, when he came out and said our Terms of Union could not be changed, he was wrong.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR.SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: I note with a lot of satisfaction today, Mr. Speaker -

MR. THOMS: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): May I ask the hon. the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) to please restrain himself.

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I note with a great deal of satisfaction now when he is wrong on women's rights that he now reverts to another course of questioning on a by-election in Trinity - Bay de Verde. I will decide and the government will decide when the by-election is called in Bay de Verde, and when we so decide we will inform the Leader of the Opposition and all members of this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I think people are beginning to see the difference between the speech making that the Premier makes and his actual performance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: We will let his performance judge his actions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, would the Premier tell us what it is that the people of Trinity - Bay de Verde would have to do to convince him that they would like to have a representative in this House of Assembly, their most basic, fundamental right?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am willing to stand on my performance if the Leader of the Opposition is willing to stand on his. I stood for the Terms of Union. We are standing for the offshore, we are standing for the fishery, and the Liberal Party of Newfoundland can continue to languish in the wasteland of politics



PREMIER PECKFORD: in this Province if it does not soon support the government on those basic issues. I am very, very disappointed in the Leader of the Opposition and his party, who continue to lose battle after battle and soon the whole war will be lost for the Liberal Party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Why do they not stand up and support the Terms of Union? Why do they not stand up and support -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!  
We will recess for five minutes to allow everybody to cool off.

RECESS

MR. SPEAKER(Simms):

Order, please!

For the purpose of clarification, there would normally be twelve minutes still remaining in Question Period, but today being Wednesday, Private Members Day, the routine business, according to Standing Orders, must end at four o'clock. I would just remind hon. members of that. We will proceed with Question Period.

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, the Premier in answering questions from the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) in connection with including women's rights in the constitution mentioned that there were a number of Provinces opposed to having this included in the constitution, but the hon. gentleman did not name the provinces. Is the hon. Premier at liberty to state what provinces were opposed to having women's rights included in the constitution? And while he is on his feet, just to save me asking another supplementary, would the hon. gentleman tell the House what he thinks the chances are of getting the accord opened up, getting the other provinces to agree to have women's rights reinstated -

MR. HISCOCK:

And native.

MR. NEARY:

- and native rights - in the constitution as they were prior to the First Ministers' meeting. So my number one question is, is the hon. gentleman at liberty to name the provinces? Personally I cannot see - it is inconceivable why anyone would be against including women's rights in the constitution. What problem, what excuse, what reasons would they give for being against it? I cannot think of one reason myself.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. NEARY: So I would ask the hon. gentleman if he would care to elaborate on that answer.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, first of all it is not women's rights into the constitution, it is equality of the sexes in the constitution, and that is a big difference.

MR. NEARY: It is the same thing.

PREMIER PECKFORD: No, it is not the same thing -

AN HON. MEMBER: If it were all male you would not have the problem.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - it is equality of the sexes. I am not at liberty to name the provinces that are having difficulty with this, Suffice it to say that up until the accord was signed, in the couple of hours before it was signed, there were a number of provinces which opposed the principle of a charter itself, let alone some of the rights that would be accommodated by the charter, or included under the charter. But I am not at liberty - I think it is fair, also, to say that most of the women's groups throughout the country who are lobbying on this matter, are familiar or know or have a good idea what provinces are the ones that have been difficult on this issue and are working to try to convert them to the cause, so to speak.

The chances of there being some amendment agreed to by the nine Premiers and the Prime Minister on the question of equality of the sexes I think is good. It seems to me that it is quite possible in the next day or so that there will be a unanimous agreement by the nine and the Prime minister.

On the whole question of native rights, I do not know. There is an ongoing lobby in that area as well. For our part we have done a number

PREMIER PECKFORD:                      of things on the native  
rights side. First of all, we have endorsed through  
order-in-council, the government some months ago, the  
position of

PREMIER PECKFORD:

the United Nations on that which therefore takes care of our support of aboriginal rights in the Constitution of Canada. We have done that up front some time ago and so we also support that.

It comes as a surprise to some people because the constitutional debate got so waylaid with other things that right from the beginning we were one of the few provinces that supported the principle of a charter and wanted to get into the details of it at the beginning. We were one of the few. Our white paper supported that. We had always supported the principle of a charter and it is in our white paper, if any of the hon. members care to just review it again to see.

But to answer the member directly, I am not at liberty to disclose the provinces. I think it is clear to a lot of people who are close to the scene the provinces who have been concerned and who have been a bit negative on this point. The chances, I think, are very very good for the equality of the sexes part becoming part of the accord.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Premier probably did not get the drift, did not get the point I was making. There was a change of government last night, for instance, in Manitoba and I would suspect that Manitoba was one of the provinces that objected to the equality of the sexes.

MR. NEARY: Sterling Lyon, as everybody knows, was very anti-constitution, very anti-charter of rights. Now he is gone, so now does the accord stand? How does that stand up now with the new NDP Premier in Manitoba who no doubt, Mr. Speaker, will agree with the equality of the sexes being included in the constitution? Does the accord still hold now because there are nine signatures on it including Mr. Lyon's - or can it be opened up again because Mr. Lyon is gone with a new Premier coming in?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Number one, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) says I did not get his drift. I am afraid he did not get mine. I realize the Manitoba election last night, and what I was trying to say to the member for LaPoile - he was so eager to wonder whether I got his drift, he was not listening to mine - and that is that what I was really saying to the hon. member for LaPoile was that whilst there had been a change in Manitoba there still might be other problems in some other provinces, number one.

And I do not want to walk on that ground again. If I do walk on it again, it will have to be very lightly. That is number one, and I think the member for LaPoile understands what I am saying on that.

The question of whether the accord is somehow broken because of the change of government in Manitoba, of course not; they signed for the people and for the government and they were the legitimate government at the time so it has no bearing upon the accord itself.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):  
Buchans.

The hon. the member for Windsor-

MR. FLIGHT:  
my question please.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask

MR. SPEAKER:  
Buchans.

The hon. member for Windsor-

MR. FLIGHT:  
for the Minister of Mines (Mr. Windsor) with regard to the Wabush situation. Would the minister indicate to the House when he first got an indication that there would be a lay-off, albeit a temporary lay-off, in Wabush, when the minister himself became aware of it?

Mr. Speaker, I have a question

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Mines.

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, I was notified by the officials from the mining company a number of hours prior to their announcement that the mine would be shutting down temporarily around Christmastime.

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary, the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, it is a fact, as the minister would know, that almost half a year's production in Scully Mines, almost a full half year's production is in storage at Pointe Noire and Wabush. Could the minister tell the House how that came about, how it came about that a half years production is in storage? And how much production, how many months production is the company prepared to stockpile and capable of stockpiling?

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

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, they have half a year's production. It took half a year to do that and half a year is the limit on which they are prepared to have an inventory at any one time.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Well, that is very interesting, Mr. Speaker, because the next question I want to ask the minister is, Given the state of the steel industry and the auto industry, and we know now that they have six months production in storage and they cannot put up with any more, they cannot have any more in storage, would the minister indicate whether or not there will be any more shut-downs, even if we accept the three weeks? Is Wabush, is Scully Mines looking at more shut-downs in 1982 as a result, number one, of the stockpile that he says has reached its maximum



MR. FLIGHT: capacity, or as a result of the state of the auto industry and steel industry in North America?

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

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, obviously, the temporary shut-down is as a result of the present market for iron ore, particularly as a result of the Stelco strike. There is no indication that there will be any more shut-downs at this point in time. The only indication we have is that there will be that three week shut-down.

MR. HANCOCK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. the member for St. Mary's - The Capes wish to yield?

MR. HANCOCK: I yield, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary again is to the minister. Now, we have established that Wabush can only stand six months storage; they have six months storage in Pointe Noire and Wabush. Can the minister confirm to the House - because the strike is still on at Stelco, one of their biggest customers - can the minister confirm to the House, number one, that it will only be a three week shut-down and that there is not a great danger of further shut-downs in Wabush in 1982? And, Mr. Speaker, while I am up, for the sake of saving time, let me ask the minister this - and he can defer to the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) if he wishes: Why did the company, Pickand Mathers, the Scully operators, not live with the legislation? Why did they not conform to the legislation existing that the company

MR. FLIGHT: must give the workers - and  
I read that legislation as protection for the government,  
why did it not also give the government the sixteen weeks  
notice that is required under the legislation before they  
can lay off the number of men who were laid off at Scully?  
And further, why did the layoff - these are very simple  
questions to understand, Mr. Speaker - why did the layoff

MR. FLIGHT: include only the hourly paid men and not include any of the administration of Scully Mines?

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

MR. FLIGHT: Three very simple questions.

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, yes, that is indeed three questions. First of all no, obviously I cannot give any commitment that there may not be other ramifications of a weak market or a continued lengthy strike at Stelco or at other mines. Nobody can predict what these conditions will impose on the market. Obviously for the same reason the same answer applies to the fact that the company has not given sixteen weeks notice. They are required under the legislation and my colleague advises me that one week's notice is required for a temporary shut down or - notice is required for more than a one week temporary shut down, in this case it is three - except where there are extenuating circumstances. In this case it would certainly seem that the company has a valid case in stating that the present condition of the mining industry, strictly related to the Stelco strike, are extenuating circumstances.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has expired. It being Private Member's Day I call motion Number 3 on the Order Paper by the hon. member for St. Barbe (Mr. Bennett), WHEREAS the high cost of living in this Province has placed an unbearable burden on those who are dependent on government assistance;

AND WHEREAS we profess to live in a society based on equal rights and opportunity for all;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House urge the government to take measures to make adequate provision for those for whom society is responsible.

On the last day the debate was adjourned by the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms), who is not here. I recognize the member to my left, the hon. member

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

for Kilbride.

MR. AYLWARD:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, because there has been quite some time since this motion from the hon. member from St. Barbe (Mr. Bennett) has been discussed, I am not sure the exact way the debate went the last time but to read over the resolution: "BE IT RESOLVED that this House urge the government to take measures to make adequate provision for those for whom society is responsible."

My own personal feeling on this matter is that I have in the past urged government to do this. I am urging government now to do it. I will urge government in the future to do it. So, Mr. Speaker, this resolution, as far as I can see, is in line with the way I think on this matter -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. AYLWARD:

- and I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, some of the efforts of the people on this side of the House who continuously urge government to do these things, some of the successes we have had by reading some highlights from the 1981 budget.

Mr. Speaker, in the 1981 budget it says, "Funds have been provided for construction of a new hospital in Channel and a new clinic in Forteau." People who depend on government for medical service, Mr. Speaker, certainly government has come through in these two cases with the hospital in Channel now being constructed, Mr. Speaker. We have understood this week there are some problems with the contracting company, but certainly the government's commitment is still there. We are doing our utmost in providing

MR. AYLWARD:

funds for that. Funds are being provided this year for a new hospital in Clarendville, to commence a new hospital in Clarendville, Mr. Speaker. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, this is an indication that government is doing what it can for people who need health services.

