

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 24, 1981

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

First of all, I would like to draw the attention of all hon. members to the presence of a new Page today in the person of Miss Siobhan Davis, and I am sure hon. members would like to join me in welcoming Miss Davis to the staff.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: Also, on behalf of hon. members, I would like to welcome to the Speaker's Gallery today eleven male cadets from the Salvation Army Training College, St. John's, accompanied by their principal, Major Hammond, and their instructors Lieutenant Jacobs and Captain Goulding. Welcome.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. FLIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a couple of questions for the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall). The first is with regard to the Bedford Dolphin being diverted from Newfoundland, from what we understood was a drilling programme off Newfoundland, to drill off Nova Scotia. Would the minister tell the House whether or not that came as a result of the Province not issuing a permit to the owners of the Bedford Dolphin?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the question, has as all questions of the Opposition have, certain implications in them, First of all he talks about this vessel being diverted. As far as the Government of Newfoundland is concerned this government was not diverted. I understand, Mr. Speaker, that the diversion of the vessel -

MR. THOMS: (Inaudible) to be diverted.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I will respond to

MR. MARSHALL: the questions but I am not going to respond if I am going to be interrupted.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the -

MR. FLIGHT: I would like to ask a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member wishes to ask a supplementary.

The hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, the question still stands if the minister would answer the question when he stands, but supplementary to it is that we understand - and maybe this should be cleared up if it is not factual - we understand that there were fifty Newfoundlanders hired to work on the Bedford Dolphin as a result of Newfoundland regulations and the rest, and now those fifty jobs are jeopardy. I will ask the minister, since Nova Scotia has taken the page out of our book now and is insisting on local preference, is the minister prepared to do anything to keep those fifty jobs that will be lost once the Bedford Dolphin takes up the drilling programme off Nova Scotia? What about the fifty jobs we are going to lose?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I am quite prepared to answer the question but I would like to have a climate in the House that is an ordinary civil climate, and if the hon. gentleman can keep his own colleagues quite I will answer it.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the hon. gentleman's question, he talks about fifty Newfoundlanders being on that vessel. Yes, there are fifty Newfoundlanders on that vessel, and we are rather proud of that because the fifty Newfoundlanders are on that vessel as a result of the regulations that this government has brought in.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: That, Mr. Speaker, is a very practical manifestation of the way a government works through its laws.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: Now with respect to -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I again take my seat, I will respond-if the hon. member's colleagues want an answer -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: - to questions of a matter of public importance, I am quite prepared to give them. But I am not prepared to give them in the spirit of ignorance that they are pursuing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FLIGHT: It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the minister is not very comfortable with the questions, and probably would be a lot less comfortable if he had to give the proper answers. So I will ask the minister this, Mr. Speaker, would he tell the House-and the Petroleum Directorate, who over the past months have issued figures relating to the economic impact of a rig drilling off Newfoundland - would he tell the House how many dollars, millions of dollars have been lost through the economy of this Province, have been lost to the local suppliers by having the Bedford Dolphin diverted from Newfoundland, by refusing the Bedford Dolphin a permit to drill off Newfoundland? How many millions of dollars have been lost to the local economy of this Province this year and over the next four years, since the contract with Nova Scotia is for four years, that we would have had that for four years?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, in the first instance there were not many millions of dollars, in fact, there had been many millions of dollars that have accrued to this Province as a result of the imposition of those regulations to which I referred. Now in this particular case that drill rig never had a permit to drill on the offshore of Newfoundland.

MR. FLIGHT: It was refused a permit.

MR. MARSHALL: It was not refused a permit.

The drill rig was not refused a permit. I understand that the drill rig was chartered by Petro-Canada and at the present time Petro-Canada has no rights to drill off the East coast of the Island part of the Province of Newfoundland. And that is the position.

As the hon. member is aware, there has been a moratorium placed on permits during the currency of the offshore negotiations and that will continue. I suggest to the hon. member that implications made that he is the purveyor of, again the message perhaps through Petro-Canada, giving insinuations to the effect that millions of dollars have been lost and that fifty people will lose their jobs are entirely without foundation. The fact of the matter is fifty people are on that rig now and we assume that they will continue on that rig. But the hon. gentlemen there opposite will be very pleased to know that they are on the rig as a result of the efforts made by the Peckford Administration.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. FLIGHT: I have a further supplementary.

MR. NEARY: I will yield.

