

PRELIMINARY

UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

10:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 1981

The House met at 10:00 a.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of either the Premier or the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), I have a question for the President of the Council, (Mr. Marshall), who is now, in addition to being a lawyer and a House Leader and a part-time Minister of Energy, Acting Premier, I would like to ask the Acting Premier -

MR. ROBERTS: Nobody acts like the Premier.

MR. STIRLING: Last night on CBC the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) admitted that if there was a major change in expenditure he believes that, yes, he would have to bring in a mini-budget and, yes, he would allow a full debate. The question for the Acting Premier is that how major would the changes have to be in order for them to bring in a mini-budget and allow a debate?

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

MR. MARSHALL: I would like first of all to allude to the introductory remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition and say that, you know, whatever the temporary mantles I have to take from time to time, I can assure him I will never take the mantle, or never attempt to measure up to the mantle of Leader of the Opposition. I will never be in that position.

In relation to that, Mr. Speaker, as for that, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) yesterday gave what I thought was a very comprehensive picture of the present variations from the original budget and he did

MR. MARSHALL: this in accordance with the policy of this government to give full financial information. As for the statement, I did not hear the statement that the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) made, but all I can say is that I thought his statement yesterday in the present context was full and complete information to the legislature and to the Province, as is the custom of this government. There is no necessity to bring in a mini-budget at this particular stage. We do not anticipate that there will be. And there will not be, Mr. Speaker, because of the strength of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and the measures which he has taken as a result of what was seen by the government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: And I might remind the Leader of the Opposition that the various elements making up the increased expenditures were given yesterday, the variances in the budget. This was done, as I say, comprehensively. The member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) made comments.

MR. MARSHALL: There is a possibility in Question Period, and the hon. gentleman is exercising this right now, to examine us with relation to it. There is a Late Show on Thursday, there are many, many opportunities, Mr. Speaker, to debate it and we would welcome the debate on it at any time because it shows how careful this government is with respect to the ordering of the fiscal affairs of this Province and the acceptance of the fiscal responsibilities for the benefit of the people of Newfoundland.

MR. STIRLING: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, it is exactly for the reason that the House Leader (Mr. Marshall) mentions, this The budget that this government has, this government has a record of only taking the political context of everything and not telling the people of this Province the whole truth. They have a record for that. Now we have seen it in the last two or three days. Would the House Leader tell us how much money the Province expects to spend, how much did they budget, and how much do they expect to save on the three items that they mentioned last night - advertising, travel and consultant fees? Tell us how much money they expect in total to save.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Well, Mr. Speaker, we expect to save a considerable amount. We looked at the budget and these expenditures that were provided when the budget was brought in were thought necessary for the development of this Province. We regret very much that we had to curtail them, but we would certainly rather curtail them - I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) would agree with this - many other expenditures that would hurt individuals more. This is the last thing that we would wish. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that there will be specifics that will come out

MR. MARSHALL: from time to time and I think it is beneficial, I think the best way to handle it is the way the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) has done it. He has come out very frankly and he has given a statement as to the financial position. As to these specific details, they will be certainly given and I know that the Minister of Finance, if he does not do it before, will be giving it in the next Budget Speech, and I would think that the Minister of Finance would have great cause for pride in the next Budget Speech to give a recounting of the way in which the government has administered the finances this year, particularly, Mr. Speaker, when one considers the situation in other provinces of Canada, such as the Province of Nova Scotia and the Province of Quebec, where large, large deficits on current account have been anticipated and here we, this poor 'have not' province at the very bottom of the ladder in Canada, through the effective administration that we have had, have managed to keep it down to such a minimum is a matter of a great source of pride to us and is a good reason why we have such confidence in the Minister of Finance of this government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. STIRLING:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Supplementary, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: The House Leader (Mr. Marshall) again has demonstrated why we need a full debate. I asked him three specific questions which he ignored completely, gave us none of the answers, and brings the lie to the fact that he is going to give all information in Question Period.

Mr. Speaker, there is, by any estimate, a missing \$11 million. By all the calculations there is a missing \$11 million unaccounted for. Would the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) tell us under what headings we can look to find out where that missing \$11 million comes from?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I do not know where the hon. the Leader of the Opposition gets his missing \$11 million; all I know is that I miss the import of the hon. leader's questions from time to time and this is another such instance. All I can say, Mr. Speaker, with respect to this is that, as the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) indicated, there were certain elements that had caused a differentiation between the budgetary figures and what had appeared on an interim examination a little while ago. Two of these elements were the large wage settlements that had occurred in the public sector and the increased amount on the debt service fund. Now, in the latter case, that is something that the hon. gentlemen there opposite would be very, very conversant with because, as they know, there were \$200 million or \$300 million— I do not know exactly, the budget will give the exact figure — but there were substantial amounts last year that were rolled over in new debt. This was debt that had been incurred by the hon. gentlemen's party in their madcap schemes to get elected in 1966 and what have you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: And we know that the interest rates at that particular time were 6 per cent and 7 per cent, and we know, Mr. Speaker, that the interest rates now have risen to 14 per cent, 15 per cent and 16 per cent, so this is a part of the reason.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, we are coping with the mistakes of the past and we are looking forward with a great deal of confidence to the promise of the future.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I presume now the only way we can make any attempt at all to get at the details is to ask the individual ministers what contribution they had to make in their various departments to make up this deficit. Perhaps I will start out with the Minister of Fisheries. Could the Minister of Fisheries tell us what cuts, if any, he had to make in his department to make his contribution to the deficit? Was the minister asked to cut back, and, if so, in what areas did the minister have to tighten his belt?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, when in co-ordination with other departments we discussed the need for some restraint on government spending, we looked at our spendings the same as other departments did - I am assuming that they did in the same manner as we did in the Department of Fisheries - looked at programmes that we felt were not really essential to

MR. MORGAN: continue this year. Now that did not include, by the way, the revision of facilities and services to fishermen, but there were some programmes which are not really essential to go ahead with and based on that, we deferred these programmes until hopefully next year if the funds are available.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Now, would the hon. gentleman care to give the House a list of these programmes that had to be deferred or cancelled for this year. Could the hon. gentleman give us a rundown of what programmes had to be deferred?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I will do the same thing this coming Budget debate, the same as I did last year. I tabled every cent that we spent in last year's fiscal year. I recall tabling in the committees, every single cent that we spent, where it was spent, how it was spent and in what manner, like contracts, etc. I have no hesitation in saying now I will commit myself to the same thing when the Budget debate takes place, and when the committees are analyzing and assessing the estimates, I will again put forward all information regarding where programmes were cut, where programmes were not cut and what dollars we spent and where we spent them.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that may be a noble gesture on the part of the hon. minister that he is going to tell us when the new Budget is brought in what programmes have to be deferred. Mr. Speaker, extraordinary measures have had to be taken by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) who cannot balance the Budget, public spending is out of control. Now I think the minister should tell the House now, because these programmes were previously announced, what programmes have been cut, what belt tightening had to be carried on in the Department of Fisheries, what programmes have to be deferred? Now is the time to do it because the news yesterday of the deficit was brought into this House by the Minister of Finance and the people are entitled to have the information of what belt tightening has taken place.

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I will say that we just this past number of months have

MR. J. MORGAN: spent approximately \$400,000 in providing facilities and services to the coast of Labrador. And that is strictly, totally provincial funds, no federal involvement. I just recently, no longer than two weeks ago, announced contracts to the value of \$375,000 for different areas of the Island portion of the Province to help fishermen qualify for unemployment insurance by giving them weeks of work on various fisheries projects. So I can say again that the essential part of our programme in the Department of Fisheries in regards to fisheries facilities and services, none of the essential services were looked at in cutting back on some of our expenditures for this year.

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

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

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is not the question I asked the hon. gentleman. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is under an obligation to tell the people of this Province what programmes have to be deferred. He is under a very solemn obligation to do that as a minister, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) came in and announced savage cuts, so he indicated in his remarks, and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) is one of the ministers involved who had to contribute to the reducing of the deficit, the overspending in current accounts. And now the minister is stonewalling and refusing to give the people any information.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

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

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

President of the Council.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is making a speech, number one, he is repeating in substance a question already asked. As the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) has said, and as government has said, these details are to be supplied, and they will be supplied at the appropriate time when proper assessments can be made. Now the hon. gentleman is, as I say, making a speech and he is repeating in substance a question already asked.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

To the point of order, the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) I do not believe has asked the question yet, but he has certainly been fairly lengthy in his preamble to a third supplementary question. So perhaps he should put his question now to the appropriate minister.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, now is the appropriate time to give the House and the people the information. Would the minister tell us under what subheads the cutbacks in the Department of Fisheries took place? If the minister is refusing to give us the programmes, tell us the subheads that the hon. gentleman had to take money from to give to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) to try to reduce his deficit.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, obviously I would not be able to, in my mind this morning, without having any of the estimates in front of me and a budget in front of me, give the details down to the level of the subhead number etcetera. But to give an example of non-essential activities in our Department of Fisheries this year, and because of our financial restraint in our department and other departments, an example is our Seafood Day promotions we had planned for this year. If you notice there is no Seafood Day promotions

Nov. 20, 1981

Tape No. 3599

DW - 3

MR. J. MORGAN: around the Province like we
had last year in different hotels, in different restaurants.

MR. MORGAN: That was a spending of the taxpayers' dollars which we felt this year was not essential, although it may be needed down the road to get more awareness of the need for more consumption of fish and fish products, and the value of these fish products for nutrition and high protein and all that. But we felt it was not just essential this year. It is not really essential to do. So that is one subhead I can think of right now that we cut back on because there is no need to carry out the programme this year.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. gentleman indicate to the House if the big brief case now, the big leather bags that other ministers are carrying around that look like maternity bags that the GPs used to carry around in the old days when children were being born in the houses, these big leather suitcases that ministers are carrying around, would the hon. gentleman tell the House how much that cost, if that was considered to be an essential item, and if it was paid for by the minister's department or paid for in the Premier's Office out of the Executive Council account?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I will gladly answer the question about my brief case here. The reason why, Mr. Speaker - I think my colleagues on this side of the House of Assembly know - is that I go home every single night with stacks of papers from my office, every single night.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: Every night I go home with stacks of paper to look after in the evening. And that is why I carry a brief case because it is always filled with papers

MR. MORGAN: that I deal with as minister in administering the affairs of Fisheries in our Province.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Health. As the Minister of Health well knows the Central Newfoundland Hospital is on strike this morning. The first question I would ask the minister is is his department's, his government's, Treasury Board's inability to settle with CUPE and get away from the danger of hospital strikes around, is that a result of the \$30 million cutback we are listening to now, budgetary cutbacks?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I cannot speak for the President of Treasury Board.

MR. FLIGHT: Speak for the Department of Health.

MR. HOUSE: I think that we have been bargaining in good faith, good offers have been put on the table and of course the conciliation report has been in. We have accepted the report as far as I can gather. I think that is correct. We have accepted the report in both cases from CUPE and NAPE and the hospital support staff. There is a strike this morning, a walkout in Central Newfoundland, and they have essential employees designated and they are all there working this morning. And of course there is no problem at the present time. And I say 'at the present time' because the hospital - the hospital boards operate hospitals. They are given their mandate under the act and as long as they can carry out their mandate, you know, that is satisfactory. They have not told us that they cannot carry out their mandate. They are saying right now essential employees have been designated, they are working

MR. HOUSE: and there are some disruptions but everything seems to be okay at the present time.

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister two questions in this one supplementary. Why did it take so long for CUPE to get the report, the conciliation board report? We know how long it has taken, now why did it take so long to get the conciliation board report that the minister just indicated the government have accepted? And has the minister got any indication - this would appear to be rotating strikes - now specifically as far as the Grand Falls Central Newfoundland Hospital is concerned, has the minister got any indication as to how long the Grand Falls Central Newfoundland Hospital will be down? Why did it take so long to get the conciliation board report and is there any indication, are negotiations going to a point, are the talks going to a point where we have some idea of how long we can expect all the health services for all of Central Newfoundland to be down?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I am not familiar with the total ramifications of the conciliation board. I presume - the Minister of Labour (Mr. Dinn) can answer that perhaps better than I can - but I presume that when a request is made for a board and it is granted, then it takes a normal procedure. I am familiar with that by virtue of the fact that I was a Minister of Labour for a five or six month period. And it was a very short period after the conciliation report had been in that government accepted the recommendations of that board. I do not have any indication, Mr. Speaker, how long the hospital will be down. The total hospital is not down. It is the support staff.

DR. COLLINS: The lab and X-ray are in and nurses are working there and there are essential services being carried out because the hospital have designated and, of course, the union has honoured the list that they have designated. With regard to rotating strikes, I do not know. There is also a strike at Carbonear this morning so these two hospitals are down and these are the two, I think, two CUPE hospitals.

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, as the minister has just indicated we have just come through a two month strike of NAPE, of the laboratory and X-ray technicians. The support staff at those hospitals are just as important to the efficient or even the ordinary running of the hospital as any other group in the hospital. And I would ask the minister this, how long, as Minister of Health, in his opinion - he knows what he went through on the NAPE strike - how long is he prepared to see a strike go on by CUPE? How long is he prepared before he feels the health services of this Province may be in the position where we would have to look at the same kind of legislation that he brought in, back to work legislation?

Now, Mr. Speaker, NAPE was providing essential services as well. And, Mr. Speaker, before the legislation came in NAPE tried to get their essential people back to work. So, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the minister how long he is prepared to see strikes, the nature of which we have in Central Newfoundland this morning, before he as minister will recommend to his Cabinet that we would take the same approach we took with NAPE?

MR. HOUSE: They pulled out of essential services.

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

MR. FLIGHT: NAPE did not pull out. NAPE was ready with their services.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, in the case of the previous strike - I want to refer to that - there were no essential services being provided in some of the hospitals. As a matter of fact, it became such a hassle to try and get essential services.

MR. FLIGHT: Not true.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, it is exactly true. It became such a hassle that by the time that they got the men, the emergency was over and some of the hospitals then consequently did not -

MR. STIRLING: That is not true.