New correctional facilities, Mr. Speaker, is also one aspect of our budget in 1981, which also shows that the government, through the urgings of most of the people on this side, are providing assistance for those who depend on government.

Funding is provided to commence a school for the deaf, Mr. Speaker, to replace the existing facility. This, also, is another indication of the success this government, and the attempts of this government, is having to fulfill the wishes of this resolution.

One other thing that the government has done this year, which is very important to people who depend on fire fighting services throughout the Province, is that we provided an introduction to a province-wide insurance for all volunteer firemen. Mr. Speaker, this is very important to a lot of people in my district. Certainly the volunteer fire department in the Goulds were asking me about this for quite some time, and I am very pleased to say that our government has come through for these people so that their families and themselves can be protected in case of injury or damage.

Mr. Speaker, also in the budget for 1981, 'Effective April 1, 1981 minimum increases of 8 per cent will be applied to public service pensions'. Mr. Speaker, within our financial situation here in this Province this certainly is a step forward. It is to be noted that this is a minimum increase, and larger increases were

MR. AYLWARD: awarded to individuals who received lower pensions. This certainly is an indication that this government is trying to do everything they can for the people, as mentioned in this resolution for people who depend on government.

Also mentioned in the budget for 1981, we have effective May 1, 1981, 'Social assistance rates will be increased by 10 per cent'. Well, Mr. Speaker, we would all, on both sides of this House, love to see more money go to the people who are in need of it.

MR. PATTERSON: Hear, hear!

MR. AYLWARD: We all recognize that the monies that are provided for social services could be improved. Certainly each one of the members on this side, and, I am sure, on the other side, have instances of hardships under social services. There is only so much money and we are doing everything in our power to increase the amount so that the people could - social assistance is supposed to provide the basic necessities. We would certainly like to increase this as much as possible and we have shown evidence of our intentions to do this by our 10 per cent raise, as of May 1, 1981.

MR. MARSHALL: Not only that, but year after year we keep bringing them in.

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) just stated, if you wish to review past budgets, particularly since this government came into being, the social conscience of the Peckford administration has certainly



MR. WARREN: We all did.

MR. AYLWARD: - at least for the time of -

MR. PATTERSON: Listen! Listen! You will learn something.

MR. AYLWARD: - at least for the time of the projects, Mr. Speaker, and it involves -

MR. WARREN: What about increasing the cost of bird licences?

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. PATTERSON: Where are you going to get the money for welfare if there are no taxes? Do not be so foolish, boy!

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, this programme also benefits the people who are employed, naturally. It involves the community in community projects and it certainly beautifies and improves the whole community, as it did in our way, and many more of these projects are out throughout the Province have been carried on this Summer.

Mr. Speaker, some other items in the highlights of the Budget for 1981; MCP coverage will be extended to include optometry services provided by qualified optometrists. This also, Mr. Speaker, is a help for people who need these services. Very good measures.

MR. WARREN: (Inaudible)

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

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



November 18, 1981

Tape No. 3527

EL - 3

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, Your Honour has already called to order the member for Torngat Mountains. (Mr. Warren), asking him to desist from

MR. MARSHALL: interrupting my hon. friend's speech, and he is still persisting to do so, Mr. Speaker. I think that the hon. gentleman should be specifically asked to and if he does not there are remedies that unfortunately the House will have to take.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): To that point of order, it is every member's right to be heard in silence, and I would ask the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) to restrain himself while the hon. member for Kilbride (Mr. Aylward) is making his presentation to the House.

The hon. member for Kilbride.

MR. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is to be noted that the hon. member for Torngat Mountains asked his House Leader (Mr. Hodder) to stand up and protect him and defend him but his actions are not defensible, so I would ask him if he would refrain, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution, if people took the time, particularly people in the Opposition, to read Managing All Our Resources within our Five Year Plan -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, if they want to turn to chapter six, they will see the social policies of this government, the first time ever that a government of this Province planned such detailed social policies of the Province. I will go over some of the highlights of this, in the Department of Health alone we have projects for special care programmes, health and manpower, accessibility of health care services - all of these things are mentioned in chapter six - public health services to be improved, health promotion and long-term care, Mr. Speaker, Social Services is also mentioned in this chapter six of Managing All Our Resources. Social assistance make-work projects which, as I mentioned before, were a great success in our area, in many areas of the Province this year, are mentioned in it. Services for mentally retarded to be improved, services

MR. ALYWARD: for senior citizens, day care teaching, homemaking services. Mr. Speaker, all of these things show the government's intention to support. We have already shown that we plan to live up to this motion, Mr. Speaker, and I have no trouble in supporting it because this government has shown in past performance and they show in their Five Year Plan that we intend to take measures to make adequate provisions for those for whom society is responsible. Mr. Speaker, we are doing this, we have done it in the past and our Five Year Plan shows that we will do it in the future.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

The hon. member for Port au Port.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. HODDER:

I had no intention of engaging in this debate until I heard the hon. member opposite's comments that this government would continue to uphold this

MR. J. HODDER:

particular motion as they have done in the past. Now, Mr. Speaker, I happen to represent a district and an area, if we look at Bay St. George, which has an unemployment ratio of 6,000 people. Now I will not go into the -

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is not the ratio:

MR. J. HODDER:

I am sorry. But the Manpower Office has 6,000 registered unemployed people.

Now I will not go into the reasons for that, there are an awful lot of reasons, but this brings about a situation where when you have 6,000 unemployed you have an awful lot of people who must depend on either unemployment insurance or on social assistance.

And over the last three or four months, Mr. Speaker, the policy of the Department of Social Services has been nothing less than the most -

MR. D. HANCOCK:

Dismal.

MR. J. HODDER:

Dismal is not the word. I am searching for the word, Mr. Speaker. The word, I think, it is almost - I think in terms of the way that perhaps the rights of people have been walked on as were walked on in Nazi Germany when I talk about the way that the people who are on social assistance are being treated today. And I am glad the minister has just entered the House.

Mr. Speaker, I walked into the home of an individual, I visit him quite often, I go in there to see him - I should almost mention his name because he is a man who has a heart condition and at the same time has an infected kidney. He cannot even bring in his own wood. He cannot bring in his own wood. He has a family who are older, they are in school, he tries to keep them up.

MR. J. HODDER: I go to visit him because he sharpens his pencil whenever I go in and he says, 'Mr. Hodder, this is the way I am living now'. And what I am saying to the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) is that if you do not raise the allowances for those people who cannot help themselves - I am not talking about those who can go out and catch a fish. I am talking about the widows and I am talking about the handicapped who can no longer keep their families in food and clothing and whose refrigerators are bare.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J. HODDER: And I am asking that if you can give 50 per cent raises here over two years and 20 and 40 per cent there over two years - I know there is a difference. I know we cannot keep, I know we cannot keep the people who are on social assistance to the level to which a person who is working. I know that otherwise there would be an awful lot of people who would go on social assistance.

But what I am saying to you, Mr. Minister, is that in my district and in Bay St. George and across this Province and in St. John's there are people who cannot live! I will give you an example, a lady in my district who gets \$260 a month because she is a widow was just given a rural and remote home. She got it! You know what they put in it? It is not your department's fault altogether but it shows the problem. She gets \$260 a month. They put an oil furnace in her home. To fill the tank she has to give up her first month's assistance.

MR. FLIGHT: He shrugs, he shrugs his shoulders.

Nov. 18, 1981

Tape No. 3529

DW - 3

MR. J. HODDER:

And he shrugs!

I will tell you something else. You brought in benefits, Mr. Minister, some time ago for pregnant women but you have withdrawn them for

MR. HODDER:

those under eighteen. Why did you do that? And I will tell you something else that is happening in some areas of this Province, people are now - when I speak of Nazi Germany, people now have to wait until the social worker arrives, if they are on short-term assistance, in order to get their assistance. I had a man walk in my office and take his jacket off, and take his shirt off and then he showed me his scars and his medical condition. He tells me he is on short-term assistance. He is a very intelligent man. He worked until he was disabled. And he shows me his scars and he says, "This is the way I walk," you know, "here is my foot, here is my shoe that is built up that far, but yet I have to stay home two days a week until the social worker comes to see if I am making money or not." So therefore we are now under the eye of the state.

MR. HICKEY:

That is not so.

MR. HODDER:

It is so. It is so. It is so.

MR. HICKEY:

That is not true.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

Order, please!

MR. HODDER:

It is so. And you know it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

It is true. It is so.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

Order, please!

I have to ask the hon. member

for Port au Port to address his remarks to the Chair.

Thank you.

The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. FLIGHT:

It is so and it is under

his order.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, to the minister through the Speaker I will address my remarks. I apologize.

Mr. Speaker, excuse me if I am upset or emotional because I have to live with these problems day by day by day. And I will tell you something, everyone here in this House, that I represent a district that has a lot of social services problems and I have to deal with them day by day by day. I did not go to Florida for Easter last year. I did not go away for a vacation this Summer. I stayed home and I looked after them. And the minister, Mr. Speaker, the minister knows that these problems exist. And yet the administration are becoming - I will tell you what is happening now, Mr. Speaker, in my district and in the districts on the West Coast -

MR. TULK: Every district.

MR. HODDER: - and every district in this Province, every district in this Province there is a backload. They have decided now that if a lady's stove, and I am talking about a widow again, I am not defending those who can defend themselves, Mr. Speaker, but when a lady's stove needs a grate or when a lady's stove needs a new chimney or something like that, and she cannot afford it herself and she is a widow, she goes to Social Services, do you know how long it takes, Mr. Speaker, in order for that lady to get some satisfaction? Sometimes two to three months because it is the social worker who makes the decision, Mr. Speaker, it is not the social worker, it is the person who is at the regional office who makes that decision, so therefore it must go to the regional office.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, a point of order. That is incorrect. That is untrue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. HICKEY: That is absolutely untrue. It is incorrect.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

Order, please!



November 18, 1981

Tape No. 3530

NM - 3

MR. HODDER:

(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

Order, please!

The hon. Minister of Social  
Services has a point of order.

MR. FLIGHT:

No, Mr. Speaker, he did not

call a point of order.

MR. HICKEY:

Mr. Speaker, I cannot sit here

and allow -

MR. SPEAKER:

On a point of order, the hon.

Minister of Social Services.

MR. HICKEY:

- allow the House to be deceived  
either intentionally or otherwise. I am not suggesting the hon.  
gentleman is intentionally deceiving the House. I believe he  
thinks he is right. I am simply informing the House that what  
the hon. gentleman has been told is

MR. HICKEY: untrue.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. HICKEY: I happen to run my department and I happen to know where the management decisions are made. And they are made, in this particular instance, on an item such as this, at the district office, all fifty-two of them and if they are not, my hon. friend -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, yes. Oh, yes.

MR. SPEAKER ( Butt): Order, please!