MR. SPEAKER: Yields for a final supplementary for the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, as the minister knows the Bedford Dolphin was going to drill on acreage now under permit to the Newfoundland and Labrador Petroleum Corporation, the Terra Nova prospect it is called. That is where they were going to drill. Will the minister tell the House - because it has not been decided yet what drilling programme that the Newfoundland and Labrador

MR. G. FLIGHT:

Petroleum Corporation will have or ever have. We presume it is going to be joint ventures. That is what the message coming from the Petroleum Directorate is - in order to save the jobs in the millions and possibly hundreds of millions of dollars we have lost over the next four years by refusing the Bedford Dolphin a permit to drill, why could we not have looked into a joint venture, the Newfoundland and Labrador Petroleum Corporation look at a joint venture with the operators of the Bedford Dolphin, thereby getting the exploration and protecting the jobs in the millions, and I repeat millions and hundreds of millions of dollars, that will be lost to the local economy of this area by refusing to have allowed the Bedford Dolphin to have drilled off Newfoundland?

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I would that the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight), who is the spokesman on energy matters for the Opposition, would get his facts straight because it is rather dangerous when an elected member of this House gets up and makes statements that are completely untrue. He premised his question, Mr. Speaker, by saying that the Bedford Dolphin was going to drill on Newfoundland and Labrador Petroleum Corporation land, that Newfoundland and Labrador Petroleum Corporation somehow or other - this was the implication - had refused to allow them to drill. And that is entirely and absolutely not in accordance with the facts.

MR. W. MARSHALL: The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that there were certain - we were prepared to make certain proposals. These proposals were made in accordance with the ongoing negotiations with respect to the offshore. I am not at this present stage going to go into in any depth or any details what these proposals are because government is determined to maintain a moratorium on these offshore negotiations until they come to fruition. But it is safe to say this, that this government will not and will never, Mr. Speaker, give away all or any of its rights to the offshore for the sake of one drill rig. That is a philosophy -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, that is the philosophy which the hon. gentlemen there opposite emulate because that is what they are used to because that is what they practiced when they were in government. And that is the reason they will not be in government again for many years to come.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who just answered the question indicated that this merely involved one offshore rig. Well, Petro-Canada announced, at the same time that they were forced to divert this rig to drill for oil and gas off Sable Island, they announced that by next Summer there would be four more rigs chartered or leased to drill somewhere on the Eastern seaboard of Canada. Now would the hon. gentleman indicate if these four rigs that have been chartered or leased by Petro-Canada, if any

Nov. 24, 1981

Tape No. 3681

DW - 3

MR. S. NEARY: of these rigs will be drilling
on the Grand Banks or will Petro-Canada be forced

MR. NEARY: to get all four rigs to drill off Sable Island or some other spot outside Newfoundland waters?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. gentleman knows, Petro-Canada has certain acreage up off Labrador, Probably what the hon. gentleman might like to be made aware of is that Labrador is very much an integral part of the Province of Newfoundland -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: - and its offshore belongs to the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

So in respect to the future plans of Petro-Canada, they have removed their rigs from Labrador because of the type of weather and ice conditions, what have you, which is normal in this season, and I expect them to be back up off Labrador next year as well.

So the hon. gentleman need not try to take up the cudgel - cudgel -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: - of his ineffective -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: - the cudgel on behalf of the ineffective spokesman for the Minister of Energy and try to cloud the issue and insinuate that there will be no rigs from Petro-Canada drilling off Newfoundland and Labrador. Labrador is very much an integral part of this Province, and, yes, Petro-Canada will be back there next year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, now let us set the record straight. The hon. gentleman in the beginning, who was rather nasty with my colleague, did not give us a straight answer as to who was responsible for this rig not drilling off the Grand Banks. Now let me see if I can get things in their proper perspective.

Is it because the Premier of this Province, the Government of this Province, asked for a moratorium on drilling permits, especially to Petro-Canada, on the Grand Banks during the sensitive negotiations between the provincial government and the federal government on the offshore ownership question, etc., that are currently going on, is it because the government, the Premier of this Province, asked for that moratorium that this rig, halfway across the Atlantic, had to be diverted to drill off Sable Island? Is that the real reason why the drilling rig that was destined for the Grand Banks did not actually go to the Grand Banks? Is that the reason for it?