MR. HOUSE: - some of the hospitals did not, Mr. Speaker, have any services provided by the union during the lab and X-ray and I could name the hospitals -

MR. STIRLING: Name them.

MR. HOUSE: I can name the Grace Hospital as one which did not have any union people come in during that particular strike.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sit down!

MR. HOUSE: Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not finished. The member asked me three or four questions.

MR. MORGAN: Carry on.

MR. HOUSE: About how long I am prepared to see a strike go on, the negotiations take place between Treasury Board and the Newfoundland Hospital Association and the union, and of course I also have some input by virtue of recommendation. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that when hospitals tell me they cannot carry out their mandate and when of course the lives of people are in danger, obviously I am going to act, but I cannot say how long we are expecting a strike to go on. What we are saying

MR. HOUSE: is we have negotiated in good faith and of course we just cannot help a walkout. We have accepted the conciliation board report and at this point in time, this is the first two hours of this particular strike.

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

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

MR. FLIGHT: The minister says the Treasury Board or the government negotiated in good faith, the union says exactly the opposite. School is out as to who will be proven right, Mr. Speaker. But I would want to ask the minister: in central Newfoundland there are three or four hospitals depending totally on the Central Newfoundland Regional Hospital for its services. How are these hospitals affected? I am thinking of the Botwood Hospital and the Buchans Hospital. And I would want to ask the minister, since this is a final supplementary, he indicated a few minutes ago, I read his answer to indicate that as far as he was concerned that the CUPE employees may not be as essential - he compared them to NAPE - as the lab and X-ray technicians to the maintenance of the health programme in Newfoundland. Would the minister indicate whether or not that is what he implied and tell me about how the smaller hospitals that are being served by and dependent on the Central Newfoundland Hospital is going to fare out while the Central Newfoundland Hospital is on strike?

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

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I did not indicate

MR. HOUSE: anywhere along the line that CUPE people were not essential. I said that the people that they deemed to be essential were working this morning, and I give credit for that because it was a hassle to get essential services in. And I said we experienced that and that was one of the reasons why we had to take the action with the lab and X-ray group. With respect to the other hospitals, I believe the other hospitals depend on

MR. HOUSE: Grand Falls Hospital for laundry services and some lab work and, of course -

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible) same board.

MR. HOUSE: No, the hospital, say, in Springdale is a board unto itself and, of course, that particular board -

MR. FLIGHT: What about Buchans and Botwood?

MR. HOUSE: Buchans and Botwood do depend on the hospital but they will all be still taking in the people on request.

MR. FLIGHT: They are glorified nursing stations.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, 'They are glorified nursing stations', the member is saying. They are in-patient facilities and they operate by separate boards themselves. Botwood is, of course, operated from the department, and the Buchans Hospital itself has its own board. And while the regional hospital is in Grand Falls, they do a lot of the primary care in their own right. So right now they are no more effective, these hospitals, than, of course, the people in Grand Falls.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health (Mr. House). The Minister of Health is aware that there were instructions sent to each of the departments telling them how much money they had to cut back. I would ask the Minister of Health now to tell us how much in total his department has to cut back in order to balance the budget and what specifically these cut backs include?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, as members will recall, some time ago, last Spring, following the budget, a question came to me asking me if we had cut back by 4 per cent in the hospital budgets and I said that we had been trying to keep our costs down. Mr. Speaker, there is no basic major target for us to meet. The fact of the matter is that we deemed that the hospitals would be able to live with less than the 4 per cent

MR. HOUSE: and we have perhaps been vindicated in that. They did not have to cut back 4 per cent; they came back and told us last year, last Spring, what they could live with and that is the same as it pertains now. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, I believe the hospital budgets before now - and there has been no change since - they indicated that they could save something like \$1.7 million and that was common knowledge and that is the situation as it stands now.

MR. STIRLING: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: The specific question you have not answered is that the envelopes were sent out two weeks ago, before the federal budget came down, and each department was told what their target was as to what they had to cut back. Is the Minister of Health saying that his department did not have any cutbacks, no projections of any cutbacks, his whole department?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, we never talk about any projections of any cutback; we take a look at our situation and run it as frugally as we can. The fact of the matter is we have said to everybody concerned in our department we want to try and save as much as we possibly can but we do not cut back on quality, we do not cut back on any of the services. We just try to save through the normal

MR. HOUSE:

procedures of being frugal and I think the hospitals and all the other services that we have given are showing that. So, Mr. Speaker, we are not used to dealing with envelopes, that is a federal government policy. We do not deal with envelopes.

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, there have been a couple of times when the Minister of Health (Mr. House) has made a statement and because he did not quite understand he came back in and corrected it later. In fact, there was an envelope sent to each deputy minister. Now, the minister may not be aware of it. Are you now saying that the Department of Health did not receive any specific instructions as a result of what the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) called "an in-depth, full-scale review of their individual budgets to include a measurement of expenditures and commitments to that date, their projected requirements for the balance of the fiscal year and a reassessment of assumptions underlying these requirements"? Is the minister saying a) that he does not know the deputy minister received an envelope; and b) that there are no adjustments as a result of that in the Department of Health?

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

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is what the hon. member was reading out and saying, this is a normal procedure. Nobody comes to the department to say you are cut back on this or that. The fact of the matter is we were asked to see if we could do some belt tightening. We have done it, we are doing it and we are not cutting back on service. And like the other ministers

MR. HOUSE: have answered here this morning, in due course in the estimates we will give and show where money was saved, and it will be shown that money was saved despite the fact too that we have put in place these new programmes like the Cat scanner this year and some ultra-sound equipment to other places.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! Order, please!
The time for Oral Questions has expired.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend And Revise The Law Providing For Accessibility To Buildings For Physically Disabled Persons," carried. (Bill No. 118)

On motion, Bill No. 118 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Enable Price (Nfld.) Pulp And Paper Limited To Become A Federal Corporation," carried. (Bill No. 115)

On motion, Bill No. 115 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Premier to introduce a bill, "An Act Respecting Certain Powers Of Appointment," carried. (Bill No. 119)

On motion, Bill No. 119 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Premier to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend Certain Acts Respecting Government Departments To Provide The Power For Ministers To Enter Into Agreement Subject To The Specified Terms And Conditions," carried. (Bill No. 117)

On motion, Bill No. 117 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order 23. Continuing debate on second reading of a bill entitled, "An Act To Establish The Alcohol And Drug Dependency Commission Of Newfoundland And Labrador," Bill No. 109. Yesterday debate was adjourned by the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. J. Hodder), who really has not spoken at all yet.

The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. J. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to address myself in a few words to this particular bill.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the estimates last year showed that some \$45 million was made by the Province in taxes on alcohol and some \$35 million was made by the Province on tobacco. That was in the 1980 estimates. I think we run, as far as the alcohol consumption is, around \$50 million revenue to the Province. And this is the first time -

MR. J. MORGAN: He is talking about alcohol this morning? He does not look too well, to me.

MR. J. HODDER: The Minister of Fisheries
(Mr. Morgan) never looks very good to anyone in the
House, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. L. STIRLING: The difference is that he
will look better tomorrow and you never will.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, that particular
amount of money has been put into the provincial treasury
year after year after year. It is only now - and I do
commend the minister - that we have brought into the House of
Assembly a bill which attempts to do some good to help those who
are sometimes, because of

MR. HODDER:

the free use and the frailties,

I suppose, of human nature -

MR. STAGG:

I will help you.

MR. HODDER:

Thank you, 'Fred'. Thank you.

MR. STAGG:

I know how a hangover feels.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER:

- frailties of human nature

that some of us become involved in.

Mr. Speaker, I want to refer

only to a couple of sections of this act, and they are section 11, and section 12 of the act. And the wording of section 11 and section 12 I think lets the government off the hook. And I want to say this, that the wording of those sections everyone should look at. Section 11 says, "The Commission shall" - shall, a very positive word, Mr. Speaker- "shall sponsor and conduct and promote programmes for treating"- sponsor and conduct programmes. It shall sponsor and conduct.

MR. STAGG:

Sponsor, conduct and promote.

MR. HODDER:

And promote, and promote.

They may disseminate information for the prevention of alcoholism and drug dependency, the treatment and rehabilitation of persons suffering from alcoholism or drug dependency.

Mr. Speaker, section 12 says

that, "The Commission may"- now this is the fault which I have with the act - "The Commission may," and it is the "mays", Mr. Speaker, that I wish were the "shalls," because, "The Commission may establish, conduct, manage and operate clinics and centres for the reception, observation and treatment of persons suffering from alcoholism or drug dependency."

Now I think, Mr. Speaker, that

the "mays" should be "musts." Because if you look at the Province I understand that here in St. John's there is Talbot House, which is a seven day treatment centre, and you also have the Harbour Lights, which is run by the Salvation Army, but they are not true

MR. HODDER: treatment centres. The closest centre for treatment, for long-term treatment, is in Nova Scotia and many Newfoundlanders go to Nova Scotia - .

AN HON. MEMBER: And New Brunswick.

MR. HODDER: - and New Brunswick, or across the country.

AN HON. MEMBER: And Ontario.

MR. HODDER: And what I say about this bill, Mr. Speaker, is that while it is a good bill, when you look at section 11 as to what the Commission must do, and then when you look at what the Commission may do, I would rather substitute the "must" for the "may." That is section 11 and section 12. Because section 12 says that, "The Commission may establish, conduct, manage and operate clinics and centres for the reception, observation and treatment of persons suffering from alcoholism or drug dependency." They may.

They may, "enter

MR. J. HODDER: into agreement with hospitals and other institutions for the accomodations, care and treatment of persons who are suffering from alcoholism or drug dependency. They may enter into other agreements with other persons or associations."

These, Mr. Speaker, should be musts. And that is the only problem that I have with the bill except for the fact, as some of my colleagues have pointed out here in the House of Assembly, about the appointment of the people who serve on this commission. And I do hope, Mr. Speaker, that it is not done in a political way. I really do hope that because I know of -

MR. STAGG: Our buddy.

MR. J. HODDER: Yes, our buddy, please do.

I know a member who sat in this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, who is now president of the Alcohol and Drug Foundation in Stephenville, who used to replace the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) and is now in private business, who has devoted years of his life to getting a worker in Stephenville. And that is the sort of person, of whatever stripe - as a matter of fact that particular individual should be the chairman of the whole organization. I do hope, Mr. Speaker, that the five appointees, which the Act calls for, who come from the different departments or the appointees from the regions here across the Province, are not done in a political fashion. Because, Mr. Speaker, this bill is welcomed by everyone who has anything to do with this particular problem and in any way in particular, Mr. Speaker, if a political appointment were to be made, even it appeared, Mr. Speaker, to be a political appointment, would be made in any section -

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible) all Liberals (inaudible).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. FLIGHT: That is the only thing the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) has said in this debate so far, that they appoint all Liberals. That is the depths.

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): Order, please!

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

MR. J. HODDER: No, Mr. Speaker, I will say this. This goes beyond party, this goes beyond partisanship because the appointments, both the bureaucratic appointments - there are fourteen, I understand, to be appointed to this board. There are many people in this Province who have done outstanding work in this field with little help. And I will ask the minister, when he stands to close the debate as well, how much federal funding will there be? Because I understand there will be a considerable amount of money contributed, that this bill brought in by this government depends considerably on federal funding. I am told this by the Alcohol and Drug Foundation, that if -

MR. HICKEY: No, there is not.

MR. J. HODDER: Well then I would ask the minister, if it is not so, for the minister when he stands to tell me that there is no federal funding.

MR. HICKEY: We are likely to get federal funding, but there is nothing dependent on federal funding and this bill is not dependent on it.

MR. J. HODDER: Well, I am told that once this bill passes -

MR. HICKEY: (Inaudible)

MR. J. HODDER: But will we get -

MR. HICKEY: (Inaudible) money.

MR. J. HODDER:

promised?

Is there federal funding

MR. G. FLIGHT:

MR. J. HODDER:

MR. HISCOCK:

agreement.

How much funding is involved?

I am asking the question.

There is \$2 million in the DREE

MR. FLIGHT:

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

How much funding is involved for this?

Order, please!

Perhaps the hon. minister could respond to the question when he closes the debate. It might be more appropriate rather than questions and answers now, unless the minister wishes to answer the questions now.

MR. J. HODDER:

would like to pay a tribute to those groups

Anyhow, Mr. Speaker, I

MR. HODDER:

in St. John's, Corner Brook, Stephenville, Grand Falls, Labrador. These are the places where we have people in place -

MR. FLIGHT: Buchans.

MR. HODDER: In Buchans as well. Do you have a worker? In Port Aux Basques they do not have a worker. There is one in Stephenville who does go to Port Aux Basques. But for those groups who through their own funding and with very little funding from the government, when we consider we make somewhere around \$50 million in taxes from alcohol, I would just like to pay tribute to those people who on their own have seen the problems and for years have worked with little funding. I think I can speak very surely when I say I have seen at least four or five briefs come by my desk from people in the Bay St. George area, as I am sure the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) can, looking for funding from government, looking for a worker, looking for someone to help, and there has never been much help. Now one of the members opposite spoke the other day, they said, "Oh, but the Liberals when they were in did not do anything about it either," and that is a great shame as well. But I might point out that this administration has been in for ten years. And I think as a matter of fact in the estimates last year for the liquor industry there was some \$45,500,000 made by this Province from the sale of alcohol and yet we put back into the hospitals practically nothing.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is in a sense a scandal that we are now only beginning to give credence to the problem in that we are now introducing the bill. I think that this commission

November 20, 1981

Tape No. 3608

ah-2

MR. HODDER: must be generously funded .I think that this commission should not be in any way partisan. It should not even seem or appear to be partisan as far as the appointments of the fourteen people, some of whom will come from regions of the Province, some of whom will come from departments of government. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that in the past most of the money - I understand now that

MR. HODDER: everything comes under the new commission - in the past the money was passed out to the Drug and Alcohol Foundation and there was an Alcohol and Research Centre in Stephenville. And I think the first thing in the next budget-and this goes back to the points which I made earlier about the 'may' and 'shall' because that is the thing that bothers me about the bill. The bill lets the government off the hook if they do not want to do anything - I think the first thing that the next budget must do is to put a detoxification centre in this Province. It would be set up on the Island, not a one-week programme. At the present time I refer back again: we have Talbot House, which is affiliated with St. Clare's Hospital, but they have a seven day programme and that is a programme which just gets people off the streets and the problem is not solved.