MR. HICKEY: - give me the name and I will see to it that it is corrected.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I must remind the hon. Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) that that is not a point of order. I think the minister took an opportunity to clarify remarks attributed to his particular department. The hon. member for Port Au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, at the point that the minister interjected in my speech, I was saying that in order for anybody to get anything done in social assistance - and if the minister wants to come down to my office, I do not even have to go down, he can go down with my secretary, and she will gladly go through the list of widows and people who are on social assistance who are now waiting for decisions because any decision that must be made to give any type of home care whatsoever must go through the district office in Corner Brook. First the worker must write the letter, then it has to go to the district office, then it has to come back and it takes months. And do not tell me it does not happen because it does.

MR. TULK: It does happen.

MR. HICKEY: I will correct it. The hon. gentleman has agreed that I correct it. You know I am not magic. I am not a magician.

MR. TULK:

I thought you were.

MR. HICKEY:

I am saying it is not the policy of this government. I am saying it is not the policy of my department. I have 400 people out there. I cannot read all their minds.

MR. TULK:

It is happening in my district.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Right on.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, I just want to address myself to one other point.

MR. HOLLETT:

You are doing a good job 'Jim'.

MR. FLIGHT:

Keep going 'Jim'. Tell him his asphalt is (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT):

Order, please! The hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) has the floor.

MR. HODDER:

No, Mr. Speaker, they can all talk if they want to. I only have a few more words to say and lots of time, give and take, fine.

Mr. Speaker, the other thing

I would like to address to the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) through the Speaker is the fact that why is it that when the federal government raises, say, the Canada Pension - now everyone knows that Canada Pension is paid into by an individual. It is almost like you pay an insurance policy and in your older age you get back your insurance policy. The same with Old Age Pension. You know, there are a lot of people across this Province where one of the spouses receives Old Age Pension and the other spouse does not. They have a family but as the Old Age Pension, the Canada Pension or whatever goes up, the Province gains, they take back. In other words, the Department of Social Services takes back the amount of money that the federal government increases it by. Now the federal government increases this money and if you look at the ratio, Mr. Speaker - and I would ask all members to look at the ratio on which Old Age Pensions have been increased and then look at the ratio at which people on social services

November 18, 1981

Tape No. 3531

ah-3

MR. HODDER:                   are increased. They did not get  
increased at all. You know the one time they were increased,  
Mr. Speaker, they got a secret increase?

MR. HODDER: In 1979, it was sneaked out during the election campaign when everybody was out fighting an election. Some of us were going door to door, and when we walked in they told us, We got an increase of 10 per cent. It is increased occasionally.

Mr. Speaker, there are two types of people in this Province who need help. Right now I am speaking for the widows, I am speaking for the handicapped. And that administration over there, and that was the only point I wanted to make when I stood up today, Mr. Speaker, that administration over there is not speaking for those people. Because even those who are not widows or handicapped, mentally physically or otherwise, those who cannot find jobs and must, and find themselves - and there is nothing so sad, Mr. Speaker, as a person who finds himself on social assistance, who has worked all his life. Those who find themselves on social assistance are the people who really suffer, not those who have been on it and have learnt to live that way. Those who have learnt to live with social services are not so bad, the persons who finds that he is there because of a handicap, that particular person, Mr. Speaker, I am speaking of also. Those are the types of people I am talking about.

I know there are people who draw social assistance because they cannot get jobs, and they do not have U.I.C. In my district right now there are federal make work projects at this moment whereby if you work for one week, and get your one week's stamp, you get laid off. If a guy needs two stamps, he gets two stamps and he is laid off. There is a project in my district that way at the present time. It is going on in Cape St. George, just to give people U.I.C. rather than welfare. It is a federal government programme.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is shameful.

MR. PATTERSON: Tell Trudeau about that.

MR. HODDER: Yes, that project is going on. I am working for another one now just to get people on U.I.C. and off welfare so that they are not inspected and snooped on. And I will tell you something else, that when there are no jobs available, and I do represent a district where there are no jobs available - I just went door to door in a community called Kippens, which is the highest employed community in my district, and do you know what the issue was? social services and unemployment. And there is no help for them. If they go there are too many people pushing at the social workers. And I will tell you about the social workers. The most dedicated group of social workers that ever lived live in my district and are in the district, in the Piccadilly office and in the Stephenville office.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. HODDER: Yes. But they are overworked. They are overworked and they have no money. And I will tell you something, and, Mr. Minister, if you cannot get your Cabinet - Mr. Speaker to Mr. Minister - to give some of those people some help, then they will rise up, they will rise up and eat your administration. That is all I have to say.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. the member for Bay of Islands.

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a few words to say on the motion. I would like, first of all, to read it into the record. 'WHEREAS the high cost of living in this Province has placed and unbearable burden on those who are dependent on government assistance; AND WHEREAS we profess to live in a society based on equal rights and opportunity for all; BE IT RESOLVED that this House urge the Government to take measures to make adequate provision for those for whom society is responsible.'

Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great interest to the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) and he certainly has shown a lot of compassion for his people and perhaps the cases that he has brought for attention are what we call the exceptional cases. Not the - this is not the general rule, Mr. Speaker, these are exceptional cases and there are exceptional cases in every district of the Province. In some cases perhaps like in his district, the employment opportunities, for example, like we have in the Bay of Islands, are not the same. We have, for example, the great Bowater organization, we have the Lundrigan empire, we have the hospital and we have the college and other things, all things brought about by this administration.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, this government and previous governments since the 70's, they were not only aware of the needs of people, but they have acted. And if you want to close your eyes and be political about it, maybe you could say they did not help. But former governments,

MR. WOODROW: for example, have added a little to the social benefits, to welfare recipients before an election came up. This government has given an annual increase of 10 per cent for the last two or three years. That certainly is significant. They also have not decided to leave people on social assistance. It is nice, for example, to say to Mr. So and So we are going to give you social assistance and let you stay there and rot on it. But what this government has tried to do is, to uplift people by giving them some dignity. And for that reason they have provided special needs programmes. They have put the programmes in place. For example,



MR. LUKE WOODROW: they have made what we call - they are referred to as employment opportunities, make work projects or what have you. And as a result of these projects over 10,000 people have left the welfare rolls in the last seven or eight years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUKE WOODROW: It is on the record. It is on the record.

MR. HODDER: Where did they go?

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. L. WOODROW: This is a good example of rehabilitation. Many of them have got jobs in other places. I do not know where they all went, but it is on the record.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. L. WOODROW: I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. member - he did not mention this one - the high cost of housing in this Province. We cannot do a thing about what was done in the last Budget brought down a short time ago by the federal government -

MR. W. PATTERSON: Liberal Government.

MR. L. WOODROW: - federal Liberal government. What did they do? They just helped about maybe 200 people. And what about the thousands of others who need help? We have no control over mortgages. It is up to the federal government. What compassion have they shown people? And yet, we will say, they will rant and roar over what is being done. I could probably also ask how many DREE programmes have been signed in this Province over the past three years? Three programmes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. L. WOODROW: In fact, nine or ten still remain to be signed. Are they helping the people of this Province?

Regarding, Mr. Speaker, the 200 people who have been helped, and I have several in my district, I had one today, in fact, a letter from a constituent of mine sent to my office today, and if the federal government had been a bit more helpful he would not have to appeal to me to try to help him in his sad plight, help him from losing his house. I would say that they have done - they have helped 200 people Mr. Speaker, but they have helped - in fact, it is too little too late.

Now, I would like to say to the hon. member that I do not think that social assistance was ever meant to provide everything for people, but it was meant to enable them, through their own help, to better themselves. And I think we all know, and we would have to probably be very unwise or, for example, fooling ourselves not to say

MR. WOODROW:

that there are some people, Mr. Speaker, who are never going to change, we have them in every district. If you gave them a million dollars today, they probably would have it gone in a week from now. I like, as the hon. member does, to visit homes in my district also and I am thinking now of the example of a lady who receives social assistance and she happens to know how to spend her money. She tells me that it does not just go over night, she does not go out and spend it on useless things. She has to sacrifice maybe many things. Again how many, in fact, of our social assistance recipients - certain homes I visit, if you go in there will you not find, for example, if not alcoholic beverages, at least evidence to know that they had it there? We all have to make sacrifices. I am sure the hon. Speaker has to make sacrifices. We all have to make sacrifices. We cannot expect, in fact, to have everything that we need in this life, just let her go.

I want to give a few examples of people in my district who have nice homes. I have gone into their homes on purpose and I enter the home and I say, 'I do not suppose you have this home all paid for?' 'Yes, we have it all paid for, we own everything in it including the furniture as well.' And I say, 'How did you do it?' 'We worked for it, we worked hard and we made sacrifices.' And I believe that this is what this administration is trying to do, to get people to realize the dignity, not, in fact, leave them down in the dregs of poverty for the rest of their lives. We have a certain dignity to live up to and I think it is up to us as government to try, in fact, to encourage them. It is very easy for us to go out - I could go out if I wanted to, I could go in my district and talk about the minister, he is not doing this or he is not doing that. But I feel sure that the minister, and the administration, knows that there are only so many dollars to go around. We have at the present time the highest sales tax

MR. WOODROW: in the country. What are we going to do? Are we going to add an additional two or three cents to what is there already? I think we have, Mr. Speaker, to be honest, we have not got to be playing politics with a thing like this, especially with the lives of people. I think there is nothing more downgrading than, we will say -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. WOODROW: - to be playing politics with the lives of those poor people.

Mr. Speaker, in the Smallwood era, and I happen to know about it, there was no plan for social assistance -

MR. TULK: How come you supported him?

MR. WOODROW: Well that was years gone by. I did not have enough sense to do anything else then. I learned since then.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WOODROW: There was no such plan. I heard what you could do, for example, you could call a Deputy Minister you could say, there is probably - you know, I need a - a member could call and he could say, 'Well, we need a few bucks to help out this one or that one in the district.' 'No problem. Okay, fine.'

MR. MARSHALL: If the hon. member would permit. If you were on the government side of the House - if you were in Opposition like I was, you were not allowed to talk to them.

MR. WOODROW: I know it, absolutely. That is another example. Now what we have today, we have committees, we have administrators and assistant administrators and we have social workers and they go out in the field, in fact, they just do not give until they find out the needs of people. I too sometimes find it difficult probably when I call about somebody, I cannot get a direct answer. But I have been fooled by people a few times. So I think that it is proper and right

MR. WOODROW:

that the people working in Social Assistance should go out and just examine, just see if the people who are talking with them are really telling the truth or what.

Now, we have also given special attention, Mr. Speaker, to the sick, the blind and other disabled people. I have at times called up at the request of constituents of mine to ask if there were any extenuating circumstances whereby we could help somebody. And when that case is examined it generally comes out in the positive.