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

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman need not try to rig his questions because, Mr. Speaker, the rig was not destined for Newfoundland, off the Grand Banks. Petro-Canada at the present time -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: Petro-Canada at the present time does not have any rights to drill off the Grand Banks. I am sure the government would be amenable to considering drilling by any company which wishes to recognize our complete rights, our provincial rights as enunciated in the offshore regulations, and if Petro-Canada and the hon. gentleman wish to drill off the Grand Banks, the quickest way to do it is for Petro-Canada and the hon. gentleman to use their influence with their

November 24, 1981

Tape No. 3682

NM - 3

MR. MARSHALL: colleagues in Ottawa to
reinstate what Mr. Clark's Government did with this
Province, in other words, give us our rightful rights
to the offshore.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. NEARY: It is becoming increasingly obvious, Mr. Speaker, to everyone in this Province that Newfoundland is getting all the evils of oil and Halifax and Nova Scotia are getting all the benefits and this is just an example of what we see happening as the result of the provincial government's policy here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: But, Mr. Speaker, let me quote. The hon. gentleman just answered my question there by saying that it was not true. Well is the hon. gentleman aware that a spokesman for Petro-Canada made this statement in Halifax recently? He said, 'The rig was diverted to Nova Scotia because of the sensitivity of negotiations between the federal and provincial governments on offshore jurisdiction.' That statement was made by Mr. Ron Bell of Petro-Canada. In view of the answer that the hon. gentleman just gave me to the question, is he aware that Mr. Bell made that statement and said that the rig was halfway across the Atlantic when they were forced to make the decision to send her off Sable Island rather than on the Grand Banks?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I cannot be responsible for any statements made by officials of Petro-Canada. If that statement was made, I mean, I cannot see how they

MR. MARSHALL: can talk about a rig having been diverted when Petro-Canada in fact had no rights to drill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: The fact of the matter is they have no rights to drill in the Grand Banks area. So the hon. gentlemen there opposite who continue to try to be the spokesmen for people outside of this Province, who are trying to deprive the people of this Province of their rights I think should consider -

PREMIER PECKFORD: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: - I think should consider the types of -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: - of implications that are arising as a result -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: - of their questions.

Try as they may, Mr. Speaker, from the line of questionings, they will not drive myself or the government off our position. that we are not going to be entrapped into debating in public any aspect of whatever nature these very important and critical offshore negotiations that are now ongoing between the federal and the provincial government.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Could the hon. gentleman tell the House, Mr. Speaker, if it was possible to issue a temporary permit until the negotiations had ended? Is it possible that the provincial government and the federal

MR. NEARY: government could and should have gotten their heads together and issued a temporary permit so that we could get this rig out there drilling rather than have it sent to Sable Island? Was that possible? And the second part of my question; is the hon. gentleman also aware that two rigs are now being constructed in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia? We heard so much talk about oil rigs being constructed in Newfoundland, what has happened to that plan? Is all that business now gone to Nova Scotia and New Brunswick? And is the hon. gentleman and the government monitoring what is happening in Halifax vis-a-vis what is happening in St. John's in connection with spinoff benefits from the offshore oil?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, all I can say is as hard as the hon. gentlemen there opposite may try and strive, that this government is not going to bend to the pressure that they are trying to exert which could well result in us giving away our resources and our rights. Mr. Speaker, we will not do that. If the hon. gentleman is so concerned about rigs being built in other parts of Atlantic Canada, I would urge and entreat him to use his endeavours with his colleagues in Ottawa to see what we can do with respect to the synchrolift here in St. John's -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: - to give us at least one-third of the money that they are giving to the Halifax Shipyard, to see what they can do with respect to the revitalization of the shipyard in Marystown, and what have you.

This government is striving to do everything it possibly can, Mr. Speaker, within the context within which we operate, and we operate in a very, very difficult context, and it is made all the more difficult, Mr. Speaker, by the hon. gentlemen there opposite and their party, speaking for the Liberal Party both of Canada and Newfoundland rather than for the people of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Arising out of the answers given by the Acting Minister of Energy, House Leader, lawyer, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier. The answers given to my colleague indicate that the Premier is still following the same tack that he took last Spring. Is he still in fear of overheating the