We do have Harbour Lights; that is a religious institution that has religious overtones. It is doing a good job but again is not the answer in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to a hospital in St. John, New Brunswick. It is known as Ridgewood, and this is a treatment rehabilitation centre for alcoholics. And in this particular institution not only is a person - and I speak in this more of a problem of alcoholism than I do of drugs because I have less familiarity with the problems of drugs - but in Ridgewood, in St. John, not only is the alcoholic treated but his family is treated as well and they have follow-ups as to what happens. It is not a one-week emergency type of treatment, it is a treatment that has a very high percentage, a very high ratio of success. We do not have this in this Province, we have never given lip service to it. And in the bill, when we look at the bill, and I refer again to Section 11 and Section 12, 'The Commission shall', and if you look at everything that the commission shall do

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I have very little other to say about this except to say that we will be voting for the bill on this side of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER: It is a long time coming, it is very good, it has good intentions. I think it is welcomed by those people who have been working in the Province with the problem of alcohol and drugs. It is welcome news to them. But, Mr. Speaker, I do believe, and I will stress again, that it should be a non-partisan commission and it should be followed. If we are going to do this, let us not pay lip service as we have done in the past. Let us not do as we have done in the past, bring in a piece of legislation and then let it die. Let us back this up in the budget with some concrete projects for the Province. And when I speak of a hospital or an institution for this Province, we badly need it. If we listen to the minister's figures where he tells us that the consumption of alcohol last year rose from 1.3 gallons in 1970 to 2.4 gallons in 1978 -

MR. FLIGHT: Gallons or barrels?

MR. HODDER: That is per capita.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HODDER: Not barrels. He said 'Gallons or barrels?'

Well, Mr. Speaker, if that is a trend - and I see nothing that would stop the increase - then certainly this Province should have a proper treatment facility for those people who need it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the member for St. John's Centre.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. McNICHOLAS:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the minister on introducing this bill to deal with alcohol and drug dependency in Newfoundland and Labrador. I think recognition of this problem is the first step.

I would like at this stage to pay tribute to some of the people who have been pioneering in this field for many, many years and I am thinking particularly of Alcoholics Anonymous; I am thinking of St. Clare's Detox Centre, who for a number of years have had their new centre in being; I am thinking of the Salvation Army and their Harbour Light; and particularly I am thinking of the dedicated men and women throughout Newfoundland and Labrador who, under very difficult circumstances, for many

DR. MCNICHOLAS: years have been trying to come to grips with this problem. An area that has struck me for many years as being a particular worry and should be a worry to all of us, are the young people. I am thinking of the schools in particular. I think this drug addiction in particular has gotten completely out of hand. I am sure many of us have seen children half bombed from drugs and unfortunately they are now getting to the stage where they are half bombed from alcohol too. We have all seen it. We know it. We tend to ignore it. Obviously the school teachers and parents and all of us are not dealing with the problem. I do hope that this new commission will take this particular aspect of drug abuse in hand because if we cannot deal with the children, this thing is just going to get worse and worse.

I was struck very forcibly yesterday by the comments from the hon. member for La-Poile (Mr. Neary) when he mentioned, I thought rather lightly at first, about general practitioners and psychiatrists being the biggest drug pushers in Newfoundland and Labrador and it was only just on reflection that I am inclined to agree with him. I agree not in the sense that the doctors are at fault: I think the fault is the system, or should I say the lack of system. I think a lot of us do not realize what lengths addicts will go to to get their drugs or, even moreso, what lengths pushers will go to get drugs to sell to these people. I have been told that in New York last year there were more pharmacists killed than policemen. I have been told in the city of Detroit that downtown now there are no longer any drugstores because it is too dangerous to have them in the downtown section.

DR. MCNICHOLAS: I am not suggesting that our problem is anything in that field or to that extent but we have an increasing problem. And to get back to the member for LaPoile's (Mr. Neary) comments about the doctors, I wonder do we realize that a patient can go in to a doctor today if he needs tranquillizers and if the doctor thinks so he will get a prescription. He can go tomorrow to another doctor and get another. He can go to another doctor the day after that and get a third prescription. In fact, if he is energetic enough he can go to all three or four doctors in the same day.

DR. MCNICHOLAS:

Now what we need very badly, what is in many other jurisdictions, is a register where all habit forming drugs will be controlled, the disposition of these drugs will be controlled, and we need that badly here. And I would suggest to the minister that he would instruct or advise his Commission to get that started without delay. And I would certainly recommend that on a committee to advise this board that we would have a physician with a particular knowledge of pharmacology and that we would also have a consultant pharmacologist on that committee.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to speak at length on this bill. I must say that I welcome it. I think it is overdue. But it is great to see this thing that we, dealing with medicine, see every day in our practice. I was interested in the comments from the speaker who just preceded me. His figures that he gave of \$45 million net profit that the government make each year, I think a good section of that, even though we are strapped for money, a very good section of that we are morally bound to contribute that. We do not have any centre for dealing with drugs and alcohol problems that I am aware of outside the city of St. John's. We have, as I mentioned, the detox centre and the Harbour Light, but we do want in-patient facilities. We want money for research. We want to deal properly with this major social problem that is getting worse day by day.

I am sure it is the prayer of every Newfoundlander that this commission will be a success and that we will, over the years, make great inroads into a major, major problem.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Unfortunately, as the former speaker just ended up saying, while everybody in this Province will hope that this commission will have success, I for one do not think it will. Not only do I not think it will, but I think it is a cover-up job, it is a cosmetic job, it is a PR job and it has to do with what was brought out last year in the Social Services Committee, a national story that myself and the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) got into.

The amount of money that was being spent - for example, last year in rehabilitation \$45,000 was spent on research and development of an alcohol programme. In the Salvation Army treatment centre, \$92,000; the Detoxification Unit at the Grace, \$240,000; and Alcohol and Drug Addiction Foundation, \$230,000. Most has gone into salary and office equipment. The Native Alcohol Rehabilitation Programme, \$87,000. So what is happening? As the minister said last year how much is being spent in various department. They are now taking it all together and putting it under one and getting the big fanfare that they are now going to be tackling, the problem of alcohol and drug abuse in this Province.

It is long overdue and with a \$45 million net profit from alcohol and cigarette sales in this Province, it is one of the major fund raising events. And in each budget the people of this Province and of this nation always know that if there is anything that is going to go up in any budget it is always going to be alcohol and cigarettes.

The Status of Council of Women was set up, how much was it given? \$150,000, again a PR job. The Arts Council was set up, \$150,000, again a PR job, cosmetics, basically trying to give the idea that we are really progressing and going forward. But here with regard to this alcohol programme, we are going to put them all together and have it sound like it is a great programme.

MR. HISCOCK:

The member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) asked if there was any money coming from the federal government. In the Coastal Labrador DREE agreement, \$2 million is going to go towards rehabilitation of the natives of Labrador. All together that is at least \$25,000 each, which only goes to show the magnitude of the programme that is with our native people in this Province.

With regard to our minors, with regard to high areas of unemployment, we know what happens in high areas of unemployment; people get their unemployment insurance and basically they have nothing to do and end up going down to the local bar. With the ever increasing number of dollars coming into this Province, and the speculation of oil and gas, we have more pubs or clubs down

MR. HISCOCK: in St. John's now than ever before. The last time we had that was back when we had the British Navy here in St. John's, long before we were a colony, back in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries when there were supposed to be 365 clubs or bars or walk-in bars on Water Street. But, Mr. Speaker, it is a problem, and it is a major problem, and I think some of the members in this House this morning have been taking it rather lightly.

With regard to another point that I want to ask about and see done, with regard to the Department of Health, why is not the Department of Health involved in co-ordinating this problem? Why is not education involved in this, and Social Services and Recreation? One of the main problems in this Province is the lack of co-ordination among the various departments. If it were not for the Salvation Army in this Province, it would be nil. And it was only because of embarrassment last year with the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) that this government, after getting national exposure for what was happening, ended up saying, 'We had better come up with another PR job like the Status of Women and the Arts Council and bring up the Alcohol and Drug Addiction Foundation.' So, Mr. Speaker, that is basically how I put it.

Health and Welfare (Canada) have been placing many advertisements with regard to smoking, which is again one of our major drugs in this Province and nation. Health and Welfare (Canada) have gone into some surveys, particularly with Christmas coming on, and say, 'We are not against drinking' - and I am not against drinking by any means, but it is the amount of drinking, the excessive drinking. I am very glad to see now that the Department of Social Services and rehabilitation attaches its name to those commercials. We need more

MR. HISCOCK:

co-operation like that.

I also feel that the Departments of Health, Education, Culture, Recreation and Youth, and Social Services here in this Province should have their own advertising on T.V. and in our schools and hospitals and nursing clinics.

With regard to alcoholism, we do need a long-term programme instead of sending our people out. We are more concerned with getting \$45 million for building hospitals or schools and not really concerned with the type of society that we are creating. I do not think we really are aware of the society that we are creating.

With regard to drugs - I want to speak for a short while on drugs, Mr. Speaker, about the amounts of drugs that are used in our high schools and in universities and trade schools. I, for one, believe very strongly that we should have decriminalization of marijuana in our society. And the reason why I say that is because of what is happening with our younger people. Because they are young and because they are experimenting and because they are trying the various new things, they end up getting caught, whether it is for small amounts - and I only talk about decriminalization for small amounts, I am not talking about pushers by any means - but when we get that, what do we get, Mr. Speaker? We get people who have a criminal record for the rest of their lives. I know a person who was only nineteen who ended up getting busted for two joints of marijuana who went on, got his Masters degree and wanted to get a job with the federal Department of Justice but could not get it because that was on his record. Once it is on the record it cannot be taken off. And if you want to go to the United States, you cannot go to the United States or some other countries in this world because you have a record. I, for one, Mr. Speaker, believe that that is creating a problem with regard to effects on the family,

MR.HISCOCK: with regard to the repercussions it is having on the young person's career and also the repercussions it is having on society. If we had to arrest the number of people for drug committed offenses in this country we would not be able to build jails fast enough to accommodate them; they are in the thousands, I believe over 80,000 so far have criminal records as a result of being caught and brought to justice for possession of marijuana. That is one thing that I am concerned with and I hope that the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer)

MR. HISCOCK:

will impress upon their counterparts in Ottawa to decriminalize it. It has gone before, it has been recommended by various groups to do it. And I know now maybe some of the press will pick up on it and say one is talking about a drug addiction foundation and here is one of the members saying that it should be decriminalized. I am not saying legalize it, I am saying it should be decriminalized and put it on the drug addiction part.

With regard to another part that I am a little bit concerned about has to do with education. With various contacts with younger nephews and nieces and friends in the family, one time there were a lot of chemicals being used in this Province, acid and MDA and various other forms of drugs. They are a lot more damaging to the person because they do not have any control and it is unfortunate now, Mr. Speaker, that chemicals are now being brought back into our schools after a fad was changed. And I think that again the Minister of Rehabilitation, the Ministers of Education (Ms. Verge) and Health (Mr. House) and Recreation (Mr. Andrews) have a job to encourage and let our kids know the danger of what is going on and what can happen to them. There are many people, I think it would be interesting that the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) and the Minister of Health should let this Province know how many people are into the Waterford Hospital as a result of drugs and chemical drugs and how many are in there and let out throughout the year and how many are still in there. If the Province and the schools only knew the long term detriments that some of this experimentation has they would probably take it a lot more seriously. And as I said, I feel very strongly that the various departments should be co-ordinating their efforts.

With regard to the youth of the Province, I believe very strongly our Department of Recreation is doing nothing concerning what needs to be done. For the past couple of years I have been advocating a Summer youth

MR. HISCOCK: programme like the federal government Canada Works to be set up by this government, but we have not. We have very little, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to recreation, we have very little money that is being spent on having teams compete with each other. I myself, representing Labrador, almost had to beg last year to get \$1,000 to take our hockey team over to St. Anthony to compete. There is not enough money set aside for the rehabilitation, and I would go as far to say there is not enough money spent towards the prevention measure and the prevention measure, Mr. Speaker, with regard to our young people, as the RCMP is doing, is get them in sports, get them involved in other forms of recreation and let them know that there are other forms of highs without resorting to drugs and alcohol. And when our people do get into them and when they do become addicted, then obviously we, as the society, have to pay the price. And when I said last year that alcohol should be barred in some of the native communities, I ended up stating from the point of view that when you look at the problem, when problems are compounded in a community and then they come back to the full society and ask us to build more health clinics and ask us to take over the families because of broken homes, ask us to end up building X number of other programmes then I, for one, feel very strongly that if a society or if a community abuses it in such a way that, yes, society has the right to take that right away from them, and it is not playing, as I said before, big brother.

One of the things I am a little bit amazed at is again how the Newfoundland Liquor Commission and the Brewer's Retail treat the Southern areas of Labrador. Because of the abuse in the Northern parts of Labrador - Cartwright, Port Hope Simpson, St. Lewis, Fox Harbour - various other communities along the coast, who wanted to get a beer licence in particular, could not get it because of the abuse that was being done up North. And I say, if that is not

MR. HISCOCK: a parental attitude and playing big brother, then what is. We do have a problem in this Province and I, for one, do not think that this bill is going to address it. I think that the people are becoming aware of the problem and now that they are becoming aware of it then the government is saying, 'Well, we better do something about it. So the best thing we can do is take the Salvation Army part, take the research development, lump it all together and do not have it under rehabilitation, have it under the Alcohol and Drug Dependency Commission and give them \$500,000 and everybody in this Province will clap their hands and say, 'Look, \$500,000.'