And then there are many other things. We have, for example, such things as woodcutting projects and the like; in fact, there are so many things that the government are trying to do. You just cannot do it all in a minute. Then, of course, again we have inflation. Mr. Speaker, I am always amazed when people from the other side will say, Ottawa has come through again. I mean, you would almost think that they were separatists. Why are not we entitled to Ottawa's benefits as well as Ontario or Nova Scotia, P.E.I. or any other province? I think, in fact - sometimes there is a great big Hurrah made, 'Ottawa has come through again! We are entitled to it and I think, Mr. Speaker, we are entitled to it moreso than the other provinces because we are the youngest, Mr. Speaker, in Confederation and as a result of that, in fact, we need more help. We need twice as much help as the people in Ontario and Quebec. We need more help than the people in provinces like Nova Scotia, P.E.I. and New Brunswick. So I do not, in fact, get run away with somebody when he says, 'Oh my, Ottawa has come through again.' We are Canadians and I think we are entitled to what is on the go.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: When I spoke earlier, Mr. Speaker, I do not think you were in the Chair. I spoke about the DREE projects. There are only three DREE projects signed. We have requested nine or ten. Why is that? Do you call that 'Ottawa bashing'?

Again, for example, sometimes, you know, people on the other side accuse the Premier of this and of that. What is he going to do? Do you think, for example, that the Premier is going to just go up and sit down nicely with Mr. Trudeau and say, Okay, we will accept whatever you are going to give us? If he had to do that with the constitution I can assure you that we would not have a Premier who is so respected not only in this Province, Mr. Speaker, but in the whole of the Dominion of Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: Let me bring out something else, Mr. Speaker, just to tell you what is happening in Bay of Islands. There was a Liberal meeting held in Bay of Islands on Tuesday night to look for a Liberal Association.

MR. AYLWARD: How many came?

MR. WOODROW: It was so badly attended they could not have it. And that was held where they had access to Humber East and Humber West.

MR. HISCOCK: That is not true.

MR. WOODROW: It is, absolutely.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WOODROW: Really, you know, I mean, that is something to boast about.

AN HON. MEMBER: About five or six people.

MR. WOODROW: About four or five people.

MR. MARSHALL: Would the hon. member care to tell us where their guest speaker was?

MR. WOODROW: The guest speaker was the hon.  
the Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER: He could not make  
it, you know.

MR. WOODROW: That is right.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WOODROW: No. If that is the way it is  
going, Mr. Speaker, I think that we must be doing something  
right.

MR. AYLWARD: The biggest meeting they had all year.

MR. WOODROW: I hope that we will continue -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. WOODROW: Well, thank you very much. We  
try to do our best. I hope that we will try to continue to  
do right.

I could, Mr. Speaker, go on and  
on and say a lot of other things but, of course, as you  
know, time will not permit. But I am going to keep on  
working, Mr. Speaker, with the Minister

MR. WOODROW:

of Social Services (Mr. Hickey), with the administration and try, in fact, to go on to not only help better the people of the Bay of Islands but of our Province in general.

MR. AYLWARD:

Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW:

And let us all be very proud Canadians.

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird):

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I will start off by saying to the hon. member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) that if our party was going around spending \$3,000 or \$4,000 on booze and liquor to give out to people to attend a function, then I am sure that we would get that many people out too.

MR. TULK:

But we are all teetotalers.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak on this motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. WARREN:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that if we had to get that -

MR. TULK: Tell us about Manitoba, how the Tories got wiped out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I am sure all hon. members are enjoying the conversation, but the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) has the floor, with your indulgence, please.



MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, there is no trouble to know which ministers are in trouble in the next election, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young), the Minister of Health (Mr. House). These are the ones who are so all concerned about their districts. Now they are trying to find something that the Liberals are doing right in those districts.

Mr. Speaker, one of the best resolutions that was brought into this House of Assembly since June 18, 1979 was brought in by my hon. colleague from St. Barbe (Mr. Bennett) and that is -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, that is telling this government to either wake up or ship out. And, this is exactly what this one is saying because this government is actually doing very very little, very very little, Mr. Speaker, for us as Newfoundlanders and Labradorians. Now, I was so shocked to hear the member for Kilbride (Mr. Aylward) - now, the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) was not too bad, but the member for Kilbride to get up and defend a government that he has been part of for the last two and a half years. I know, Mr. Speaker, I know that as a backbencher sitting over there he has to stay on the good side of the Premier as long as he can. Because, Mr. Speaker, as soon as the Premier calls the next election, I am sure he may get re-elected, but he will be sitting over on this side.

Mr. Speaker, maybe the member for Kilbride may get re-elected. If he does, he will be sitting over here with probably two or three others.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, the member spoke about all the good things, all the so-called good things that this government has done since 1979. He mentioned about a Clarenville hospital, Mr. Speaker. I have heard about a Clarenville hospital in 1973, 1974, in 1975. In fact, Mr. Speaker, there were signs erected in 1975 in Clarenville that the hospital would start immediately. The hospital is not started yet.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is 1981 and they are still waiting for the hospital in Clarenville. That is what you call a progressive government. The Premier said Come by Chance will open in 90 days. Alleluia! 90 days, Mr. Speaker, have gone to 900. The Premier forgot the zeros. So now here is what you call a progressive government. Come by Chance will open in 90 days.

Mr. Speaker, here is another example of this government caring about the people of Newfoundland, caring about the people of Newfoundland and it affects every single person and that is, Mr. Speaker, that at the present day, because of the Minister of Finance's (Dr. Collins) Budget last year when he said there will be a twenty-two per cent tax on gasoline, not twenty-seven cents to the gallon no more, which you would pay back to the government, twenty-seven cents, today you are paying back forty-six cents.

MR. PATTERSON: Tell us about the (inaudible).

MR. WARREN: I suggest the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) shut up and listen. Here it is forty-six cents, Mr. Speaker, and the minister and the member for Placentia, as well as all other people in this Province, have to pay that. And who brought that in? Where is this Progressive Conservative government that is concerned about the ordinary Newfoundlander? Where is it, Mr. Speaker? Here it is, tag it on to all those people who have vehicles, which includes pretty well everybody in this

MR. WARREN:

Province, Mr. Speaker. So this is the kind of government we have, Mr. Speaker.

Look at the moose licences, Mr. Speaker. They have gone up over 100 per cent in the past two years. Mr. Speaker -

MR. PATTERSON:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird):

A point of order, the hon.

member for Placentia.

MR. PATTERSON:

I think the hon. member for St. Barbe (Bennett), he has an excellent resolution here. It is deplorable that it has reached down to a political battle.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PATTERSON:

I think you should address the resolution. It is an excellent resolution and I am going to support it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

To that point of order -

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

The hon. member just contributed a few remarks he would like to make.

The hon. member for Torngat.

MR. WARREN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what this resolution is saying. And if the member cannot read I will repeat what the resolution says.

Mr. Speaker it says, "BE IT RESOLVED THAT this House urge the government to take measures". What measures have they taken? Add up the tax on gasoline, is that the kind of measures, Mr. Speaker? They have increased moose licences by 100 per cent, Mr. Speaker, increased marriage licences, increased birth certificates. Mr. Speaker, the only thing this government never increased, was people who do surveying, people who dig holes in the land and they only pay \$2 for a permit, Mr. Speaker, when they should be

MR. WARREN: paying much, much more.  
Mr. Speaker, this is the way the government should be getting taxes, on those people who are doing mining.

So, Mr. Speaker - let us look at it, Mr. Speaker. Let us look at social assistance across this Province. My hon. friend from Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) said he had roughly 6,000 people on the UIC payroll, or on UIC benefits.

MR. STAGG: That is more people than he has in his district.

MR. WARREN: Yes, that is more than I have in my district, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HODDER: See if the Premier -

MR. WARREN: Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN: - Mr. Speaker, today in Davis Inlet, a tiny community of only 300 people there are 93 people unemployed, 93 people - 93 per cent, I am sorry. 93 per cent unemployed. Now, Mr. Speaker, is that something for this government to be proud of? Is that something for this government to be proud of?

AN HON. MEMBER: The Premier really shot you down yesterday, boy.

MR. WARREN: Let me tell you something else, Mr. Speaker, about how concerned this government is. In a few days time the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is going to bring in some measures to get money back into the Treasury. Because they have overspent so much on repairing the Premier's house and so on, they want to get some money back into the Treasury. So here is what they are going to do, Mr. Speaker, here is one

MR. WARREN: thing they have planned to do. Now, if there is enough vocal support from myself and from the people in my district this may not happen. Here is what they plan to do.

They are planning to increase the cost of every commodity, increase the cost of every commodity that this government is going to sell in the government's own stores in my district. They are planning to increase that commodity to get \$75,000 back into the Treasury.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is what you call a government concerned for the people. They are going to increase it, not increase it because it needs to be increased, but increase it because the government needs an extra \$75,000. But, Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise this House that if the government decides to increase the price of those goods they have not heard the last from me because I definitely will be letting everybody know through the media and through everything else that here is an example of what this government thinks about how to take the money out of the back pockets of the people who really do not have any money to take it out of, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MOORES: 'Mr. Patterson', we need a quorum.

MR. TULK: Get a quorum in here.

MR. MOORES: Get in a quorum or we will call.

MR. WARREN: The people, Mr. Speaker, who are working for the Department of Social Services, they have a tremendous job to do. Mr. Speaker, they have more to do than they are getting paid to do. And this government, and I am speaking on behalf of the many social workers, and not only the social workers with the Department of Social Services but all other employees. There are some employees who are

MR. WARREN: waiting two and three months to get back a travel claim from this government, Mr. Speaker. Now is this any concern for their own employees? Mr. Speaker, I believe that my hon. colleague has brought in a well-founded resolution. I believe, we should support it.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. WARREN: I think we should support it. Mr. Speaker, when we see this government motion coming forward, and hear members on the other side - this is what is astonishing, Mr. Speaker, to hear members of the other side of this House getting up and saying "I am going to support the resolution". I just heard the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) say he was going to support the resolution. Mr. Speaker, that in itself shows the defeat of this government, that in itself shows that this government is going, going, gone, knowing that you can hear members on that side of the House saying they are going to support this resolution urging the government to take the measures necessary.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that shows that those members sitting in the backbenches - although the member for Kilbride (Mr. Aylward) got up and he said everything right, but then to hear the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) getting up and saying I am going to support the resolution, it really shows that this government is really down the drain. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we should look at the sales tax, look at the liquor tax, look at the fee that an individual has to pay to go into a provincial park. Anything, Mr. Speaker, that can hit the lower income person, anything that can hit the average or lower income Newfoundlander, this is what this government has taxed. This is who this government is attacking, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Four dollars a night.

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, when some of the parks are not fit to go in. When they are not fit to go in. They should not be four dollars a night, the parks should be left alone, they should be turned over to private enterprise.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN: Then, at least, you would have a park, Mr. Speaker, that would be suitable to visit. So I believe it is ridiculous, a moose licence increasing 100 per cent. I suppose that is easy too, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, some of these things I believe government should look at seriously. Let us tax the multi-millionaires, Mr. Speaker, let us tax the multi-nationals and all these things, but do not tax the average, ordinary and lower income Newfoundlanders. We have to support those, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MOORES: Heave it out of you, 'Garfield' boy. Heave it out of you.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, it is amazing to hear the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) say Social Services is interested in community projects.