MR. STIRLING: Newfoundland economy this year, 1981?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I just wish to reiterate what the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) has already said, that when we are involved in very serious and sensitive negotiations between the federal government and ourselves over all aspects of the offshore, we must be careful how we speak. These negotiations are underway. We would like, as the Minister of Energy has said, talking about overheating the economy, Where was the Liberal Party of Newfoundland and the Government of Canada when their own federal Crown corporation asked for \$20 million for a viable shipyard in St. John's? Where were the Liberal Party of Newfoundland and the Liberal Party of Canada when they began to unilaterally reduce ferry services at Argentia, which provides for the tourist industry? Where is the Liberal Party of Newfoundland when they allow trade-offs to occur in our transportation system so that the people of Labrador cannot be guaranteed coastal boat services as well as air services at the same time? Where is the Liberal Party of Newfoundland when it talks about the economy when we have eleven DREE agreements ready to be signed right now before DREE?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Where is the Leader of the Opposition when he talks about heating of the economy when all of these things are outstanding? Where was the Liberal Party when we talked about the Terms of Union and mobility rights and constitutional entrenchment?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: When one talks about heating of the economy, Mr. Speaker -

November 24, 1981

Tape 3684

EC - 3

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

- one can become awfully

excited about the hypocritical attitude that the Opposition takes towards development of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

A supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING:

As the Premier knows, those twelve or fifteen questions that he asked I cannot answer because the Speaker will not allow me to answer, unless the Speaker has had a change of heart. I would be glad to answer them any time the Premier would like to change places. I would be glad to do it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HODDER:

And we will do a better job, Mr. Speaker.

MR. STIRLING:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask another question of the Premier, who is an expert in all areas related to mobility rights. Is it true under the new constitution that the Premier was so proud of, and one of the things that he put into the constitution, is it true that under this new constitution Nova Scotia now has the right, put in by our Premier, to bring in legislation that would prevent those fifty Newfoundlanders who are now working on that oil rig, prevent them from working in Nova Scotia?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. the Leader of the Opposition wants to scoff at the achievements that were made a couple of weeks ago at the constitutional conference, so he may scoff. I, for one, as one Newfoundlander, am proud that we were able to have our Terms of Union protected, that we were able to have provisions on mobility put in the constitution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I would invite the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) or any member opposite to my office any day of the week to see the telegrams and the letters that are coming in from Newfoundlanders, and Canadians all over, who agree with me.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: I would also beseech the Leader of the Opposition to listen to the negotiations that have gone on in the last week or two and the position that Newfoundland took in those private negotiations as it relates to women's rights and as it relates to native rights for the people of this country.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: I would also like to ask the Premier if he would like to see the telegrams from the thousands of young Newfoundlanders living in Alberta because they cannot get a job in Newfoundland?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, if that is so, then why did the Leader of the Opposition object to mobility rights and affirmative action programmes for Newfoundlanders in this Province? Why?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: There is the hypocrisy.
There is the hypocrisy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: People who live in glass houses should not throw stones, Mr. Speaker. The Leader of

PREMIER PECKFORD: the Opposition cannot have
it both ways.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: He cannot try to defend the
people who are living in Alberta from Newfoundland, and at
the same time drive Newfoundlanders from Newfoundland to
Alberta because he was against the mobility rights.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!
The hon. the member for
Terra Nova.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: There will not be a young
Newfoundlander left in the Province.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order! Order!
The hon. the member for Terra
Nova has the floor.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, for some time now we have been trying to find a solution to what has got to be the greatest financial mystery in 1981 -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. LUSH: - and that is, we are trying to find out which departments are going to be affected by this \$16 million cutback recently announced by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). So in this respect, I wonder if the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) could indicate to the House whether or not there will be any cutbacks in education this year, cutbacks from those announced in the 1981-82 budget?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for his question. It has been a while now since I have gotten a question on education and -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MS. VERGE: - there are so many exciting developments in education this year there is a lot to discuss.

This year the government will be spending record amounts of money on education for our young people at every level from kindergarten to university and adult continuing programmes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MS. VERGE: It will be done in a responsible manner with certain non-essential discretionary items, which had been contemplated, postponed until more prosperous times.

MR. LUSH: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, the hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: That was not even a convoluted answer, it was no answer at all.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. LUSH: The question to the minister, Mr. Speaker, again was whether there will be any cutbacks in education without talking about unimportant areas. The question I will ask the minister directly is will there be any cutbacks with respect to the \$37 million that was allocated for capital grants for building schools this year?