MR. E. HISCOCK:

I, as I said, would like for the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) to point out -

AN HON. MEMBER: Sit down.

MR. E. HISCOCK: I will sit down when I am ready.

MR. CALLAN: That is telling you, boy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. E. HISCOCK: I hope the Minister of Social Services will tell this House if it is true that on the coastal Labrador DREE agreement there are \$2 million allocated towards rehabilitation of natives. And if that is true, Mr. Speaker, as I said that is an astounding amount of money. The other question I would like to ask is, if there is, is any of the money going from that \$2 million, or how much of it is going, towards helping this and would it go into this funding?

I for one, do not care where the money comes from. I do not care if it comes from the federal government, the provincial government, the municipal government, the churches or whatever. The main point is to get the programme, get it on the go. And, as I said, it is not a matter of preaching righteousness or whatever, because I believe people in this society have the right. But when they become dependent they become dependent on society. And I do feel very strongly that if we are going to take \$45 million and put it out to them, then, at least we should have so much money set aside for corrective programmes.

MR. S. NEARY: \$45 million is a profit.

MR. E. HISCOCK: Yes, net profit.

MR. S. NEARY: (Inaudible) hundreds of millions.

MR. E. HISCOCK:

Which is quite true.

But we have to ask ourselves, you know, 'How much effect is alcoholism having in this Province? And how many people are on social services as a result of that and how much have we to pay out? How much money is being spent on our health costs as a result of operations on the liver and x number of other - cirrhosis of the liver and other ones? And how many other -

MR. T. HICKEY:

100 cases out of every 500.

MR. E. HISCOCK:

Pardon?

MR. T. HICKEY:

100 cases out of every 500.

MR. E. HISCOCK:

100 cases out of every 500

which is amazing! Amazing! So maybe, instead of setting up this, probably what we should do is we should go dry.

If you are talking -

MR. NEARY: Hold on now. Do not take away the only pleasure we have.

MR. E. HISCOCK:

I am just saying if you talk

about the benefits -

MR. S. NEARY:

That is going too far now.

MR. E. HISCOCK:

Exactly. It is going too far.

But that is what I am trying to say. This is not going far enough to deal with the problem. And what it comes down to is that, obviously, if a person in our society has the civil liberties to decide what they want - and nobody in our society should judge them if they do. And, also I think it is unfortunate that in many cases when they do develop a problem with regards to drugs or alcohol in this Province, they are looked down upon for going for help. That is the most unfortunate thing, the negative attitude that we have towards trying to rehabilitate people. And I, for one, feel that if a person has a mental illness and goes to the hospital it is not so much, if a person has a sickness and goes for an operation there is very little said, but if a person has a drug problem there is something wrong with him

MR. E. HISCOCK: and if a person is in an alcohol programme and wants to be rehabilitated, 'Ah, boy, he is gone over the hill now. He will never be any good, or whatever other statements are being used'.

But I am very skeptical of this bill as I was with the Status of Women as I was with the Arts Council. I think they are noble bills, that they should be brought in, but I feel very strongly they are being brought in for advisory councils in this Province brought in for PR. And this government has been bringing in too many high profile bills not having any substance and any follow-up to them. And what is happening -

MR. F. STAGG: Yes, that is (inaudible).

MR. E. HISCOCK: And I will point out to the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), as the Advisory Council of the Status of Women has pointed out in the last couple of days, that they will soon see through it, they will soon see through this farce and so will the Arts Councils. When there is \$150,000 put in and there are \$2 million worth of applications coming forward, they will soon find out that that is window dressing. This unfortunately is affecting people who do not have control over themselves and if they had control over themselves we would not need a bill like this.

So, Mr. Speaker, in closing I think that it is an important bill. I think it is a bill that is bringing together all the ones who are under Social Services and Rehabilitation, it is putting some other money from federal areas in and co-ordinating the effort but, basically, not enough is being done. I feel that the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) should have a major drug education programme in the high schools. I do not think she is aware of the compounding problem that is arising. And also I hope, as I said, we would have decriminalization of marijuana

MR. E. HISCOCK: because of the criminal element that it is causing on that person's record. And I would have to say to the Minister of Health (Mr. House), the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) and the Minister of Recreation, Culture and Youth (Mr. Andrews) who unfortunately is not here, that we should have all four

MR. HISCOCK:

departments co-ordinating their efforts and then we may at least be able to get at the programme.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

Before recognizing the next hon. member, I would like to extend a warm welcome on behalf of all hon. members to Dr. Donald Morrison Smith, Scientific Advisor for the International Affairs Secretariat of Health and Welfare (Canada) and former Chairman of the United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs. Welcome.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. STAGG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank my colleague for St. John's East (W. Marshall), the Minister of Energy, for giving way to me on this matter. I have a few comments -

MR. NEARY:

How nice can you get? Only (inaudible) Tory.

MR. STAGG:

Yes, a true Tory. One Tory to another.

MR. FLIGHT:

A Blue Tory.

MR. STAGG:

I would like to have a few comments on this.

Mr. Speaker, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. STAGG:

- following up on a couple of the statements made by my colleague from - where is he? Not Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) but Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) - my colleague from Eagle River, talking about the amount of money that the Province raises as a result of the sale of alcoholic beverages in the Province. He did not

MR. STAGG: mention it, but we do raise an awful lot of money by the sale of cigarettes. And the implication there is that we are raising too much money and that we are taxing it too much. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am a reformed smoker and I guess there is nothing worse to the inveterate smoker than a reformed smoker. I do not necessarily wear it on my sleeve but I gave up smoking ten years ago and I believe that it has added - it will in the long run, add many years to my life. There are many people being discouraged from smoking because of the actual cost of the product. A pack of cigarettes now, twenty-five cigarettes costs in the general vicinity of \$2. When I started smoking in 1958 at the tender age of fifteen or so, cigarettes were thirty-three cents a pack. Now even given inflation over these -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. STAGG: A pack of Matinees, it was, and Matinee is still in existence. It was the post Royal Blends era.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: But governments, succeeding governments, both federal governments and provincial governments throughout Canada have put an awful lot of taxes on cigarettes, and periodically it has been said that this is a taxing on the luxury of the common man, the luxury of the working man and that sort of thing.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe that anybody who is persuaded to quit smoking because of the cost of the product has made a correct decision. And if governments raise the taxes in addition to raising money, they also save money because there are

November 20, 1981

Tape No. 3616

EL - 3

MR. STAGG: associated health problems
with the smoking of cigarettes and more and more doc-
umentation and proof that it is one of the most debil-
itating and disgusting habits that a person can take
up. And I must also say that

MR. STAGG: it also appears to be something that is being taken up more and more by the females. I have sat around meetings , at a variety of meetings, and men seem to have quit smoking, most men seem to have quit smoking but women are smoking-proportionately, many more of them are smoking than men. There is one in the corridor there now and I see her puffing on a cigarette every now and then. Well, I say to the women of the world, 'Women of the world unite, throw down your cigarettes because we need you, we need you healthy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. THOMS: If they throw them down - how can you watch out for Stephenville (inaudible) while the Premier is staring at him?

MR. STAGG: Why is the Premier staring at me? Well, there could be any number of reasons for that. But it is a habit that government does well to tax and to dissuade people from the use of the product. In addition with the cost of liquor -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order!

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, I am doing my best here. Now when the member for Port Au Port (Mr. Hodder) was speaking I was very supportive of what he said. He has no concern when anybody else is speaking. He carries on conversations and is disruptive. If he is going to be disruptive at least direct his comments to me and do not carry on a conversation with others.

MR. THOMS: This is a point of order.

MR. STAGG: Now, Mr. Speaker, as far as the price of a product, the price of a product does have an awful lot to do with the amount of it that is consumed. I lived in an area , the Bay St. George area, that had

MR. STAGG: the Ernest Harmon Air Force Base in it. I lived there for a number of years, during the war years, and the 50s and the 60s when it was possible to get a 40 ounce of liquor, the best kind of liquor--there are certain grades of liquor, you could get a 40 ounce for \$1.50.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: These were the good old days, boy.

MR. STAGG: The Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) says, these were the good old days. Well, indeed they were the good old days and we have the proof of it in our area. There are some people who, because of the access to this cheap booze, are still paying the price today and many of these people are the kind of people who will hopefully benefit from this Alcohol and Drug Dependency Commission. We have our share of alcoholics in my district as we have everywhere else but I think a disproportionate number of them owe their alcoholism and their dependency on alcohol to the availability of cheap liquor. So just to clue up that point, if government did not tax the alcohol in the way that it did and does, then we would have an awful lot more patrons or reason for this Alcohol and Drug Dependency Commission. Perhaps it is because of the fact that the government has gotten in there and really made it expensive and a luxury to indulge in that practice, that we have fewer than we do today.

MR. HODDER: Hear, hear! Agreed!
But go one step further.

MR. STAGG: Maybe the hon. member can go one step further himself. Now, as far as the decriminalization of marijuana is concerned - this is an interesting thing, the decriminalization of marijuana. A lot of the bleeding-heart Liberals in the country talk about the decriminalization

MR. STAGG: of marijuana knowing that it will not happen but advocating it anyway because they want to be on both sides. I would say that if it ever really got down to the vote in the House of Commons or any of these legislatures, the people who are advocating the decriminalization of these so-called sort drugs would not do it. But it is an interesting thing to get up and say the decriminalization of it, not legalizing it but decriminalization it, which is an interesting contradiction. Now, Mr. Speaker, I run the risk of being labelled an old fogey by saying this, but I do believe that there is more and more evidence coming to light that the sophisticated and chic drugs that have been used throughout North America and throughout the world are in fact debilitating and you can put them in the same category as alcohol. Governments have striven imperfectly. Yes, they have striven imperfectly as far as the marijuana is concerned.

MR. STAGG:

I remember back in the late sixties and early seventies if somebody had a sprig or a mere trace of marijuana on his person, on his or her person, he ran the risk of being put in jail for long periods of time. And there was a very rigid enforcement of the law in that regard. Well, it has relaxed considerably and there seems to be a sort of benign, neglect, for want of a better term, but I think it is an accurate term, benign neglect as far as enforcing the letter of the law under the Narcotic Control Act or the Food and Drug Act. And it seems, generally speaking, to be working. And prohibition and large penalties for the use of these substances is not really the answer. The answer is in preventative measures through education. And to digress here slightly, but it is related, I believe that we would not have the French/English problem that we have in Canada today if in 1968 when the present Prime Minister took office, he had decided that they were going to spend billions of dollars on making French available to the English people of Canada and pouring money into the education system, we would have a bilingual country today if money had been put in at that level because it would be voluntary.

Now, there seems to be a similar philosophy that is pervading the fitness movement for instance. You see it started off in the late sixties or early seventies where fitness is in and everybody needs to be fit and so on, and a lot of people are genuinely involved in that. And if a person is fit and if you exercise properly, and you do not indulge yourself and get overweight and that sort of thing, well, generally speaking, you will be a healthier person and the problems that the Minister of Health (Mr. House) has with money for the hospitals and so on, they are lessened. Because healthy people

MR. STAGG: do not have to go to hospital.
The same thing is true as far as education in smoking and drinking is concerned. Now this Alcohol and Drug Dependency Commission is primarily to focus on people who are victims of the past, victims of the permissiveness and the lack of education and so on that has pervaded the past - well, I guess centuries really. Because alcohol, when it was discovered by the alchemists trying to find gold, they discovered that it was something that was probably even more lucrative than gold, at least it is alleged, that is who discovered it.

MR. NEARY: It is too boring. You are driving everybody out of the House.

MR. STAGG: Maybe that is the problem.
Now, through education -

MR. HOUSE: No, that is not true.

MR. TULK: You are listening? Education is the answer to this and I must commend the Department of Health and Welfare Canada, and I believe the Department of Social Services - I see the tag on the ads, both of them are involved in it - about this thing called Dialogue on Drinking, where people say you can say no, and they turn the glass down. And there is a very, very effective, a very effective message in that, where people can take some pride in saying no, or drinking in moderation, or smoking in moderation, or, hopefully, quitting smoking but drinking in moderation. That is my credo, by the way, I do not smoke but I do drink occasionally, always in moderation.

There are substitutes for alcohol as well. There are non-alcoholic drinks that have a kick to them, there is soda water, the Perrier, the mineral waters. There are whole groups of people who are

MR. STAGG: able to socialize with their drinking friends and are quite able to remain coherent, obviously remain coherent, but do not feel out of place drinking non-alcoholic beverages.

 So, Mr. Speaker, I am putting in a plug for education, for education on this subject and hopefully that will be the order of the day during the 1980s. And we have a generation of people who are

MR. STAGG: still in our schools and most of us here are fathers or mothers and the things that we were encountering only ten or fifteen years ago, when we were the people who were getting involved with drinking, ourselves, and learning the various facets of drinking and smoking, well now we have to have the sober realization that we have children of our own who are reaching the tender age where these things are very much going to become parts of their lives. And the example that we show, and we as people in this Legislature.-.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: - as far as the legislation we pass and our own behaviour in addition to that, is very much to be scrutinized both by the public of the Province and certainly, hopefully, we will be examples for the youth of the Province to follow.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say that if the government did not tax the cigarettes and alcoholic beverages as they did, we would probably have a much greater problem. I commend the minister for bringing in this bill. It is a good bill and, of course, it has to be followed up by action. We also need money. The Province needs money. Hopefully with the development of our natural resources, we will be able to get the kind of money we can put into these projects that will make this Province the place we all want it to be.

Thank you.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):
Buchans.

The hon. member for Windsor -

MR. FLIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I do not intend to speak long on this debate, Mr. Speaker, but there are a few points I would want to raise. And the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) is here waiting with bated breath for what I have to say.

MR. THOMS: That is right. Could I have my matches first though?