MR. HICKEY: It is true. It is true.

MR. WARREN: It is true, Mr. Speaker. Yes, it is true, but also, Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you something else, that recently the federal government announced x number of projects to help the fishermen to get enough U.I.C. contributions, and, Mr. Speaker, in some of those projects, federal initiated projects, who should be working on them but clients from the Department of Social Services. And, Mr. Speaker, this is an indication that this government has to rely on Ottawa even for the sake of getting Social Services recipients off their payroll.

MR. PATTERSON: (Inaudible) in history.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I assure you that in the district of Placentia, which is not Liberal now but it will be Liberal the next time round -

AN HON. MEMBER: What? What?

MR. WARREN: Oh, yes. The member for Placentia is gone, he is gone.



MR. PATTERSON: (Inaudible) you over there.

MR. WARREN: The only chance the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) and the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) have of retaining their seats in the House of Assembly is to change over before the next election is called, because, boy, then you will definitely get back.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, the member for Kilbride (Mr. Aylward) said the members on this side should read Managing All Our Resources. Managing All Our Resources, Mr. Speaker, yes, I read that. But if we have to look at the government since 1979, who in this House, who in this Province can really say that this government has managed our resources?

MR. WOODROW: Clark gave us (inaudible) say to the Trans-Canada?

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, Clark lasted for six months too. Maybe that is the reason why Clark lasted for six months.

MR. WOODROW: He was honest.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, he is the same Prime Minister that the Premier walked on the steps of Confederation Building. And he is the same Prime Minister that the hon. former Minister of Fisheries - Jim McGrath was then Minister of Fisheries, what were his comments, Mr. Speaker? What were his comments? I will leave it to the discretion of the hon. member for Bay of Islands.

MR. WOODROW: He was honest.

MR. WARREN: Exactly, Mr. Speaker. And I can say one thing for the hon.

MR. G. WARREN:

member for the Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow), he is one of the most honest persons on that side of the House, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. G. WARREN:

And that is the kind of people, Mr. Speaker, that we would like to have on this side.

Now, Mr. Speaker, - I am sorry I got carried away a little bit, but I wish to go back for a second to this resolution. I brought a resolution into this House a while ago asking for medical evacuation from Labrador or ambulance services for Labrador. This government brought it in - in due course this government accepted that resolution and all of a sudden a measure was brought in by the provincial Department of Health saying, 'Okay, we will institute ambulance services for residents in Labrador'.

MR. B. TULK:

One of the most successful resolutions ever put forward.

MR. G. WARREN:

One of the most successful, yes. However, one thing was lacking.

MR. B. TULK:

What was that?

MR. G. WARREN:

Take a patient - I have brought this to the minister's attention several times, and I have brought it to the attention of the House, take a patient who is in Davis Inlet - I will just use Davis Inlet or Charlottetown for an example - and it is going to cost them roughly around \$500 or \$600 to come up to the hospital.

MR. B. TULK:

Why?

MR. G. WARREN: Now, if they die when they get out here, fine and dandy, if they die, because the body will be taken back free of cost. But if they get better they have to pay \$500 or \$600 to go back. Meanwhile now - I do not know if it is the attitude now, 'If they die all the better,' you know.

MR. B. TULK: So they will pay your way to hell but not back.

MR. G. WARREN: Yes, right. Okay, here is an example. We will take care of the ambulance service. We will ship you out to St. John's to see Dr. So and So in St. John's but when you get out there now, how you get back is your problem. So that is what you call a good ambulance service helping the people of Labrador. I see a minister up there in the hallways shaking his hand.

MR. TULK: That is not his hand, that is his head.

MR. G. WARREN: That is his head is it, Mr. Speaker? It looks so shiny I did not know.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. G. WARREN: So, Mr. Speaker, if this government is concerned they would not bring in a programme, they would not bring in a programme that will only go halfway to meet the needs. It is like the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) said earlier today about social services; there are so many people in the hon. member for Placentia's (Mr. Patterson) district, there are so many people in the hon. member for Nas-kaupi's (Mr. Goudie) district, and in my district and all around Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, and I do not mind saying it, who are being paid welfare today who are too - I will not use the word - but too lazy to work who are too lazy to work, Mr. Speaker. And that

MR. G. WARREN: is what is wrong! The Department of Social Services has to redefine their programme. There are people, Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER: Name them.

MR. WARREN: Yes I would love to name them. And it is a fact. I know people who are sitting down on their fat bottom looking out through the window at people working. While, Mr. Speaker, they are getting social services, there are some other poor sons-of-guns out having to work their heads off.

And this government is responsible, Mr. Speaker. This government is responsible! And any member in this House could say the same thing. There are people right throughout this Province being paid, Mr. Speaker, paid social services because they are too darned lazy to work. And, meanwhile, those who are unable to work, those who are unable to work, Mr. Speaker, those are the ones who are sacrificed. Like the example the hon. member for Port-au-Port (Mr. Hodder) gave. Those are the ones, Mr. Speaker, who are being sacrificed. And when this government can see the light, when this government can look at the social programmes and pay to those who deserve it, Mr. Speaker, the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador will be no better off. And there is only one alternative and that is for the Premier to call an election and let the people throw them out and put somebody in there who can govern this Province. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): The hon. member for Fogo was the only gentleman who stood and the Chair recognizes the hon. member for Fogo.

MR. B. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak on this resolution that has been so ably presented by my hon. friend, the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Bennett). It is a resolution that most of us, I think, should take a serious look at and I refer in particular to the way that it has been constructed and put together. I think if you look at the first WHEREAS that the gentleman has presented to us, you will see that he says that the high cost of living in this Province has placed an unbearable burden on the people of the Province.

Mr. Speaker, if there is anybody who doubts that the cost of living in this Province today is unbearable, then they should take a trip around the Province and perhaps knock on some of the doors that no doubt the member for St. Barbe and other people in the backbenches of this House have knocked on. There is not a doubt in the world, Mr. Speaker, that the hardships being suffered by the people in Newfoundland today are perhaps

MR. TULK:

pretty close to being what they were in what we refer to as the 'Dirty Thirties', And I do not believe that there is a person in this House who would disagree. There is not a person in this House who can disagree with what the resolution, itself, says. If you look at the second WHEREAS, Mr. Speaker, 'AND WHEREAS we profess to live in a society based on equal rights and opportunity for all'; then I hope, Mr. Speaker, that there is not a person on that side of the House, in particular, who would disagree with that WHEREAS because the truth is that the Premier of this Province has built his whole political future on saying exactly that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

There is not, again, a person in this House who can disagree or would wish anything different for Newfoundlanders.

Mr. Speaker, the BE IT RESOLVED of this resolution asks the government to take measures, to make adequate provision for those for whom society is responsible. Now, Mr. Speaker, the operative words in that resolution, the operative words are that the government must take measures to make adequate provisions for those for whom society is responsible. Everybody in this House, again, Mr. Speaker, should agree with that statement. In view of the fact that I am sure that everybody in this House will agree with the first two WHEREASES. There is nobody who can disagree with that. But, yet, hon. gentlemen on the other side of this House find it convenient to disagree with what the member is saying. They say, no. The member for Kilbride (Mr. Aylward) and the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) say that this government is doing

MR. TULK: everything that they can do. Well, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, and in the opinion of a great many people in Newfoundland, this government has done very little but lay the blame for our financial problems in this Province on Ottawa. Now, Mr. Speaker, where Ottawa is to blame we should blame them, and I would be the first to do so, as I have done. But I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that indeed this crowd over there are perhaps doing the best that they can, and the chief word there is 'they'. It seems, Mr. Speaker, to me, it seems to me and to a great many other people whom I speak to, that the government in this Province today does not understand what its role is in the economic system of the Province or at least they do not wish to understand.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the member for Kilbride (Mr. Aylward) says that they are doing the best that they can but that they do not have the money. The member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) in an aside from his seat just now said, 'Where do you get money for social assistance if not through taxes?' The member is right. You do get money for social assistance through taxes and I agree that they do not have the money. But the chief question is, the chief question in this Province today is, why does the government of this money not have the money to provide the social assistance to widows so the people, whom the member for Port Au Port (Mr. Hodder) pointed out to us very vividly, cannot make their own way in the world? Why do they not? And I want to come back to a statement that I made a few minutes ago when I said that it seems to me that the government does not understand its role with regards to private industry and it certainly does not understand its role with regard to unions.

MR. HODDER: The member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) finally came to the House of Assembly.

MR. TULK: The member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) , I will get to him later.

It seems to me that the government does not understand its relationship to private enterprise in this Province, neither do they understand their relationship to unions. Now, Mr. Speaker, you may say, well, what has this to do with the resolution? I hope to point out what it has to do with the resolution as I go along. Because, Mr. Speaker, it is true in this Province, and it is true in every province in Canada and indeed it is true throughout the Western world, that private enterprise has built our civilization but government is needed and government has to protect people and unions in this Province. The trade union movement in this Province, and the Trade Union movement in North America were seen as a file against private enterprise and helped to protect the people wherever they happened to be.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look at private enterprise. What has happened under this government? What has happened under this government? It seems to me that private enterprise in this Province, under this government, is





MR. TULK: As a result, Mr. Speaker, the government is not getting, and I agree again with the member from Placentia (Mr. Patterson), the government in this Province is not getting the new dollars that is required to maintain our services. Well, what is the other side of the coin as far as this government is concerned?

MR. HODDER: Waste, waste.

MR. TULK: What is the other side of the coin?

The unions in this Province, Mr. Speaker, what role do they have to play? Mr. Speaker, when people in this Province, the trade union movement, when they, out of frustration of not being able to keep up with the cost of living in the Province, when they try to get an increase in wages, and they use the collective bargaining process, which governments in this Province have set up for them, what does the government do? What did they do in the case of the hospital workers? Mr. Speaker, last Thursday the government in this Province came into this Legislature and passed legislation that did not allow - and it is a black mark in the history of Newfoundland - the collective bargaining process to reach its natural conclusion. Why did they not do as the unions asked them to do, to put everybody back to work and put the grievance into binding arbitration? No, Mr. Speaker, they did not want to do that. Instead they wanted to bring the workers of this Province to their knees. Mr. Speaker, that is strike breaking. Their attitude is not one of creating an environment for the unions and the businesses in this Province; for businesses, first of all, to make a profit and for unions to partake of the benefits of that profit, their attitude, Mr. Speaker, is a government that says, We are masters of all and we will not bend to anybody.

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible)

MR. TULK: I would ask the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) to be very quite -

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER(Butt): Order, please!

MR. TULK: - because the Premier took care of his political future yesterday evening -

MR. FLIGHT: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: - with his jokes about LaBatt's Brewery. Be very quiet. Deal with your own side.

Mr. Speaker, if we look at the attitude of this government, a prime example -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. TULK: - a prime example of what this government and their attitude, what they try to do is in the fishery.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STAGG: Where were you on Thursday and Friday?