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

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, the provision in the budget brought down in the Spring for new school construction, which allowed the Denominational Education Committees to proceed with projects with the use of \$15.8 million of government money, has been translated into action with construction starts having been made, plus we have made and will keep our commitment for funding for high school related construction in the two following years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. LUSH: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Supplementary, the hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: I take it from the minister that there are no cutbacks with respect to capital grants for building and the equipment of schools, Can the minister indicate whether there will be any cutbacks with respect to operational grants to school boards?

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

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, the amounts announced and committed by government through the Department of Education for primary, elementary, and high school education to the Denominational Education Committees for school construction and servicing of debt, plus operating grants to school boards, plus teachers' salaries are being delivered in full. The evidence is in the 650 schools around the Province and it amounts to record spending. As the Premier indicated the other day, our Province, as a matter of fact, relative to our means, to our ability to pay is that one of the best performers in the whole country. Our Province is, number one,

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MS. VERGE: - of all of the provinces in Canada in terms of our spending on education as a percentage of our residents', our population's earned income.

MR. LUSH: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I take it from the minister then that there are no cutbacks with respect to capital grants for the building and equipping of schools. There are no cutbacks with respect to operational school grants for the school boards. So is the minister saying then that there are absolutely no cutbacks at all this year in Education?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, to repeat, we are spending a record amount of money on education in our Province this year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. LUSH: I am not talking about whether we are spending record amounts. That is immaterial, Mr. Speaker. The question is whether or not -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. LUSH: - the question is whether or not there are any cutbacks in Education as a result of the \$16 million cutback announced by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins)?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I think it would be a lot more important and relevant for the hon. member to direct his concern at what is going to happen in our ability to fund -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MS. VERGE: - post-secondary education -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MS. VERGE: - next year and the years after with the federal government's position in reducing established programmes financing for post-secondary education.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HISCOCK: My question is also to the Minister of Education. Can the minister inform this House if there is going to be a raise in bursaries for students in rural areas in this Province? Because now the amount of money cannot cover board. And also could the minister inform us with regard to students in trade schools, provincial students with \$25 a week who cannot basically pay their board, whether

MR. HISCOCK: the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge)
is going to raise this in the coming budget?

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

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, the provision by
our government of bursaries to the small number of high school
and elementary students who, because they reside with their
families in very small isolated rural communities, have to leave
their parents to complete their high school education is a
good programme of the government. The amount of the bursaries
is being reviewed as we prepare the budget for next year.

MS. VERGE: As for allowances for vocational school programmes, I think that is one example of our generous, overall student-aid assistance programme.

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

NOTICES OF MOTION:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I wish to give notice of a motion, and with the unanimous consent of the House to have leave tomorrow, if the member for Harbour Main-Bell Island (Mr. Doyle) agrees, to have this as the first motion to be dealt with tomorrow.

WHEREAS the Government of Newfoundland has supported the inclusion of the rights of the aboriginal peoples of Canada in the Constitution; and -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

AND WHEREAS an agreement has now been reached -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am doing this on the request of the native peoples of Newfoundland and Labrador, who asked that I do it this morning, by all groups, and I indicated that I was prepared to do it and to give notice of it today and if there was unanimous consent tomorrow to debate it first, tomorrow before the resolution which is now on the Order Paper, then it could be brought on tomorrow.
AND WHEREAS an agreement has now been reached among all the signatories to the constitutional accord that the rights of

PREMIER PECKFORD: the aboriginal peoples of Canada are to be entrenched in the Constitution; AND WHEREAS the identification and definition of the rights of the aboriginal peoples of Canada are to be discussed at a constitutional conference with representations of those peoples within the next year;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House approve and support the agreement of the Government of the Province to the inclusion of the rights of the aboriginal peoples -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: - of Canada in the Constitution in the following terms; 34 (1), the existing aboriginal and treaty rights of the aboriginal peoples of Canada are hereby recognized and affirmed, and (2) in this act aboriginal peoples of Canada includes the Indian, Inuit, and Metis peoples of Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Further notices of motion.

000

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, in the interest -

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. STIRLING: Since we are now unanimous, Mr. Speaker, there would not seem to be any reason to have to go through the formalities. We have established the procedure in this House with unanimous consent of dealing with similar matters in the past and in this session, and we do not require a debate. We have had the debate yesterday. The only thing that was prevented yesterday was to actually vote on that resolution because the Premier, at this point yesterday, had

MR. STIRLING: sent a telegram off to the Prime Minister saying he would not agree to it, and last night obviously he changed his mind, after he had a chat with the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry), so that there is no need for a debate. Let us put that through with unanimous consent today, accept the resolution in the spirit in which it is intended by leave on both sides.