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I support this bill. Any person with a teenage family would support this bill. I commend the minister for bringing it in. And it is probably noteworthy, Mr. Speaker, that anyone in this House of Assembly who has any family, there is a fair chance that that family is in the teenage bracket. And, Mr. Speaker, what is happening in this Province would have to be of great concern to anyone with teenage sons or daughters or children who will become very shortly teenage people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this bill might very well be a case of reaping what we sow. The statistics given by the minister are absolutely mind-boggling, Mr. Speaker, that from 1973 to 1980 the drinking amongst teenagers increased by ninety per cent. The consumption of alcohol amongst our young people has increased by ninety per cent. And when I say reaping what we sow, Mr. Speaker, we should all harp back to the day that this administration brought in a bill in this House, the legislation that reduced the legal drinking age from twenty-one to nineteen. Now, Mr. Speaker, we are seeing the fruits of that legislation. We are seeing the fruits of that deed by this administration.

MR. FLIGHT: It was a popular move amongst the young people, Mr. Speaker, The adults of the day felt, well, like the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) a few minutes ago said, well you can vote when you are eighteen so why not drink when you are nineteen. Nobody felt like coming out and being opposed to the young people in the Province but there was a lot of concern, Mr. Speaker. Any responsible parent or person in this Province who had an idea what could happen when you freed up alcohol the way it was freed up, was concerned.

The heads of the churches opposed the legislation. There was all kinds of opposition but it was very popular at the time. I remember the cliché, 'You can fight for your country when you are eighteen, but you cannot drink a bottle of beer until you are twenty-one'. Well, Mr. Speaker, you can drink a bottle of beer now, legally, at nineteen. And here is what is happening, and we all knew it then, Mr. Speaker. I was one of the people concerned at the time. When the legal age was twenty-one, nineteen year olds were going into the clubs and they were going in legally. They were being allowed to go in. They were not being challenged, or very few times was a nineteen year old being challenged.

So, what is happening now, Mr. Speaker? Since the legal drinking age is nineteen, sixteen and seventeen year olds are going into the clubs without being challenged, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I have gone into clubs in this past year or so in this Province where there was a great sign on the wall saying,

MR. FLIGHT: 'Underaged drinking prohibited. Proof of age is necessary.' If there were a hundred people there, Mr. Speaker, ten of them were not above nineteen years old. Not ten. Now, Mr. Speaker, the government can live with the monster they have created.

There was a movement, by the way, a year ago, and I want to hear the minister address himself to this when he stands up, there was a movement to reconsider going back to the twenty-one year old legal limit for drinking. And that movement, Mr. Speaker, was, by and large, supported by a lot of young people, a lot of teenagers.

MR. FLIGHT:

So, Mr. Speaker, if ever there was a crisis, having consumption of alcohol - and I am going to stay on the alcohol. I am not as well versed in the drug addiction aspect as some hon. members here seem to be in the concern with drugs, although I know it is a concern. But if ever there was a statistic that a government of this Province should be ashamed of, it is the statistic that drinking in this Province has increased, the consumption of alcohol has increased by 90 per cent amongst our teenagers. And, Mr. Speaker, if ever there were anything that an administration had to take blame for, it was a bill that was pushed through with the kind of majority that this government had, pushed through just for the political expediency of the time. There was no thought put into it, it was not passed out to a Royal Commission to investigate, there was no committee of the House of Assembly set up like we had set up for the flag, to travel the Province and get the feelings of the parents of this Province, the clergy of this Province and the doctors and all the other people who were aware of what was going to happen. No consideration at all - they walk in, straight legislation with the biggest kind of a majority, this great enlightened government. Well, the results of the action of this great enlightened government have given the present Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) the problem he has on his plate today. The reason that the consumption of alcohol has gone up by 90 per cent among teenagers, one of the major factors, was the reduction of the legal drinking age from twenty-one to nineteen in this Province. And I want to hear the minister deny that if he cares to deny it. I want to hear the minister comment on what impact he thinks that that particular piece of legislation would have on the statistics that he gave us.

MR. FLIGHT: You could go on and on, Mr. Speaker, but I think I have made the point. And I think one of these days, Mr. Speaker - because if we do not look at it, some minister is going to have to come into this House one of these days in three years time and say the consumption of alcohol amongst teenagers has increased by 180 per cent. It is going to keep going up and this bill is not going to stop it, Mr. Speaker. The young teenagers who are drinking in this Province today, the eighteen-year-olds can drink until five o'clock in the morning and handle themselves very well at eight o'clock. Mr. Speaker, nothing in this bill is going to stop the kind of consumption of alcohol that we have in this Province. We are not dealing with problem cases. By and large, Mr. Speaker, I have heard people stand up here and talk about the problem cases, the homes that are broken. Well, we are not talking about eighteen and nineteen-year-olds and if the drinking, Mr. Speaker, had not increased by 90 per cent amongst the teenagers in this Province, there would be very little increase in the consumption of alcohol in this Province. The major consumption of alcohol in this Province that is taking place is as a result of the consumption - the 90 per cent increase in consumption is by the teenagers of this Province. And no legislation, Mr. Speaker - those young people have made up their minds. They are going into clubs at sixteen, seventeen, eighteen, and drinking. And the next morning, Mr. Speaker, they can handle themselves, they have no problems. Ask me if they have any problems. They will make it to work, but they will be back in the club at six or seven o'clock the next evening and that will continue, Mr. Speaker. The worst scenario is, if that continues until they are twenty-seven, twenty-eight or twenty-nine, then

MR. FLIGHT: society has a problem. Then we have our alcoholics, then we have our broken homes.

Mr. Speaker, if the minister is not prepared to look at the possibility of finding a way to reduce the drinking - not deal with them after they become alcoholics, that is not the solution, Mr. Speaker, it is the preventive situation. If we in this Province cannot find a way to reduce the consumption of alcohol by our young teenagers then we are in trouble, and the minister can bring in whatever legislation he likes. They are out there now fourteen years old. Manhood to most of our teenagers is when they can walk into the first tavern and buy their first booze, in lots of cases.

MR. NEARY: Close down some of the dives in this Province.

MR. FLIGHT: Exactly. You want to make it harder for those young teenagers to get that booze, or forget it, Mr. Speaker, as far as consumption among teenagers is concerned. You reap what you sow.

MR. NEARY: Every place around today is a bistro, a tavern (inaudible) and down here it is the same (inaudible) down town.

MR. FLIGHT: I challenge the minister to do a survey. There are very few young people in this Province today who would not agree that it may well have been a mistake to reduce the legal drinking age from twenty-one to nineteen.

MR. FLIGHT: You, in effect, reduce it from nineteen to sixteen, that is what you did with the legislation, and there was no thought put into it, none at all.

MR. THOMS: That is correct, that is the problem.

MR. FLIGHT: Now the minister is a victim of what he was part of and he is going to have to deal with it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: As a matter of fact, he may well have been the minister who brought in the legislation, or he may not have, I do not know, I admit I do not know, but he may have brought in the legislation that reduced the legal drinking age. What position did the minister take? He was a member of the Cabinet. Mr. Speaker, did the minister have some questions? As I understand it, during most of the minister's life he has it with social problems, prior to coming into politics. Let us get the answers and when that particular piece of legislation was being debated did the minister draw on his knowledge, the knowledge that he acquired as a social worker in this Province, as to what might happen if you reduced the drinking age from twenty-one to nineteen?

MR. HICKEY: You will never (inaudible) the knowledge I have and all that I get from others.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, the minister is going to need more knowledge than he has right now to deal with the drinking problem we have in this Province -

MR. HICKEY: I do not doubt that either.

MR. FLIGHT: - based on his own statistics.

And, Mr. Speaker, here is a government that finally faces the problem, a problem that they helped to create, Mr. Speaker, a problem that they legitimized. And, Mr. Speaker, here there are giving the Newfoundland Liquor Commission a blank cheque, 'Push all the booze you can push.' Drinking in this Province increased by 90 per cent amongst teenagers. Now, Mr. Speaker, how much of that booze, how much of the increases in the sales of the Newfoundland Liquor Commission, was drunk by teenagers?

MR. FLIGHT: A teenager is nineteen. You are not a teenager any longer when you are twenty years old. I will ask the minister how he thinks these young people are getting the booze and how he thinks teenage drinking increased by 90 per cent. Now, let me ask the minister responsible how he thinks the young people of this Province had access to that kind of liquor that would enable the consumption to increase by 90 per cent? Where does he think they are getting the booze? How do they have access?

MR. HICKEY: All sources.

MR. FLIGHT: All sources. And what is the main, primary source of liquor in this Province? The Newfoundland and Labrador Liquor Commission which the minister calls up and says, 'We have to have another \$2 million this year in your revenues, we must have it. It has to go to \$37 million this year.'

MR. HICKEY: I did not.

MR. FLIGHT: And let me ask this, if the minister approves of this kind of thing by a government who now expresses some concern about the level of alcoholism in this Province. I have attended four or five government sponsored functions in this Province. Now I can think of all kinds of things and ways, Mr. Speaker, we can impress the people there, that we want to give them something. You know, there are all kinds of little mementoes that this Province has available but what do you find, Mr. Speaker, sitting in front of every person invited to those conventions? A bottle of screech, and it does not matter what that convention is or what the age limit is on the people there. I have been there when there have been people sitting there below nineteen years old with a bottle of screech stuck in front of them. How is that for a minister or a government who professes that they are concerned about the level of consumption of alcohol in this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have sat in ball-rooms in this city with five or six hundred people, with the

MR. FLIGHT: the minister - a certain minister, not that particular minister - the guest speaker, where for an hour and a half we had to listen to political tripe. That was the basis of the speech, how great we are.

MR. NEARY: It is shocking!

MR. FLIGHT: That is right, Mr. Speaker.

And then he picked up the booze bottle and said, 'We would like for you to take note of this, this is our Newfoundland screech'. Well, that is the very stuff, Mr. Speaker, that screech is enough to cause the -

MR. THOMS: The government screech-ins.

MR. FLIGHT: - consumption of alcohol in this Province by teenagers to grow by 90 per cent.

MR. HICKEY: Do you want prohibition?

MR. FLIGHT: I want a little common sense.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: I have to rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: It is as much for the safety of the hon. member as anything. I mean, he is supposed to address the Chair and he is getting exercise by pointing to the minister; I am afraid he is going to fall over his desk.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

Order, please!

I do not consider that a point of order but I would ask the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) to address his remarks to the Chair. Thank you. The member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. G. FLIGHT:

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I will address my remarks to the Chair.

So, Mr. Speaker, when the minister rises now to close the debate, which he will, and the bill will become the law of this Province, that is necessary, necessary for some of the reasons I have pointed out, Mr. Speaker, I would want to ask the minister how he intends to deal with the Newfoundland and Labrador Liquor Corporation? How in conscience can this government bring in a bill, Mr. Speaker, and be so sanctimonious about their concern for the level of alcohol consumption in this Province and yet give total support and put pressure on the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation to increase their sales of alcohol in this Province, the biggest revenue source they have in the Province today, Mr. Speaker, the biggest revenue source they have? And no wonder the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) keeps pointing and keeps interrupting, because he is ashamed, he is ashamed of what the facts are, Mr. Speaker. He is ashamed! He was part of it, He was part of the problem, The President of the Council was part of the administration that permitted the level of consumption of alcohol to go in this Province to the extent that it has gone.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to hear the minister tell this House what he intends to - does he intend to sit down and talk to the Newfoundland Liquor Commission and ask them to stop pushing their booze the way they are pushing it, ask them to stop permitting it to be pushed on teenagers, people below nineteen years old, ask them if they are going to call in all the distributors, all the retail outlets, all the licensed clubs in this Province and tell them to make sure that nobody

MR. FLIGHT: under nineteen - because, Mr. Speaker, I can tell the minister this, and the President, that if this government has the ability to do it and if they have the gumption to enforce - if you cut out the drinking, the illegal drinking that is going on in this Province, that is the drinking that is going on in licensed establishments by young people below nineteen years old, you will reduce that 90 per cent consumption by a fair amount. You may even reduce it, Mr. Speaker, to tolerable limits. The bulk of that 90 per cent is being drunk by people under nineteen years old with the knowledge and the consent of the people who are pushing the booze in this Province, and the knowledge and the consent of the Newfoundland government, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, one could go on and go on. The government of this Province, Mr. Speaker, should be ashamed, totally and completely ashamed, of their performance in this area. They should be ashamed of what they have permitted to happen in this Province to our teenagers. They should be ashamed of the way they are pushing booze in this Province and, Mr. Speaker, they should have been ashamed to have been put in a position to have to bring in this kind of legislation. Thank you, very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I just have a few words that I want to say in connection with the debate and to note that unfortunately I do not know really where the Opposition stands in this debate. On the one hand they all say that they are going to support the bill, in the next breath they get up and they speak against it and speak in negative tones about it.

MR. FLIGHT:

We have no choice.

MR. W. MARSHALL:

Now, the hon. gentleman who just sat down, for instance, one of his last words in his desire to try to heap blame on the government and to cast negative implications on this bill that he is supporting, made the startling statement that people under nineteen in this Province are in taverns and they are drinking with the knowledge and consent of the government.

Mr. Speaker, that is false, it is untrue and it is without any foundation whatsoever. I would suggest to the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight), who has last spoken, that the problem that he refers to does not really relate directly to this bill. The fact of the matter is the drinking age is nineteen. Whether it should be twenty, twenty-one, twenty-two or twenty-three is a matter of debate. But nineteen in this Province happens to be the age of majority, the age when people can vote, the age when people acquire rights to act apart from their guardians and their parents. If, in fact, there is a proliferation of the people coming in and drinking under that age and the hon. members have

MR. MARSHALL:

indications of this, all they have to do is call the appropriate authorities in government and it will be looked at very carefully, and very quickly and swiftly remedial measures will be ordered to be taken against the establishments concerned.

I also, Mr. Speaker - one of the major reasons why I get up to speak is because of certain negative - and I refer to the negative and unfortunate comments made by certain people on the other side.

The member for Eagle River, for instance, (Mr. Hiscock) made his speech this morning, most of it was very good, and supportive of the bill. But this is the problem which the hon. gentlemen opposite have, that they cannot embrace a positive measure whole-heartedly, instead of that they have to get into this posturing. But one statement he made that I want to refute, and because I believe that the minister himself would not be able to, when he said that the only reason why this bill was being brought in was because the government was embarrassed by it. The minister, he said, was embarrassed by certain national publicity which occurred last year, and I believe he was referring to national publicity on the CBC concerning the incidence of alcoholism in one of the communities of this Province.