MR. THOMS: In bed with the flu.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STAGG: In bed with the flu? Convenient.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) has the floor.

MR. HODDER: Some of your opponents have been asking about your attendance, but I would not tell them.

AN HON. MEMBER: Let your member speak.

MR. TULK: Be quiet now, be quiet.

MR. TULK: A prime example of the attitude of this government, Mr. Speaker, if I might continue, was found last year, 1980, in what happened in the fishery in this Province. And I want to suggest to this House and to all Newfoundland that Newfoundland's largest group of private entrepreneurs, private enterprisers in the Province, are fishermen.

In 1980, fishermen in this Province found that they could no longer survive. They could no longer survive on 1977 prices while the increases in the cost of operation had tripled. So they went on strike. And the attitude of this government was to allow the strike to drag on in the hope that the fishermen would break down and come back on bended knee to the fish companies. Finally, when they saw that was not going to happen, they appointed a Royal Commission and the Royal Commission, Mr. Speaker, has done one thing, it has shown, as everybody with any common sense who ever saw the fishery in operation in this Province knew, that fishermen were operating businesses that by and large, were bankrupt.

The fishermen in this Province are still making wages that by any standard are below the poverty line. And what was the Premier's answer? What did he stand in his place and say? His answer, Mr. Speaker, was, 'We are going to put 500 more boats on the Northeast Coast.' Five hundred more boats. In other words, he wanted to have about another 1,000 or 1,500 people who were living below the poverty line. At the same time, the Minister of Fisheries in this government (Mr. Morgan) was standing up and saying that Romeo LeBlanc was trying to name part-time and full-time fishermen. Mr. Speaker, that is the best laugh that has ever been in Newfoundland.

MR. TULK: Because the provincial Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) was the first person in Canada to define what a full-time fisherman was when he told the fishermen of this Province that in order to qualify for assistance from his department they had to make 75 per cent of their income from fishing. Now, what was that if it was not playing political games and speaking out of both sides of your mouth?

Well, Mr. Speaker, they have gone through that process with that group of private businessmen and they now have the Royal Commission, they have the report. What are they going to do about those recommendations? Is the Minister of Fisheries going to act? No. Oh, no, he has to go back now, Mr. Speaker, and consult with the fishermen again. Is that a delaying tactic? Mr. Speaker, if the past record of the Minister of Fisheries is any indication, the answer is obviously yes.

Mr. Speaker, why do I get off on the fisheries and start talking about the fisheries in a resolution such as this? Because, Mr. Speaker, in total agreement with the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson), I want to make those points to show that this government has not in any way attempted to create an environment where our people are given the opportunity to roll up their sleeves and produce new dollars so that adequate provision can be made for those for whom we are all responsible. Yet studies which the Premier rejects out of hand, studies done by the Economic Council of Canada or the Atlantic Provinces Economic Council, show that Newfoundlanders when they have the skills are as hard working and productive as any people in the world.

Mr. Speaker, if we look at the training - I am going to leave that perhaps to the member

MR. TULK: for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush)

when he speaks on education sometime. If we look at the record of this government in educating our people and giving them necessary skills, it is obvious that the record is dismal. This government's attitude, Mr. Speaker, is instead they have continually played politics with Newfoundland's pride in being Newfoundlanders and have aroused our nationalism or provincialism by continually flogging Ottawa. They are responsible for nothing. Mr. Speaker, it is coming back to haunt them. The member for Bay of Islands - it is coming back to haunt them, Mr. Speaker. The people of this Province are realizing that this government is responsible for such things as transportation, they are responsible for such things as health, they are responsible for social services, they are responsible for housing and they are responsible for forestry.

MR. TULK: I think, Mr. Speaker, the government's irresponsibility in providing for people in this Province was best illustrated by the Premier's answer yesterday evening to a question put to him by my friend, the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), concerning the closure of Labatt's Brewery in Stephenville. His reply, Mr. Speaker, was not only sickening - it was sickening not only to the people of Stephenville but to all those people who are facing a record number of closures and shutdowns in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier is very fond of poetry. He is very fond of quoting Shakespeare and I suggest to him that his humour yesterday evening was black humour fit only for MacBeth and/or King Lear. It was indeed a tragedy of Shakespearean proportion, Mr. Speaker.

So, is there any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that my friend from St. Barbe (Mr. Bennett) would put forward the resolution asking the government to care for those people and to take measures to see that the people whom he refers to are taken care of? The government, to hide its inadequacy in this area, are relying on another widespread feeling. This is a feeling -

AN HON. MEMBER: Rubbish!

MR. TULK: I expect you to think it is rubbish because you are used to rubbish.

AN HON. MEMBER: Rubbish -

MR. TULK: And you would not -

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. TULK: - know something was good even if you heard it.

They are relying on the feeling to hide their own inadequacies, Mr. Speaker, they are relying on the feeling that those people on welfare are shiftless and lazy.

MR. HANCOCK:

\$18 million (inaudible).

MR. TULK:

It is not a feeling I share, Mr. Speaker, and while I am the first to admit to the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) that there are abuses, they are few and far between. Indeed the abuse may be encouraged by policies or regulations of government. They have in place one of the regulations of this government is what they call the ninety-sixty -thirty day regulation where if you have made so much money in the last thirty days, then you are not eligible for social assistance in the next thirty.

Could you blame a person who once got on social welfare in my district, who has no food in the house- they are living off their relatives- and because her husband makes \$700 last month, made \$700 in October, had four weeks of work for the whole year, now she requires social assistance and they say, no, your husband made \$700.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on and on. I could list the increases that this government has made in taxation, how they have taken away from the people that are least able to pay. In short, Mr. Speaker, in summary, this government has not made it possible for Newfoundlanders to make a living. They have not made it possible, they have not created an environment where those who through business and industry can contribute to the Public Treasury thereby allowing government to make adequate provision for those in need. And through their smokescreens they have hidden their own responsibilities. In short they are a tragedy in Newfoundland's history. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I want to support this resolution put forward by the member for St. Barbe.

SOME HON MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER(Butt):

The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. STAGG:

Thank you very much Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member has about eighteen minutes.



MR. STAGG: Eighteen minutes, I doubt Mr. Speaker, whether I have eighteen minutes of material, but I will do my best, with the help of some interjections from my hon. colleagues across the floor. They always come through in the clutch. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution that appears to be simple and straightforward and I believe that we are supporting it on this side of the House. And certainly I would like to go on record in support of it as well. I would like to deal with some analysis of it and some general commentary. I understand that commentary can be wide-ranging and even border on the irrelevant at times. One of the main problems the we in this Province are encountering, it is the same as is being encountered in the whole of the Western World, and especially in Canada and the United States, we are coming to grips with the

MR. STAGG: high cost of living. Those people who have previously and hitherto been the breadwinners and the people who got the economy moving, kept the economy moving and were able to provide for those less fortunate than themselves - this was the social programmes initially developed during the new-deal era of the 1930's in the United States and in the 1950's with unemployment insurance benefits and baby bonus and old age pensions and those things. And while everything was relatively in tact, there was no inflation of any significance in Canada until about the early 1960's, these programmes could work. We are now in a position where, while all of the programmes of government, both the federal programmes and the provincial programmes are worthwhile and they are good and they are for the benefit of all, we are now reaching the stage where a very small portion of the population, that working portion of the population who are actually involved with productivity at the primary level, where these people have a very much increasing burden to shoulder. And by the primary producers I mean our fishermen, our farmers and our miners and other people who are involved in the manufacturing industry. These people, and we are seeing it more and more in the past year or so, these people are being driven to the wall and it is because of the rising expectations and the rising demands of more and more segments of our society that are not associated with these primary resource sectors.

Now, I realize that every person has the right to, and it is enshrined in legislation throughout this country and certainly in this Province, every person has the right to attempt to improve his or her means and to increase one's wage level in real terms so that a person can show something at the end of the year. But I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that we are coming into a decade where we are going to be biting the bullet. And the bankruptcies

MR. STAGG: as referred to by my hon. colleague from Fogo (Mr. Tulk), yes, they are increasing in frequency. There are two reasons for that, one of which is the argument that I will present later. The other is the facility and the ease with which people can walk into a Canada Manpower office anywhere in this country today and basically fill out a form and be declared bankrupt. Now, many of these people who are declared bankrupt are people who owe thousands and thousands and thousands of dollars throughout the country. They owe it legitimately to businessmen and to government and to others. They are able to walk away from it with a clean bill of health and go right back into business again. Now, that is very good. You might say, 'Well, that is good. The person is bankrupt and he or she is able to get back into the mainstream of society.' But somebody pays the price for that, Mr. Speaker. And the people more and more who are paying the price for that are the people in these primary resource sectors.

I was watching the National News last night and I see where farmers in Ontario - and Ontario is the California of Canada, it is where the majority of the farming is done in Canada, with the exception of the wheat farming which, of course, is done on the Prairies - but it is in Ontario, the Niagara Peninsula and that area, in which the food, it is the food basket of Canada, and people there are being driven to the wall. Businesses that have been in business for hundreds of years and families who can trace their ancestry back to when Ontario was called Upper Canada, these people are going out of business. These are primary resource people. They are being discriminated against, to say the least, in this society that we have today. And I think it is time that some of us in this Assembly and in the House of Commons and the Chambers of Commerce - I notice the St. John's Chamber of Commerce, the St. John's

MR. STAGG: Board of Trade said something today that I was very much in agreement with in a criticism of the federal budget. They were talking about the whittling away at the initiative for productivity in this country and as it is shown in that budget. And without speaking in a partisan way - and I suppose hon. gentlemen think it is impossible for me to speak objectively in this - I agree with them. And it is something that our Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and we as legislators, we as the government on this side of the House, will have to keep in mind when we go about getting budgets in the next budget and the budgets afterwards, that we must not discriminate against

MR. F. STAGG:

the people who have kept this country going and made the country a great country. Because if we continue to do that, if we drive the farmers of Newfoundland out of business, and if we drive the fishermen of Newfoundland and the miners or whatever, if we drive them out of business by putting too much government regulation on them, by taxing them, by covering up the loopholes and making it more attractive for a person to put his money in the bank - if a person has money and they put their money in the bank - where can you get a 20 per cent return on your investment? Where in the business world, with the exception of certain illegal activities, could you get that kind of a return? There are very few places.

So anybody who has money - unless the whole system is revamped and we sit back and take a sober look at ourselves, then we are in for trouble. Now, we in this House of Assembly may think that this is a bear pit, that this is a theatre, some people say it is a theatre of the absurd. I understand the Question Period yesterday was not the sort of thing that one can be proud about and I understand today the Speaker has some trouble as well. Well, I am telling you gentlemen on both sides of the House, especially the members of the Opposition, who set the tone of the Question Period, I am telling you that the people of this Province expect us to be dealing with the problems of the day.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. STAGG:

And no matter about getting down to the partisanship that is so prevalent in this House, we have a crisis -

MR. HODDER:

Come over!