MR. TULK: Vote now.

MR. STIRLING: And let us be thankful for the about-face. I do not expect the Premier to have the good grace to show that he has changed and made an about-face, Mr. Speaker.

MR. L. STIRLING:

So with unanimous consent we can deal with it.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, to the point of order.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order, number one, it is unfortunate that the Leader of the Opposition wishes to make small politics out of the native people of Newfoundland and Labrador and of Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Number two, the agreement with the native peoples this morning was this, that the reason why notice would be given of it today is this: that this would be the first time that the Legislature of Newfoundland and Labrador actually passed some kind of a resolution dealing with the rights of native peoples and they wanted to ensure that it got as much exposure as possible. And so as a result of that we indicated that if we gave notice today and then passed it tomorrow, it would get the kind of exposure that the native peoples wanted. It was because - and they will be here, I guess, tomorrow for that resolution. I had said to the native peoples this morning in our meeting that I was prepared to move the resolution, ask for the unanimous consent of the House and do it today, just unanimously pass it. And I am still prepared to do that as the Leader of the Opposition has proposed. But because of the agreement with the native peoples this morning, and because of their perhaps desire to be in attendance when the resolution is actually passed, I might be breaking some kind of just a verbal agreement I made with them this morning and they will not be here to see it being unanimously passed. With that caveat

PREMIER PECKFORD: if it is the wish of the House to pass it unanimously now, I have no argument.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

We are under Notices of Motion and I understand the proposal now before the House is that the resolution that was just read as Notice of Motion by the hon. the Premier be now considered to be adopted or approved by the House by unanimous consent. Such a motion would require unanimous consent?

MR. L. STIRLING: Yes, yes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, the consensus on our side of the House seems to be to wait until tomorrow so that the native peoples are here and then it can be unanimously done according to the agreement I made with them this morning.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Therefore I understand there is not unanimous consent to pass this resolution at the present time. And that is all the Chair is required to ask, if there is unanimous consent. I understand there is not and the question will have to be put again tomorrow if it is to be raised.

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

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. L. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, because this is an unusual situation I would like to make it clear that the Premier did not consult with us in any way and therefore what we were attempting to do was pass what the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

Nov. 24, 1981

Tape No. 3689

DW - 3

MR. L. STIRLING: - native group asked for
yesterday. Mr. Speaker, the Premier is aware -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

I really think the hon. Leader
of the Opposition now is moving

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): into the area of debate. That is not a point of order and I have already ruled as to what the procedure is. I asked if there was unanimous consent, I understand there is not, therefore the motion will go on the Order Paper and the request will have to be made again tomorrow.

Further Notices of Motion?

o o o

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, first of all

I want to thank the hon. the Premier for agreeing to allow a few seconds to bring this matter up.

It gives me great pleasure on behalf of members on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, to draw to the attention of hon. members on both sides of the House a feature article that appeared in the Weekend edition of the Daily News headed "Canada's Only Female Legislative Clerk, Bettie Duff". Her name is Elizabeth Mary Duff.

On behalf of Members on this side of the House, Sir, I want to say how impressed we were with this feature article in the Weekend edition of the Daily News which highlighted the career of our esteemed and lovely Clerk in this House.

Members, Mr. Speaker, were pleasantly surprised to learn that Miss Duff is the only lady Clerk in the whole of Canada. We never cease to be amazed, Mr. Speaker, at Miss Duff's competence and the quality of her work and her charming personality, and we are glad to see that the Daily News saw fit to do an in-depth feature article on her outstanding career.

MR. NEARY: We not only salute Miss Duff on this occasion, Mr. Speaker, but we congratulate her for the fine work that she is doing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to add for hon. members on this side - and I know all hon. members in the House feel unanimous in this - our congratulations to Miss Duff and our appreciation for the excellent work she is doing for the House of Assembly in her position as Clerk.