MR. HISCOCK: I was talking about the reports in the Globe and Mail. I am glad you pointed out the CBC.

MR. MARSHALL: Well, I mean, the CBC, The Globe and Mail, or what have you, news is news and it is perfectly permissible and in the interests of the public for it to be reported. But the thing that I want to talk about is to note that that statement is entirely and completely untrue.

MR. MARSHALL: I have been a colleague of the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) for many years, both when we were in Opposition, when we were in the government. And I can indicate to this House that a bill of this nature, and a measure of this nature, has been a policy and an aim of the minister for many, many years. He has been pushing this legislation. He has been pushing a commission such as this. And today and this week we see before the House the fruits of his efforts. So it is completely and absolutely untrue, without foundation and does not do service to an otherwise reasonably positive speech from the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) when he says that the motivation behind this bill was entirely because the minister was embarrassed by the publicity. As I say, I have sat with the minister for many years and I have heard him from time to time recognize this problem, advocate that measures should be taken, and he is very concerned with this problem and comments like that, unnecessarily, as far as I am concerned, debase the positive intentions of the minister and the positive intentions of this act.

I would also like to point out - although I know the minister himself, in a few minutes when I sit down, if other members do not speak, he will close the debate - I would also like to point out certain other statements that were made during the debate. I took note during the debate of, I suppose, one of the crassist remarks probably made in debate by the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Bennett) when he made a statement that is on the record of this House, and I do not think it should be allowed to be there without being answered. He made what I would call to be an infantilic, assinine statement to the effect that when the Liberal Government was in they had people working and there was no need of alcohol. Now, I am not quoting him directly but I am paraphrasing what he says and I am quite

MR. MARSHALL: sure that the records of the House will bear out what the gentleman said.

Mr. Speaker, this represents -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: All I can say is the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Bennett), and it is regrettable he is not here today - you know, this is an insult really to the people of Newfoundland and certainly an insult to the people from St. Barbe, and the people from St. Barbe are worthy of representation a little more positive than that.

Similar statements were made by other members of the Opposition, talking about various things like that. We know that economic climate-and there are many factors that affect the incidents of alcoholism. But when you have a positive piece of legislation such as this, which is going to establish a commission to advise with respect to alcohol and drug related programme, when you have the set-up that has been put there and the duties which are going to be conferred upon them, I do not think it does any service to this Legislature and certainly to the bill for negative comments of this nature.

One or two other points I want to allude to are the address made by the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) when he was here, when he spoke. If I heard him correctly I think he was advocating a regime of either prohibition or limited prohibition within certain communities.

AN HON. MEMBER: That was my (inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL: Now the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains referred to certain reports that had been received, reports that this government is quite well aware of. As a matter of fact, in its travelling the Cabinet - the Premier has brought the Cabinet to all parts of the Province and will continue to do so and in certain areas, particularly of this Province, we are aware of a higher incidence of certainly alcohol abuse

MR. MARSHALL: than in other areas. But I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the mechanism of prohibition, be it blanket prohibition or limited prohibition, is not the way to address this problem. The way to address the problem with which we are faced - and all members will agree that it is a very real problem - is through such mechanisms as the minister is bringing before the House. There are one or two other items that I want to mention but perhaps I will not because I know the minister will in a few moments. But I do wish to also point out that while the minister is bringing in this bill, I think the minister would be the last, and certainly the government would be the last to wish to bring in this bill and say that this is the beginning of the attack on alcohol and other related programmes. Because I think that no bill should be brought in without paying a great deal of tribute to such organizations as the Salvation Army, to which certain members made reference, particularly with respect to their efforts in this Province, in the city of St. John's, through their Harbour Light facility down in downtown St. John's. And for many years, as long as every member of this House can remember, the Salvation Army has taken a very, very leading part and a very effective part in the treatment of alcohol problems and the fostering of its prevention and the reclamation of people who have been affected by it. Similar observations can be made with respect to other organizations such as Al Anon, Alcoholics Anonymous and what have you. All of us, particularly in this day and age where the problem has become so acute, would be well aware and should be well aware of the contributions that these associations make. And this particular bill, Mr. Speaker, creates with government sanction a commission under the aegis of this House.

MR. MARSHALL: And one of the major concerns of this commission is to co-ordinate the activities of such bodies. It is a real positive measure, Mr. Speaker. I congratulate the minister for bringing the bill before the House and I want to re-emphasize as well that the minister should and deserves a lot of praise with respect to this because this has been a measure that has been of paramount concern to him for many years. And it does a disservice to the minister, a disservice to the government and the House and the whole of this Province for a person to get up and make an insinuation that the only reason that this is being brought about is by reaction to adverse publicity. This is a positive bill, Mr. Speaker, and as I say I congratulate the minister for bringing it in and I hope the next time, when we have positive legislation like this, the Opposition will get up and if they are going to support it they will support it with their words as well as their votes and not be queasy-weasely-like and get up and say that they are going to support it but at the same time, Mr. Speaker, get up and heap abuse on the bill itself and on the government. They do not know where they are going. They are leaderless and they are rudderless and, Mr. Speaker, the way that they have gone in this debate very effectively exhibits it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. STIRLING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The very high plane on which the House Leader, the Acting Premier just ended the debate encourages me to get into it. A very high plane. I do congratulate the minister for finally persuading his colleagues to bring in this bill.

MR. THOMS: What a terrible admission, to have to persuade his colleagues.

MR. STIRLING: What an admission. What an admission, that while they were in opposition, the admission this morning, that while they were in opposition this was one of their first principles that they were going to bring in. As soon as they became the government they were committed to bringing in this bill. 1971. Just think of that decade of heartache, wrecked lives, the wrecked lives and all of the suffering that has been created because this government did not respond to the priority of the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey). Ten years of neglect, Mr. Speaker. And it is not only in this bill. It is not only in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, we are in support of the bill, but I do not think enough attention has been paid to the root causes of the problem and some of

MR. STIRLING:

the facts as they exist right here in Newfoundland right now. We do not have, for example, a residential treatment centre. In those ten years in which the minister was trying so hard, Newfoundlanders and Labradorians who either had their own resources or who could afford to, could go to centres on the mainland. They could go to places like Dawnwood that had an exceptionally good programme. But the ordinary Newfoundlander - and I will just leaf through the comments made by the Minister of Education (Ms Verge). She did not point out in her comments that at the present time in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, in either of the two facilities that are available, there is no provision in the Detox Centre or in the Salvation Army Centre to treat a female alcoholic. I was surprised that the Minister of Education did not bring that out, that there is nowhere in this Province at the present time where a female alcoholic can receive even the most basic treatment, that there is no place in this Province where there is any anywhere. Some of the more serious problems in the last ten years have come up because of the pressures that are on females as well as males.

I would hope that the Minister of Education, when she speaks - and I support her in -

MR. THOMS:

She has already spoken, boy.

MR. STIRLING:

Well, I did not notice it in her comments, but when she speaks to the minister that she will make a first priority of the government - and I am saying this in seriousness, that the first priority of the government is to at least provide additional funding to those two centres to be able to give them the facility to treat female alcoholics. Because at the present time there is no facility in this Province where even for a two or three day period an alcoholic can

MR. STIRLING:

receive treatment.

I think it is a credit to the minister that he is bringing in this bill, but I do not think that we should kid ourselves into thinking that this bill is going to solve all the problems. We need in this Province, Mr. Speaker, a full-scale residential treatment centre, because it is not enough simply to take somebody who has become a victim of alcoholism and put that person - and at the present time it is a man. A woman with an alcoholic problem either has to continue to suffer or has to have the financial resources to go outside this Province. I think that that is an awful condemnation of this government at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, all that happens in the present system - and I must give full credit to the hospital that started it on an experimental basis and to the people who were so concerned, the volunteer people in this movement and people who were involved with Alcoholics Anonymous and other groups who have been fighting for years just to get to this stage, those ten wasted years.

Mr. Speaker, some of the root causes of alcoholism cannot be treated in three to five days and there is no provision in this next year to do anything about that. In the residential treatment centre a person would get at least a full chance of recovery. There is no point in just drying somebody out and putting him out on the street again and not changing his attitude or helping him or her to understand what caused the problems.

Mr. Speaker, some of the causes of the problems which have been identified are the basic problems that this government will not allow us to debate in this House, the kind of thing we saw this morning, in which we had a Ministerial Statement and an absolute

MR. STIRLING: refusal by the government
and an absolute refusal by the ministers to give us the
information on where the cutbacks are.

I would ask the Minister of
Social Services (Mr. Hickey) when he gets up to speak,
What cutbacks are there in his department? What cutbacks
are there going

MR. STIRLING:

to be in the alcohol and drug addiction areas? One of the basic problems that we have, Mr. Speaker, in this Province is that people who become alcoholics do not realize that it is happening to them. Nobody sets out to become an alcoholic. I believe the current statistics indicate that about ten per cent of the people who drink will eventually become alcoholics. So in addition to a basic education programme in the schools, and with young people, we need to do something about the basic financial problems of this Province and some of the things that cause the problems whereby a person turns to drink in the first place. What are some of those reasons, Mr. Speaker?

Basically one of the reasons that people turn to alcohol or drugs is because they cannot cope, because they do not have a job, because they do not have enough income to support their families, because it is an escape, because it is a means for them to find a way of drowning their sorrows. Another reason, Mr. Speaker, is that they cannot cope with the financial problems, the financial problems that sometimes cause both a husband and wife to have to work, not because one or the other wants to go out to find work outside the home but that they have to. The pressure, the pressures of children having increasing expenses, increasing costs and no money to do it with.

If you combine, Mr. Speaker, the numbers of problems of people who do not have jobs, who do not have adequate income from welfare or unemployment benefits, then it is an easy out for them to start drinking. They do not intend to become alcoholics.

MR. STIRLING: Another place, Mr. Speaker, where this government could spend some of its money is in creating a recreational alternative. Many people end up, today, drinking because they do not have a recreational alternative. This government has not spent the money in recreation, they have cut back. They have cut back on the expenditures in provincial parks. They have cut back on the expenditures in recreational facilities. They have cut back in funding for things like a boys' club. We had in St. John's a situation in which the Boys' Club in the Mundy Pond area had to close their swimming pool for lack of funds. Now, where do you think that those young people went?

Mr. Speaker, if the government really wants to do something about this problem in the overall, the government has to take a look at what are the alternatives. What are the alternatives for these people? One of the most basic rights that somebody has is a right to a job. Thousands of people in this Province today have a feeling of insecurity. They do not know who is in control of this Province. They know that this Province is blaming all of their problems on Ottawa, but yet they do not want Ottawa to take any more of the responsibility or the power. So they do not know what lies around the next corner, Mr. Speaker. They do not know if they are going to have a job tomorrow. They do not know if the fishery is going to be an absolute disaster. They do not know if somebody is going to repossess their boats. They do not know what this Province has as a future because this Cabinet and the government has their total attention tied up with issues that are not important to the average person in the Province.

MR. STIRLING:

So what is the alternative?

The alternative is to go out and have a few drinks. What is the alternative for these young people who cannot get funding to be able to travel on interchange programmes? What is the problem - the money that could be spent to bring young people in from the coast of Labrador and bring young people from here into Labrador, improved sports facilities, improved recreational facilities.

Mr. Speaker, those are the underlying problems. How do you help a woman cope with the fact that she does have a number of teenage children, the problem of the single parent trying to cope, the problem with people who have children who are living on welfare, and there is more money spent for somebody in a foster home? How do you help people cope with those kinds of problems, Mr. Speaker?

Those are some of the root causes and some of the basic problems involving alcoholism and drug addiction. This government is now refusing to debate with us what is the state of the economy of this Province. They have admitted to a

MR. L. STIRLING:

\$30 million shortfall. The President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) admitted that the minister has been pressing this government for ten years, for ten long years to take even this first step. I hope that the minister, when he gets up to speak in this debate, will tell us what he is going to do immediately to provide, at least, a minimum facility for women in this Province who become alcoholics, immediately! I hope that the minister, when he gets up to speak, will tell us how much his budget is going to be cut back. I hope that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) will tell the minister, when he gets up, what kind of an adequate budget he can provide for this very worthwhile project that is being set up. Because, Mr. Speaker, it is all going to be window dressing, all going to be simple window dressing unless we are going to do something real and worthwhile about it.

We have a situation, Mr. Speaker, where we have an urgent need in this Province. Maybe one of the Province's priorities is a residential treatment centre where we can help people reconstruct their lives because it does not only affect the single alcoholic, it affects the family, the dignity of the individual to perform in a society and get him to understand or get her to understand the problems that caused alcoholism in the first place. I had been accused, when I made five suggestions on housing and I made five suggestions on the fishery, of band-aid treatment.

Mr. Speaker, if this commission is not adequately funded this will be band-aid treatment of the worst order, because it will be worse than doing nothing about it. As long as there was nothing done, at least people

MR. L. STIRLING: could focus on the problems. And if the government wants us to do as the House Leader said, 'Get up and pat the government on the back for a wonderful piece of legislation', I think it is very naive for him to think that people on this side of the House are prepared to let them pass this piece of legislation without dealing with the real problem facing this Province. And the real problem facing this Province, Mr. Speaker, is that there is a void on the other side of the House, a lack of ability to manage the economy, a lack of experience to deal with the everyday problems. Because in many cases -

MR. S. NEARY: The Premier is a well-meaning fellow but he just has not got it to run the Province. He has not got what it takes.

MR. L. STIRLING: I believe that the government on the other side has lost the will to govern, lost the will to deal with the everyday problems, that they are waiting for a bonanza and that if only somebody could guarantee them money to flush from the heavens, they would have no problems.