MR. STAGG:

Come over, says the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder).

AN HON. MEMBER:

Come over here.

MR. STAGG:

Come over. I could not be more disgusted. We have a crisis in this country, we have a crisis in this Province, and we have to face it. And we as the legislators have to set the tone, we have to show that we are willing and able, not only willing, but that we are able to cope with these problems. And the problems are brought about by facing the issues that were brought on by well meaning people from FDR to Lester Pearson and other -

MR. FLIGHT:

FDR?

MR. STAGG:

FDR, yes. FDR, you have heard of FDR? He was the architect of the great society of the new deal in the United States in the 1930s, and the social benefits.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. HODDER:

He was a Liberal.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

Order, please!

MR. STAGG:

Well, hon. gentlemen will try to associate themselves with anybody who has been successful. Anybody who has been successful hon. gentlemen will try to associate themselves with.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. STAGG:

I am trying to make some points, obviously I must be -

MR. FLIGHT:

(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:

Order!

MR. STAGG:

- making some success because hon. gentlemen opposite are trying to shout me down.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. STAGG:

Now, I am trying to get back to it, Mr. Speaker. I am going to try to get back to it. We in the 1980s are paying the price of these worthwhile and socially desirable programmes that were brought in in Canada and the United

MR. STAGG: States in the 1940s and the 1950s, the 1960s and the 1970s. Now, you can trace some of this to the 1965 Canada Seaway Agreement where they had a strike on - what was it called? - the St. Lawrence Seaway, the strike on the St. Lawrence Seaway and the wages went up 40 per cent. It was a great victory for the seamen. Then in 1968 the then Minister of Manpower, Bryce Mackasey, tied unemployment insurance to the minimum wage, which was great, and people only had to work ten weeks and get benefits for fifty-two weeks. Well, for a lot of people, especially people in many parts of this Province, that was a boost, it helped them out considerably, But nowadays, Mr. Speaker, we cannot ignore the fact that we are paying the price. We are paying the price, where, if you have a dollar today and if you do not do anything with it, you just keep it in your pocket and it is lost in your pocket for a year, you go out the next year and it is probably worth only eight-five cents. Now what is the reason for that?

The reason for that, Mr. Speaker, is that we have lost control of expenditures in many areas. The primary responsibility for that lies with our federal government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. STAGG:

The primary responsibility lies with the federal government. They control the money supply, they are the people who set the tone in all of these economic activities in the country. And try as our Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) will, try as he might -

AN HON. MEMBER:

He cannot (inaudible).

MR. STAGG:

- he is irrevocably tied to these initiatives that are taken at the federal level.

Now I suggest to hon.

gentlemen opposite, if I am making any sense, and I think I am,

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. STAGG:

- that what they should do, what hon. gentlemen opposite should do is to implore their

MR. STAGG: colleagues at the federal level to really seriously attack the problems of this country.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) you are the government.

MR. STAGG: We had a budget in -

AN HON. MEMBER: You are the government.

MR. STAGG: We had a budget.

MR. THOMS: No, he is opposition.

MR. SPEAKER (BAIRD): Order, please!

MR. STAGG: We had a budget in December of 1979, a budget brought down by a great Newfoundlander, Mr. Crosbie. That was defeated, a budget that was defeated -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. STAGG: Well, I guess hon. gentlemen are not going to let me continue. We had a great budget in 1979, a budget that faced the issues of this country. It faced the issues that were extant in this country.

MR. HODDER: And the people of the country showed him what they thought of it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. STAGG: Yes. That is right. The people of the country were manipulated. The government fell, Mr. Speaker, and what have we got now? We have the MacEachen budget of 1981 versus the Crosbie budget of 1979. Now I suggest that hon. members, if they are interested in anything other than cheap political partisanship, which I doubt, because I do not know if hon. gentleman opposite are capable of much more than cheap, incapable partisanship, ask their colleagues to do something about it, do some things for this country that risk the political consequences of doing something unpopular.

MR. WARREN: No, they will not do anything drastic.

MR. STAGG: Well, that is it. Hon. gentlemen



MR. STAGG: opposite— I do not expect any high roads, I do not expect the high road to be taken by hon. gentleman opposite. It is obvious. I have stood up here, I have no notes, I am speaking extemporaneously, I am speaking from the heart because I am living through it. I am a small businessman. There are a lot of small businessmen in this Province. We are all living through it. We are seeing our friends who are hard working people, we are seeing them go down the tubes. We are seeing the bankers who are not involved in banking anymore, they are involved with closing down businesses and gathering in their security. You have got experts in close downs in the Province. I have been in practice for eleven years. I was in practice for nine years before I did a foreclosure. That was the way things were. Now with the -

MR. FLIGHT: That was when we had a Liberal Government in Newfoundland.

MR. STAGG: Yes.

MR. FLIGHT: If they had a Liberal Government they would have no problem.

MR. STAGG: Of course hon. gentlemen opposite, that is the road they would take. They would take the low road. We have a crisis.

We are attempting on this side of the House -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (BAIRD): Order! Order!

MR. STAGG: We are attempting to cope with the problems of government.

MR. FLIGHT: A very interesting admission.

MR. STAGG: Yes. I will admit anything if it is the truth. And if hon. members on my side of the House need advice, and if I think they need it, I will give it. I will be like the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan). When the Minister of Fisheries

MR. STAGG: here in this Province thought that the Minister of Fisheries, who was a Tory, was not doing right for this Province, he said so. But would you ever expect to hear anything like that from the Liberals opposite? Would you ever expect to hear them say anything against Romeo? Would you ever expect it? No. I will say that much for the hon. gentlemen opposite, they are politicians to the end. Anything for power!

MR. LUSH: Lap dog.

MR. FLIGHT: The Premier is hosting the  
(inaudible)

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

MR. STAGG: Yes, well I will address myself to any of these problems.

AN HON. MEMBER: Relevancy.

MR. STAGG: Yes, relevancy.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STAGG: It is the most relevant speech you have heard so far. You would not recognize relevancy if you heard it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STAGG: Now, Mr. Speaker, we have to recognize that the public out there is saying, maybe there is too much government, maybe the government has its hands in too many things, maybe the government is regulating too much. And while this motion here is admirable in the position it puts forth - it says, "BE IT RESOLVED that this House urge the government to take measures to make adequate provision for those for whom society is responsible", and I am supporting it as a general promise - but that cannot be, Mr. Speaker, the only objective of government. The only objective of government cannot be just to look after those for whom society is responsible. Let us help look after people and let us not discriminate against people who

MR. STAGG: have made this country great. Let us not do that. Let us not try to plug all the loopholes. Let us not try to make it unprofitable or unpopular to be in business. Let us not discriminate against the businessman. Let us make it so that this country can be great like it was.

MR. TULK: Your Premier (inaudible) to the land and sea.

MR. STAGG: Yes, the hon. gentleman opposite, I believe that hon. gentleman opposite made some points yesterday. I think they got the Premier -

MR. TULK: Oh we did not make him, he made him.

MR. STAGG: Yes. They may have got the Premier to make a comment in response to a poorly worded question that was picked up by the media.

MR. TULK: It was not a poorly worded question.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please!

MR. STAGG: No. The hon. gentleman posed a question. It obviously was poorly-

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order!

MR. STAGG:

And that is all you want

to talk about.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) a sick joke.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order!

MR. HANCOCK:

Do not him speak to him.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Hon. members will recall the ruling that I gave earlier in the session. I would ask them to consider those remarks that I made earlier in the spirit of debate in the House of Assembly. Shouting really cannot be permitted.

The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. HODDER:

He asked for it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Also, comments after rulings

I indicated are out of order as well.

MR. STAGG:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL:

On a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of privilege, the

hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, this is a serious matter. Your Honour had made a ruling this afternoon. After considering - The hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) you know, is violating that ruling. There is probably nothing as serious in a House of Assembly or in a Parliament as when a Speaker makes a ruling, to make comments with respect to those rulings or any comment whatsoever. And the hon. gentleman is out of order again, and if this keeps up, Mr. Speaker, I mean, the decorum of the House is going to completely go.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. HODDER:

To the point of order,

Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HODDER: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker, I was trying to relate to the House without resorting to a point of privilege which ought rarely to come, and which the House Leader (Mr. Marshall) opposite, the undertaker always - it is the only way he can get up is on a point of privilege, to point out to the House that the member opposite stood up and asked the Opposition, invited our comments. As Hansard will show, Mr. Speaker, he invited our comments. We have been trying to accommodate him.

MR. SPEAKER: With respect to the point of order, or the point of privilege actually that has been raised, there is no prima facie case obviously, so, therefore, no point of privilege. But the matter that has been raised again is one that I dealt with earlier today in the session and I hoped that I would get the co-operation of members in applying that rule.

The rule is clear, that if the Speaker gives a ruling on a particular matter, despite what hon. members may wish to say afterwards, comments are out of order. And I remind the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) that that is factual. And the Chair intends to use and exercise the prerogative that has been given by the members of this House, to protect the rights of the members and to see that members adhere to the rulings.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: I have to advise the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) that his time, unfortunately, has expired. It is gone past twenty minutes to six and, according to Standing Orders, the hon. member who introduced the motion has the right to close the debate.

The hon. member for St. Barbe.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BENNETT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am certainly delighted to see so much support forthcoming for the motion that I put forward. It looks like unanimous support and I am delighted to hear such a good response. I am pretty happy to be able to congratulate the government in what I feel is a time when they realize they have to face up to their responsibilities to the people of this Province, to the people who elected them, and the people to whom they have to answer.

This motion, Mr. Speaker, could have far-reaching debate, if you will. Because 'BE IT RESOLVED that this House urge the government to take measures to make adequate provision for those for whom society is responsible,' could be far-reaching. If we had more employment in the Province, we would have a lot less people on the welfare rolls. The creation of employment, basically, is the responsibility of the government -

MR. TULK:

And private enterprise.

MR. BENNETT:

- and/or in co-operation with private enterprise, unless we want a total socialist system where the government rules the roost all the way and cuts out free enterprise totally. I happen to be a free-enterpriser myself. I believe in people aspiring to serve their Province and raise their families in dignity, with proper employment being made available. If people cannot make jobs available for themselves, I think government should most certainly assist. So, as I say, this motion could have far-reaching effects.

I would almost like to refer to this Province, Newfoundland, as being the prodical Province. It seems to me that we wanted to pick up our marbles and run away, we wanted to take that which we thought was legally and rightfully ours like the prodical son, and we wanted to defy those to whom we should show a little, tiny bit of appreciation,

MR. T. BENNETT: I shall not flog that issue very far, Mr. Speaker. But I would like and I would hope that hon. members will understand the relevancy of my remarks, so that in the end it can be all tied together, and genuinely support this motion. So when I go back over the years that I have experienced and known in this Province, I have worked, I have always found employment, I have never been short of a days work ever. And when I was a young man there was no such thing as a person being unemployed. It was just unheard of, there was work -

MR. TULK: Those were Liberal times.

MR. T. BENNETT: It was prior to Liberal times, it was Commission of Government times. I remember 1949. I remember pre-Confederation days. I remember the tuberculosis of the day, I remember the sanatoriums that the government had to build around the Province. I remember -

MR. TULK: (Inaudible)

MR. BENNETT: - depression days. Mr. Speaker, Even your hon. self may not remember, I doubt very much if you are old enough, Mr. Speaker, yourself, and there are a lot of hon. people in this House who are not old enough to remember conditions as they were prior to 1949. I do not wish to dwell on that but I would certainly like to remind the hon. persons -

AN HON. MEMBER: I was there.

MR. TULK: Oh, we know you were there.

MR. BENNETT: - that prior to 1949 we had no hospitals of any significance around the Province. We had no high schools of any significance around the Province. The education system of the Province left a lot to be desired in the Province. We had no highroads, we had no harbours, unless they were God made. We had certainly no harbours that were made by governments prior to 1949. We had a very limited amount of electricity available to

MR. BENNETT: people for their business operations, for their homes; the kerosene lamp was the thing of the day. We did not have indoor plumbing, Mr. Speaker, we did not have decent housing, we did not have Trade Schools, we did not have airstrips all around the Province and still more airstrips being built. Prior to 1949, Mr. Speaker, we had none of these services that we take for granted today. Now, we did have twenty years from 1949-50 to 1971, we did have twenty years of progress. Let us face it now, let us be fair about it, we did have twenty good years. It may have been world economic times, but let us face the facts of life, Mr. Speaker, somebody put some management into it. Somewhere along the line somebody put some management into it. And that is why you employ a manager, that is why you employ a staff to manage a job. That is why people elect legislators and send them to the House of Commons or the House of Assembly, to manage the affairs of their Province, their country. And, Mr. Speaker, fifty-two people were elected around this Province, thirty-four of them to form a government, and in the last ten years we have not seen -

MR. TULK: Any government.

MR. BENNETT: -high schools being built, we have not seen high roads being built, we have not seen secondary or third form of processing in any of our resources, we have not seen hospitals. There are so many things that we have not seen in the way of progress in the last ten years. And we have seen less in the last two and a half years in the way of progress and development of our resources so our people can make a decent living and get off the welfare roles. Nobody but nobody wants to be on welfare. Everybody wishes they had sufficient money, everybody would



MR. BENNETT:                    like to have \$100,000  
   in the bank or even five, ten, twenty  
dollars in the bank.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:            Oh, oh!

MR. BENNETT:                    Most of the people who find  
themselves the unfortunate victims of dependency on  
government are not there by their own choosing and many,  
many, many of them,

MR. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, are victims, they are just that, they are victims.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, could you call order. I am being interrupted here in my work.

MR. HODDER: You are not here to work, my son, you are here to listen.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order!

MR. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying that in business life you go from pauper to pauper in three generations. And it seems to me that that could be relevant for this Province and for the government of the day. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we have gone from pauper to pauper in three decades, a thirty year period. We have gone from pauper to pauper. We were paupers before Confederation. We may have had the wherewithal to make a livelihood, but it was not being developed, it was not being exploited. And today, in the third - in the twilight years of our third decade, it seems to me that we are once again becoming paupers. The comments that were made by my hon. colleague from Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) were so true and so heart-rending it would make one cry if you have any compassion for mankind at all. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see the hon. Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) back in his seat. I was hoping that he would have been here to hear all the discussion that went on. It was certainly a co-operative mood that we expressed, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Minister, it was a co-operative mood towards this motion that I have put forward. And I would like that the minister should have heard all the favourable remarks from his own colleagues as well as mine.

Just before the minister came in I suggested that I am delighted to see so much support for this resolution. Mr. Speaker, most of us are old enough to have seen

MR. BENNETT: changing times, but I doubt very much if any of us have ever seen such devastating times as we see today. Now, I could blame a lot of this on the government of the day, the provincial government, but the people did elect you so it might cast aspersions on these people. They elected this government. So the people of the Province are somewhat responsible for the government that they have in power. And if this government is not able to manage the affairs of the Province so that they can put forward a balance sheet - I, Mr. Speaker, started to refer to the things that were done in twenty years of Joe Smallwood's days as opposed to the ten years of very little that has been done in this administration's day - and that balance sheet, Mr. Speaker, should be disclosed and exposed to the people of this Province and let them decide, let them choose, let them - my hon. friend across here has got 333 projects and accomplishments of Joe Smallwood's days. Now, it is going to be very interesting to see the 666 accomplishments that I hope soon come forward.

Now, if we believe in poverty and hard times, and if we do not believe in human rights and civil rights and helping people to survive and stay alive with bread on their tables, if we do not believe in that era then, of course, we do not believe in Joe Smallwood. But I saw so much progress that I am very happy to have lived the era that I have lived, to have experienced - and surely goodness all the more senior persons in this House of Assembly have to ask themselves the question, you have got to ask yourselves the question, where did most of the education come from for our honourable Premier himself if not from Joe Smallwood's era.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER: He was President of the Green Bay Liberal Association, did you know that?

November 18, 1981

Tape No. 3550

IB-3

MR. BENNETT:

Well, Mr. Speaker, this is

a resolution -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BENNETT:

This is the resolution that

one could speak on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS):

Order, please!

MR. BENNETT:

And like I said it has got far-

reaching -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member for St. Barbe

has the floor.

MR. BENNETT:

- far-reaching possibilities

for discussion. And I was glad to see that it was

MR. BENNETT:

not basically a debate. It was a discussion across the floor and everybody seemed to co-operate with it. We had a good quarter century when we had Joe Smallwood.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. BENNETT: We had a good quarter century.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. BENNETT: And we shall have another good quarter century when we put some government back to recognize the peoples needs, Mr. Speaker. And if this government do not start to recognize peoples needs they will not be in power next year. They will not be the government of this Province next year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BENNETT: We might have a socialist government. We are more likely to have a Liberal government because we are ready, willing and able to take over the reins of office of this government and run the affairs of the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BENNETT: If the Premier were able to negotiate with our colleagues -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) sink or swim.

MR. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, I sent a letter to the hon. the Premier -

MR. ROBERTS: The (inaudible) centre.

MR. BENNETT: - last Winter -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order!

MR. BENNETT: - I sent a letter to the hon. the Premier last Winter and I suggested to the Premier that I would like to have a few minutes of his valuable

MR. BENNETT: time. And I know it is valuable to him and it is valuable to the Province, I suppose it is.

MR. TULK: I hope not. No.

MR. BENNETT: But I asked the hon. gentleman if he would afford a few minutes of his valuable time, like fifteen minutes, at his convenience, so I could discuss with him -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. BENNETT: - some of the things -

MR. WARREN: Listen, boy. Listen. Keep him over there.

MR. HODDER: Fling him out, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK: You wrote you hundred lines yesterday so be quiet, be silent.

MR. BENNETT: I would like to suggest to the hon. the Premier some of things that I see in my district that could be developed, could be stimulated to create employment. And I got a telegram back from the hon. gentleman telling me to go to Ottawa and talk to my colleagues, ask them to give him control of offshore, hoping this would resolve our problems. Mr. Speaker, when I speak to the fishermen in my district they do not want the hon. the Premier and his government to have control of the offshore fishery. They do not want a fight between the various provinces to fish the gulf. They are afraid of conflict of that sort, they want to work in brotherly love, they want to work together.

MR. MORGAN: That is great love, to put the (inaudible)

MR. BENNETT: The greatest brawl -

AN HON. MEMBER: Ye shall not (inaudible)

MR. BENNETT: - the greatest brawl of all times that this Province has ever, ever known -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): Order, please!

MR. BENNETT: - the greatest brawl of all time Mr. Speaker, is the brawl that we experience today in this Province. And this government has got the people on the mat. this government has got our people to the floor, they are on the ropes and they are flogging them with their taxes, the infliction of higher taxes, a higher cost of living. You are going to see an increase in hydro rates.

MR. TULK: What are you going to do about that?

MR. BENNETT: This government continue to flog the people while they are on the ropes. They will not let up. They increased the price of gasoline, a very essential commodity.

MR. TULK: They have to go to world prices, he said.

MR. BENNETT: Our Premier encourages world prices for energy. We cannot afford it, this Province. We have not got the employment. We have lost a lot of our employment. All of our young people with all their ambition, energy, education, knowledge whatever, have gone out to the mainland and they have to continue to go because of the lack of interest and ability of this government to resolve some of the problems.

MR. TULK: (Inaudible)

MR. BENNETT: And I would like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. the Premier that I am still available to sit down with him any time and discuss some of the things that can happen in my district and my district is pretty much the same as most districts around the Province. And I can help him with the

MR. BENNETT: problems. I do not want to cause him pain in that respect. I want to see something done in my district that will create employment. I am going to go back and be elected in that district.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BENNETT: And I am ready, willing and able to help the Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. TULK: Quiet, quiet 'Jim'. You are (inaudible).

MR. BENNETT: And I am sure that people would respect me and respect him for it in turn.

MR. TULK: Thou shalt not sulk.

MR. WARREN: Twenty-five times.

MR. TULK: One hundred.

MR. BENNETT: There is so much discussion on this, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to have had hours to talk about it. And there are so many things that I had notes made on that I would like to have referred to the Minister of Social Services, so many things that we need to talk about that it seems to be driving people right up the wall.

MR. TULK: Thou shalt not sulk.

MR. BENNETT: Driving them right up the wall Mr. Speaker, There are empty cupboards - and one hon. gentleman referred to high cost of housing. I would like to see this government do something about that, not necessarily the federal government, this government. Do it in the form that you can do, where you are responsible for the forest industry.

MR. TULK: Right on.

MR. BENNETT: We import sixty per cent of our lumber. I venture to bet



MR. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, every stick of lumber that goes into any government project that this government takes on, I venture to bet, Mr. Speaker, that every stick of it is imported lumber, and our own provincial sawmill people are unemployed.

MR. ROBERTS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: Sure they have not done a project.

MR. BENNETT: This government is going back, Mr. Speaker, for years and years and years and years through the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey). And I would like to ask him in Question Period just how strapped up are you for money.

MR. TULK: \$150 million in the hole on current account.

MR. BENNETT: Just how strapped up are you for money when you have got to go back and flog widows for money they got ten years ago, you have got to go back and ask - a constituent of mine calls me, the minister is looking for

forty-nine dollars -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Save it for tomorrow.

MR. TULK:

Time is up, boy.

MR. HICKEY:

The hon. gentleman is (inaudible).

MR. BENNETT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I realize - I really appreciate the help, Mr. Speaker, and I am certainly appreciative of all the support I can get on this motion. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Is it agreed to dispense with the reading of the motion?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed!

MR. SPEAKER:

Agreed. Those in favour of the motion please say 'aye', contrary 'nay'. I declare the motion carried.

It being six o'clock this House now adjourns until tomorrow, Thursday, at 3:00 p.m.