But, Mr. Speaker, that is not the way life is, that is not the way the life is for the families who are suffering from alcoholism or drug addiction or leading to that, because you have to live with it as it is today, where it is today. You have to cope with the problems today with the assets that you have today and the opportunities you have today. And this government has given up managing. They are blaming Ottawa, giving up management, giving up taking control. They are more interested in getting rid of the national leader of the P.C. Party than they are in dealing with the real problems of this Province.

MR. L. STIRLING: Because they are the most experienced and slickest politicians and propagandists and media manipulators that this Province has ever seen, absolutely first-class. As a matter of fact, they even go to the extent that when they lose a debate in the House of Assembly, the few things they will allow us to debate, or they lose a debate in the media, they will then go out and buy half page ads, four page flyers in order to get across the message. What this has to do with the debate is the basic attitude of this government and its basic inability to manage the real

MR. STIRLING: concerns of this Province. It is causing our people the kind of lack of opportunity, frustrations, lack of money, lack of security that causes them to turn to alcohol and drugs in the first place.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. STIRLING: Let us deal with the debate, let us try to keep it on a level in which we all show some concern for dealing with the real problems in this Province. I have said that I give full credit to the minister for convincing his colleagues after ten years to at least make a start.

MR. MORGAN: When are you going to resign?

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, it should be boring for the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan). The Minister of Fisheries and cable television companies and distributors of alcoholic beverages - he is not very interested in finding out about how to deal with the real problems of this Province. If there is one person who has a zero credibility in this Province it is the Minister of Fisheries amongst fishermen, if it is possible, because that is why they have lost lots -

MR. MORGAN: That is why they are asking me to run in the next election in Bonavista North.

MR. STIRLING: Well, why do you not?

MR. LUSH: How come you know so much about other people's districts?

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) the next leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. STIRLING: Why do you not?

MR. LUSH: How come you know so much about the other districts, why do you not form an association down in your own and get yourself elected?

MR. STIRLING: The Minister of Fisheries has to look for another district because the people of Bonavista South have given him the message, that he should retire to his cable television company.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. SPEAKER (BAIRD): I suggest we are beginning to stray a little.

MR. STIRLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult not to respond to the provocative comments by such an inane group on the other side. And I realize the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) has not had time to look up that word to find out whether he has been insulted or not, but sooner or later he will.

Mr. Speaker, returning to the purpose of the bill, I again congratulate the minister for persevering against impossible odds, because he has got a start made. Mr. Speaker, this government is doing something else with this bill, it is taking its budget away from the House of Assembly. This budget should be approved by the House of Assembly because it can be one of the most important budgets that we have ever dealt with in this Province.

MR. MORGAN: What happened to the Bonavista North executive association, Liberal Association? I hear they all resigned a few days ago.

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT): Order, please!

MR. LUSH: How about the one in Bonavista South?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. LUSH: I did not see that one listed in the provincial report, the Bonavista South one.

MR. MORGAN: The Liberal Party is falling apart.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. Leader of the Opposition has the floor.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, one of the problems with the other side is they have an opposition mentality. We would like to get the opportunity to govern this Province, to do some of the things that need to be done in this Province. Mr. Speaker, one of the purposes of this bill should be to get a budget which will enable these people to really do some

MR. STIRLING:

things. If we are really serious about being concerned about the people who become victims, that should be the first step. A residential treatment centre should be a higher priority than building a new Confederation Building, Mr. Speaker. This government, in its Five Year Plan - the only money that has been shown by this government for spending is a new Confederation Building, all the rest of the money requires 90 per cent from Ottawa, the rest of it - and hospitals.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. STIRLING:

Mr. Speaker, there is nowhere in their Five Year Plan, and, Mr. Speaker, this is a tragedy, there is nowhere in their Five Year Plan where this government has made provision for a residential treatment centre. In other words, we are setting up a commission, and I know that you could not do it this year, but there is nowhere in the Five Year Plan where there is provision for a residential treatment centre. There is nowhere in the Five Year Plan where there is any provision to treat female alcoholics in this Province, there is no provision in the Five Year Plan in their construction programme to provide this kind of a facility across the Province. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey), when he gets up to close the debate on this bill, will be able to report to this House that he has some specific commitments for the budget. Now, what we may need to have, we may

MR. STIRLING:

need to have the kind of situation in which the Premier found himself in front of all the students at the university last week, when they managed to bring him in to their centre and got him on the stage and told him that he was not successful in the deception, that they knew that there was going to be a continuation of post-secondary education grants from the federal government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. STIRLING:

One said he got a commitment from the Premier. He got a commitment from the Premier to stand up -

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

Order, please! A point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill the principle of which is to establish an Alcohol and Drug Dependency Commission. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition is now obviously speaking about matters extraneous to the principle of the bill. He is talking about a speech made by the Premier at Memorial with respect to education, or health or what have you, or the relationship between Ottawa and the provincial government. Now, there is plenty of opportunity for the hon. gentleman to make observations with respect to that, but I respectfully suggest that this is a bill, the principle of which is the establishment of the Alcohol and Drug Dependency Commission, and the hon. gentleman is being irrelevant to it.

MR. STIRLING:

To that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

To the point of order, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING:

Mr. Speaker, my source that I quote is the Minister of Education, who dealt very extensively with education matters in her debate on this bill, because one of the principle purposes for the setting up of this organization

MR. STIRLING: has to do with education. And before I was interrupted by the House Leader (Mr. Marshall) I was dealing with the last commitment that the Premier made to the people at the university about an increase in the education budget. Before I was interrupted that is the point I was about to get at to find out whether any part of that increase would be available for education under this bill, Mr. Speaker. It was quite in order and the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) dealt extensively with the matter.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): To the point of order, let me say that during second reading the tone of debate is wide-ranging. However, I do believe that the hon. Leader of the Opposition was straying somewhat from that even, and I would ask him if he would confine his remarks to the bill before the House.

MR. STIRLING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Anytime that it gets embarrassing for the other side, when you start pinning them down, you can be sure that the spokesman on the technicalities of how to get people off debate will be up on a point of order. Now, Mr. Speaker, the last time that he abused the privilege of this House, he was up on a point of privilege and the Speaker had to rescue him.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: A point of order. It is against the rules, Mr. Speaker- I can give the hon. gentleman the quotation from Beauchesne if he wishes.

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

MR. MARSHALL: I was rising on a legitimate point of order, and the hon. gentleman has indicated that, you know,

MR. MARSHALL: in doing this I was abusing the privileges of the House. It is out of order to make that insinuation, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: True. True. True.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please! I think we could clear this up by asking the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) if he would confine his remarks to the bill before the House now.

MR. STIRLING: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The whole purpose of debating a bill - now, I recognize in dealing with the bill on an Alcohol and Drug Commission we are talking in terms of education. Part of the whole process of education is in case there are any alcoholics or drug addicts on the other side, we have to talk about education. Education means, also, educating people in the House of Assembly, and in the rules of the House of Assembly. And I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that the House Leader (Mr. Marshall) will be up on a number of points of order, because every time that we get to the quick - you see, they refuse to have a debate on the things causing alcoholism. The problems causing alcoholism and drug addiction, Mr. Speaker, they refuse to have a debate on that. And so when we are talking about the base causes then we have to bring in some of these other matters in finding out what causes alcoholism. And I would say that anybody who is watching the debate in this House of Assembly, the frustration of trying to get the government to deal with the real issues of the problem which causes alcoholism, the question of the economy - and you will have the House Leader now popping up on another point of order, Mr. Speaker, because they just will not debate. They will just not take on this side. They are frightened to death to let the people know the truth. They want to lead people in insecurity and frightening - the only person on the other side who referred to drink was the Premier of this Province when he dealt with it in a most joking manner, some of the real concerns brought up, dealing with alcoholism and drug addiction, Mr. Speaker.

MR. STIRLING: I was getting to the point, when I was interrupted by the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), that this government has an intention of taking away from this House of Assembly, from the people's House, all control over money. They will not bring in a budget which can be debated. They have gone through a budgetary exercise and all the work is done. It is sitting in the departments. And the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) knows now how much he has to cut back on this programme,

MR. TULK: That is right.

MR. STIRLING: And he knows right now whether or not all he has been able to do is get a hollow bill. Because otherwise, Mr. Speaker, when the minister gets up he will say, 'Okay, I will bring back the budget to this House of Assembly for approval.' Right now the Commission is the only one who brings the budget and the minister decides what that budget will be. In other words, the restrictions, the priorities will be the priorities of the government rather than the priorities of this House of Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, sooner or later the people of Newfoundland and Labrador are not going to tolerate that. They do not get involved in knowing very much about the details of what happens in technicalities here in this House of Assembly. But this government has made a conscious effort to take Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro away from this House of Assembly.

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

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition, once again, is straying from the whole purpose of this bill, and it is the principle of the bill that should be debated during second reading.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition has about two minutes left.

MR. STIRLING:

Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to deal with the principle of this bill without referring to the fact that the government is taking the control of the budget out of this House of Assembly, as they have done in so many other cases, and I was only giving a couple of examples. And in the couple of examples that I mentioned, this government will abuse the rules of this House every chance they get to prevent the people of the Province from knowing the truth. Mr. Speaker, they are not going to get away with it. They are just not going to get away with it. We will find this means or we will find another means - although we do not have the people's money to waste and spend on advertisements. I expect that at any moment now we will have a point of order. I have another minute and a half. Would you like to waste that minute and a half on another point of order?

Mr. Speaker, we support the bill, but we have not had a chance to talk about the whole problem of drugs. I have dealt with the need for coverage for women in this Province to be treated fairly and equally - a woman with an alcoholic problem cannot get treatment in this Province - that we need a residential treatment centre and we need a lot more money spent on the whole question of the research about why people turn to drugs, why people turn to alcohol and just how bad is the problem dealing with prescribed drugs.

One of the things that I did not get an opportunity to get into, because of the interruptions by the House Leader (Mr. Marshall), is that one of the major problems facing this Province today is the problem of the abuse of prescribed drugs, Mr. Speaker. It is an area that nobody is talking about. But I hope that this new Commission will be given the authority to deal with all these matters. And that is why, Mr. Speaker, because we feel so strongly

MR. STIRLING: on this side that this is going to be a very important Commission, that we do not want to see them hamstrung, that we would like to see their budget approved in this House of Assembly so that we can show how high a priority it should have. On this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, we care about people, we care about preventing the causes of alcoholism and drug addiction and we listen to people and we try to do something about it, and we try to provide jobs. That is why we are going to pay attention to making the government stand up and answer for the root causes, the base causes of alcoholism and drug addiction. We intend, Mr. Speaker, to make sure that this government cannot conceal anymore the real truth about their lack of ability to manage in this Province, the lack of concern for the provision of jobs. We saw the results in the close down of a construction industry. And the whole question of alcohol and drug addiction -

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition's time has expired.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: There is no leave.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member's time has

MR. NEARY: Go on. Get up.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey)-I am sorry- the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush).

The hon. minister, if he speaks now he will close the debate. The hon. member for Terra Nova wishes to speak in the debate?

MR. T. LUSH: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I would be very remiss in my duty, indeed, if I did not speak to this particular piece of legislation. I would practically be ostracized from my church if I did not get up and speak to and support this piece of legislation.

It is funny, Mr. Speaker, that whenever one raises any concerns at all about any particular kind of legislation in this hon. House, any kind of bill, the government interpret that to be negative or against a particular bill. Now, Mr. Speaker, we want to make it crystal clear again that there is nobody on this side of the House against this particular bill. We have just expressed some concerns, we have just expressed some anxieties, we have just expressed some directions in which we think the government should be going once this commission is set up. And this is all we have been doing, giving the government some advice, giving them some direction, giving them some guidance in the establishment of this particular commission.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is no question that this is a good step taken by the government to set up this particular commission, a commission on alcohol and drug dependency. It is a good move but, Mr. Speaker, one wonders why we had to wait until this day and age to take some action. One wonders why we had to wait until 1981, until November of 1981 to pass this particular piece of legislation.

MR. T. LUSH: when we have had an alcoholic problem in this Province ever since we have been settled. Newfoundlanders are well known for our alcoholic consumption and, Mr. Speaker, it has been a problem in this Province for years and years and years. And the government have not moved, no government moved to do anything until this day of 1981. So, of course, we are proud to see that it is now done but, Mr. Speaker, the fact that we have had the problem so long, it has caused so much anxiety, so many social problems, so much frustration, so much deprivation, so much psychological problems, physical problems, financial problems in this Province and I expect will continue to do so, will continue to do so. It is certainly unfortunate that the government have not or did not see fit to set up something like this so that we could educate our children about the ills of alcohol consumption and now, of course, drug abuse.

MR. W. HOUSE: You used to do that when you were teaching did you not?

MR. T. LUSH: Pardon?

MR. W. HOUSE: You used to do that when you were teaching did you not?

MR. T. LUSH: Used to do what?

MR. W. HOUSE: Teach the children about the ills of alcohol.

MR. T. LUSH: Oh, most certainly.

MR. W. HOUSE: Sure you did. I did too.

MR. T. LUSH: But that does not mean -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. W. HOUSE:

(inaudible) about that.

MR. T. LUSH:

Oh, yes, that was just done, Mr. Speaker, as an aside sort of thing. It was just done by efficient and competent teachers, but what we are talking about is a properly designed programme. This is what we are talking about, a properly designed programme, not something left to chance, not something left to the whims and fancies of the educational people without any kind of purpose or any kind of direction. Sure it was done by teachers in specific cases, but it was not something that was set out by the government, a deliberately planned course, or a deliberate plan of action, shall we say.

So, Mr. Speaker, there is no point in the- I do not know why the minister - the Minister of Health (Mr. House), there is no wonder he is out of Education. He is frightened to death to talk about progress in education, frightened to death to talk about progress! I think he would like to keep things the way they were about 100 years ago.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: The minute you mention about progress with education he just sits back. He is frightened to death of progress.

MR. NEARY: He looks like something out of Charles Dickens.

MR. LUSH: He is frightened to death of progress and I believe he is afraid of progress in government. He is afraid of progress, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, ho!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I hope, I certainly hope, when this commission is set up that we will see the right kind of action with respect to educational programmes about teaching our children about the harmful effects, the ill effects of drugs and alcohol. And Mr. Speaker, the drug problem in this Province is far more intense, I believe, than is recognized by most people. I believe the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) alluded to it.

AN HON. MEMBER: And you (inaudible) bottle last night.

MR. LUSH: Pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: You attended the (inaudible) association last night.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I have never contributed to an alcoholic problem. I do not like boasting, but I can tell hon. members of this House that that does not happen to be a problem of mine. That does not happen to be a problem of mine and I do not foresee it being a problem in the future. I have lots of other problems, Mr. Speaker, I have lots of other problems but I do

MR. LUSH: not happen to have the problem of drug abuse or alcohol. I do not have time to get involved in those things, Mr. Speaker. And I am proud of that fact, that I do not happen to have those problems.

But, Mr. Speaker, there are people who have them. I will say this, Mr. Speaker. I have been very close to the problem. I have been very close to the problem, and too, too close. Too, too close to problems and too, too close to alcoholic problems. And, Mr. Speaker, this is why I know of what I speak. And the drug problem in this Province today is far more intense than is recognized by most people. It is a dreadful problem, Mr. Speaker. And it is available - drugs are available anywhere at all in any community of the Province. There is no community excluded.

MR. HOLLETT: In any elementary school.

MR. LUSH: In any elementary school, is right. It is just baffling, Mr. Speaker, it is just baffling to realize, to know the amount of drugs that are available in this Province and in every community. No community is excluded. I was totally surprised to find this out in the last couple of years, the availability of drugs throughout this Province and, as I said before, every community, the smallest community in this Province, the smallest school in this Province. And I expect, of course, this is why the government have been compelled to do what they are doing today, to set up this commission because of the complaints I am sure that they have been getting from the general public. And, Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope that this commission will be able to do something to

MR. LUSH: teach young people, in particular, the harmful effects, the ill-effects of drugs and of the excessive use of alcohol.

So, the important thing now, Mr. Speaker, is that we are going to put this - I wish I could see what the minister is holding up there. I cannot see that far away.

MR. NEARY: That is learning -

MR. HOLLETT: That is the course outline.

MR. LUSH: About drugs and alcohol?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. LUSH: That is great. That is great. And I hope that we will expand upon these programmes and improve upon these programmes. But again, of course, the Minister of Health (Mr. House) is so defensive about the programme, I suppose he will suggest that there is no way that we can improve upon any of our programmes in school today. You know, we cannot improve upon them. But I would hope that we will improve upon whatever we have got and expand it to teach young people the things they need to be taught about drug abuse and alcohol consumption, a problem, Mr. Speaker, that has been with this Province ever since the first settlers, a problem, Mr. Speaker, that should have been dealt with years and years and years ago in this same manner. And I suppose without some of the - I do not know what would have happened to us. I do not know what would have happened to many of our people if it were not for the couple of groups that took the initiative to work with these problems on their own, A.A. and the Salvation Army,

MR. LUSH: I suppose the two most familiar groups for having dealt with alcoholic problems. But, Mr. Speaker, with the drug problem, there has been nobody dealing with that because that is a new problem. The drug problem is a new problem and there are many people today who do not have the expertise to deal with this particular problem. They do not know how to deal with it. They are just out there groping in the dark. They are groping in the dark, Mr. Speaker. As I said, it is a new problem and they do not know how to deal with it. I think most people will say that probably the same kind of treatment for alcoholics is recommended, but they are not sure. They are not sure that the same treatment that is given alcoholics will work for people who are addicted to drugs. So, Mr. Speaker, it is a new problem and it is going to take some research in dealing with this particular problem. I would hope now, when the commission is set up, that these people will be given sufficient funds to be able to do the research programmes, particularly in the area of drug abuse, which is going to be so vital and so necessary. Because, as I have said, it is a new problem and experts, physiologists, and all of these people who work in that particular area are not sure of the way in which we should or they are not sure of the method that we should use in dealing with drug users and people who are addicted to drugs. It is a big problem and it is a complex problem and it is a problem that, if we are to solve it, we are going to have to put a lot of study into and a lot of research. So, Mr. Speaker, a very important aspect of this particular bill is that we hope that the government will allow or allocate sufficient funds so that this commission, once they are set up, Mr. Speaker, will be able to carry out the necessary research, will be able to establish the programmes that will be

MR. LUSH: necessary to allow them to work effectively, effectively and efficiently in this area of alcohol and drug abuse. So, Mr. Speaker, this commission will deal with two of the largest social problems in this Province today. Drugs and alcohol are the greatest curse in this Province today, causing the greatest social problems, Mr. Speaker, costing the taxpayers hundreds of thousands of dollars in terms of treatment. So, Mr. Speaker, I would hope, in summing up my few remarks here, that the government, when the commission is set up, Mr. Speaker, will certainly give a liberal supply of money, Mr. Speaker, a liberal supply of money.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: Because, Mr. Speaker, they are going to need the money to set up the programmes, to set up the various correctional centres for study and research and treatment. They are going to need dollars to be able to come up with some effective and some efficient programmes.

MR. NEARY: To identify the problems.

MR. LUSH: To identify the problems. And, Mr. Speaker, there is no point in setting up a commission, there is no point in legislating these kinds of measures today unless the government is prepared to put in the dollars that are going to be necessary to develop the programmes, to establish the centres and to carry out any kind of an efficient and effective programme in this particular area. As I have said in the beginning, Heaven knows that we need that in this Province, Mr. Speaker. It is sad to say, it does not make one happy to have to acknowledge that we have this terrible problem, that we have this social curse with us today or, I suppose we should say, the social curses of alcohol and drug abuse. But, Mr. Speaker, it is a fact.

MR. HOUSE: And tobacco.
MR. HOLLETT: That is a drug.
MR. LUSH: Pardon?
MR. HOUSE: He is talking about hard drugs,
he is not referring to tobacco.

MR. LUSH: Who is referring to tobacco?
MR. HOUSE: I said you are not referring to
tobacco but it is a drug.

MR. LUSH: Oh sure it is a drug. I would
prefer that people not use it , Mr. Speaker. I would
prefer that people not use tobacco, but I am not referring
to that today. I am referring to the harder stuff than
tobacco. I cannot put a name on it, Mr. Speaker,

MR. LUSH:

because I am not familiar enough to know what it is I am referring to, quite frankly, but I know whatever it is I am referring to under the general terminology of drugs, that it is having a very harmful effect on the young people that I meet today and, Mr. Speaker, the scores of young people, thousands of young people throughout this Province indulging in drug use. And, Mr. Speaker, despite what the Minister of Health (Mr. House) says, it is my impression that we are not doing much about this in school today, even though we know it is around, even though we know that every break that students get they are out behind the schools engaging in the activity, anywhere that they can get a break at all. If they can move away from the school they are out there, Mr. Speaker, smoking, but it seems to me the schools are not dealing with the problem. It seems to me that the schools are doing nothing about it in terms of educating the young people. I think from time to time, maybe, that the good teacher, the competent teacher, will do something in terms of doing a project on drugs, this sort of thing, but there is nothing, Mr. Speaker, formal, there is nothing planned, there is not a deliberate plan throughout the system of education on the uses of alcohol and drug abuse.

Mr. Speaker, and again I cannot say this with any degree of certainty, maybe the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) is able to tell us, but for my own information and from talking to young people, I gather that there is no programme in the school dealing with the harmful effects of alcohol and drugs.

MR. TULK:

Yes (Inaudible)

MR. LUSH:

When did this come out?

MS. VERGE:

It came out this year.

MR. LUSH: This year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH: Well, this is what I am talking about. Just starting this year. So what I have been saying is correct, Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is correct. It is just starting now, just starting.

MS. VERGE: (Inaudible)

MR. LUSH: Yes. And again I would say, Mr. Speaker, there is no continuity to the programme. If it starts in Grade V, Mr. Speaker, in Grade IV, - this might be too far back.

MR. HOUSE: (Inaudible)

MR. LUSH: You see, again the Minister of Health (Mr. House) is defending the lack of a continuous co-ordinated programme right throughout the whole school system.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH: I am not suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that there is no programme. What I am saying is that there is not an adequate programme, an effective programme. It is like saying that we do not teach Newfoundland history in school, and I am sure the Minister of Health would say, 'Oh, yes, we do. Oh, yes, we do. We do it in Grade V.' Now, Mr. Speaker, what an -

MR. HOUSE: (Inaudible)

MR. LUSH: And this is the same way, Mr. Speaker, with drugs and alcohol. Somewhere along the line I would say it is touched, somewhere along the line it is skimmed, somewhere along the line we give it some superficial attention but, Mr. Speaker, there is no deliberate co-ordinated programme all the way through and this is what it has got to be. You cannot expect, Mr. Speaker, to do a little project in Grade V on drugs and alcohol and expect those kids, after one little project, a month's project,

MR. LUSH: to know everything about drugs. You cannot expect the same thing to happen in Grade VIII and Grade IX. I am telling hon. members that is the kind of fragmented approach that is taking place in school now with respect to drugs and alcohol.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Right on.

MR. LUSH: That is the kind of fragmented approach that is taking place rather than something that is extensive, something that is intensive, something

MR. LUSH: that is well co-ordinated right throughout the whole school programme, from Kindergarten to Grade XII, Mr. Speaker. That is the kind of programme I am talking about. And the minister says that we now have it.

Well, I am glad if we do. But if we do it, it is just being done. It is just being done.

MR. HOLLET: You should tell all the teachers that.

MR. LUSH: It is just being done. And if that is what is being done, Mr. Speaker, that is great. If that is what is being done then this is going to help this commission. If this kind of programme that I am now outlining, this kind of approach, this extensive, comprehensive drawn out programme right from Kindergarten to Grade XII, right on through the high school in respect to alcohol and drug abuse, then Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that we are going to help this commission, that this is going to help this commission to do an effective and efficient job, Mr. Speaker, a job that is certainly necessary to be done in this Province. And I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the people of this Province will, in a short time, recognize the importance of this particular commission, Mr. Speaker, and that we will see the effects of their work, spreading right throughout this Province. Because it is not a problem that is isolated to St. John's, it is not a problem that is isolated to the Avalon Peninsula, it is a problem, Mr. Speaker, right throughout the Province, and in both areas, both areas extensive, intensive. And I am glad that the government have decided to take this particular action now and, as I have said before, I hope that we will give this commission the tools, I hope that we will give them the tools whereby they can do their job and, Mr. Speaker, I will certainly be watching very closely. I will be watching very closely. I will be watching this commission. I will be watching the government's actions from here on in, and watching, Mr. Speaker, to see how quickly they

MR. LUSH: move to set up this commission and watching the appointment of the fourteen people - is it? - fourteen?

AN HON. MEMBER: Fourteen.

MR. LUSH: That is the biggest jobs creation programme this government got in in the last couple of years for sure.

But, Mr. Speaker, that is just an aside.

I will be watching these fourteen appointees. I wonder though, Mr. Speaker, just when the minister gets up, and maybe it has already been alluded to, I was just wondering - the clause there which says, "The Committee shall consist of a chairman and fourteen other members appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council on the following basis, namely: one member chosen from each of five regions of the Province," and I just wondered about the five regions. I did not know if there was some break-up of the Province into five regions that I was not aware of.

MR. NEARY: By population or geographic regions or -

MR. LUSH: So I do not know whether there is, as I say, some break-up in the Province of five regions that I do not know anything about, whether it is a geological -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) redistribution they are setting up the (inaudible) again.

MR. LUSH: Yes. So I just wanted to know why these five regions or what they are, whether it is a -

MR. NEARY: The five Tory districts.

MR. LUSH: Pardon?

MR. NEARY: The five Tory districts.

MR. THOMS: The East end of St. John's.

MR. LUSH: They may be five sensible geological regions, or geographical regions.

MR. THOMS: Geographical.

MR. LUSH: They could be geographical - what did I say?

MR. THOMS: Geological.

MR. LUSH: Geological, yes.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, that is all I want to say about this particular bill. I want to commend the government, even though it is long overdue. It is long overdue. I want to commend the minister for setting up this particular commission and, as I said before, we will be looking to this commission for some action and we hope that we will see some benefits from this particular commission in a short time, and hear about the programmes - or the correctional centres and the programmes that they are going to establish, and to get working on these two large problems in the Province, the problems, Mr. Speaker, that have over the years, cost this Province in terms of personal problems, in terms of finances, in terms of -

MR. NEARY: Grief.

MR. LUSH: - grief, anxiety, frustration, deprivation, right throughout this entire Province, and Mr. Speaker, I would hope that we will see a solution to some of these problems, that we will see some relief, that we will see some help and that we will all be the happier, Mr. Speaker, we will all be the happier for it.

So, Mr. Speaker, having raised these concerns, Mr. Speaker, having given the government some direction, having established some direction by which they should go, I would like to commend the government and look forward to the establishment of the commission and look forward to minimizing the ills of the problems created by drug abuse and alcohol abuse, Mr. Speaker, and hope that in a short while our people, our people who engage in these two iniquitous activities, Mr. Speaker, will soon be able to get some rehabilitation. Mr. Speaker, thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, it is four minutes before the hour of one -

November 20, 1981

Tape No. 3635

NM - 4

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CALLAN:

It is four minutes before the

hour of one o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

The hon. the member for

Bellevue has a right to be heard and he has been recognized.

The hon. the member for

Bellevue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER:

You have a right to be heard

in the debate.

MR. CALLAN:

Yes. I have about ten or

fifteen minutes of time to use on this particular bill. As it is nearly one o'clock, I adjourn the debate, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for

Bellevue adjourns the debate. Is it agreed to call it one o'clock?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

Agreed.

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I move the

House at its rising do adjourn until, tomorrow, Monday, at 3:00 p.m. and this House do now adjourn.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

The motion is that this House do now adjourn. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Those in favour 'aye', contrary 'nay' -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

Order! Order! Order, please!

In my opinion the 'ayes' have it. This House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Monday, at three of the clock.