As hon. members are aware, Miss Duff has had a long and, at least in the past number of years since 1972, varied history in public service, whether one defines that as public service in government or public service to the House of Assembly. She was Private Secretary to the former, former Premier, the hon. Dr. J. R. Smallwood, for a number of years. In 1972, I believe it was, when there was a change in government, I asked Miss Duff if she would work with me as Private Secretary for a period of time, which she did, and she then worked with me afterwards as Executive Assistant, and I believe - I am not sure - I believe that at that time, that was in 1972 or it may have been early 1973, she was the first female Executive Assistant to a minister in Newfoundland. They are fairly - I do not know if fairly plentiful,

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

but there are quite a number of them now. But at that time I am sure that she was the first female Executive Assistant to serve a minister in Newfoundland and she remained in that capacity until 1975. She then worked as Secretary to the Speaker, and I believe it was in 1977 she became Clerk of the House of Assembly. So certainly she has had a very varied experience and I know that all hon. members on both sides recognize that and wish her continued good health in the performance of her public duties.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, due to the modesty to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer), he failed to indicate that he had proposed Miss Duff for the job she now holds.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Since the matter has been raised I will advise hon. members that copies of that article are being prepared to be circulated to all hon. members so they will get an opportunity to read the story. And I, too, am thankful that the Daily News decided to do such a story because it is a matter that is of some importance I think across Canada that we have the only female Legislative Clerk in Canada, and the best. I certainly have had a very close relationship with her myself over the last two and a half years and one of the few men in her life, so she told me, so I want to take the opportunity to echo the words that have been expressed here today by the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer). I just want to indicate to all members that she is doing a tremendous job and is a great advisor to me too. So I thank her as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Continuing debate, second reading of the bill, "An Act To Establish The Alcohol And Drug Dependency Commission Of Newfoundland And Labrador." (Bill No. 109) The last day debate was adjourned by the hon. the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan), who simply adjourned the debate. I do not believe he had spoken for any length of time.

The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker; on Friday, two or three minutes before one, I adjourned the debate and did not have any chance to say very much at that time. I would like to say a few words though on this bill before we finish up with it. Five or ten minutes, I think, will suffice for me to say what I have to say. Most non. members who spoke before me have made the points, I think, that were necessary to be made and perhaps what I can do is to reiterate and perhaps repeat some of the questions or the concerns

MR. CALLAN: that at least members on this side of the House have in connection with this particular bill.

Mr. Speaker, as I look over and as I think about and contemplate this Bill 109 entitled: "An Act To Establish The Alcohol And Drug Dependency Commission Of Newfoundland And Labrador", several proverbs come to mind as I contemplate this bill. 'A stitch in time saves nine', is one of the proverbs that comes to mind. Alcohol and the illegal use of drugs is a problem in our society here in this Province and is gradually getting worse. It has been ongoing now for several years, for many years, and in the last five, ten or fifteen years it has been becoming more and more of a problem for our society. So this bill then, Mr. Speaker, perhaps is a little bit late coming. If this bill had been introduced into this House of Assembly five or ten years ago, then perhaps that stitch in time would have saved an awful lot of ruined lives and perhaps the problem that we have today in our society would not be nearly as pronounced as it is.

Another proverb, Mr. Speaker, that comes to mind with reference to this bill is, 'Better late than never'. And I think perhaps this is the proverb that best suits this bill. We have a bill here in the year 1981 which sets up a commission to study, to hear, to study into and to travel around the Province, I understand the commission and committees will be travelling around the Province, and finding out the whys and the wherefores and so on of why people are more and more getting into drugs and more and more getting into alcohol. So 'Better late than never' is perhaps another apt description of this bill. It is long overdue but now at least we have it and let us hope that it is effective and does the job that it is meant to do.

Another proverb or saying, I suppose, that I could use is, 'When the going gets tough, the tough get going'. I do not know if this has anything to do, or very much to

November 24, 1981

Tape No. 3692

SD - 2

MR. CALLAN: do with the introduction of this bill.
There is no question, Mr. Speaker, that the going is getting tough,
the going is definitely getting tough as we see all around us
the many, many people whose lives, property and so on and so

MR. CALLAN:

on are crumbling because of problems that many of our adults are having with alcohol; broken homes, loss of jobs and on and on the list goes.

The Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) in introducing the bill gave us some frightening statistics. The member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), when he in particular referred to the people in Labrador, the Inuit and the Eskimos and so on, he again produced some very frightening statistics with respect to the abuse, misuse and so on of alcohol.

So the going, Mr. Speaker, is getting tough, there is no question about that. But whether that is why the tough got going in introducing this bill is another question.

The fourth and final proverb that comes to mind, Mr. Speaker, is 'An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure'. That one, I suppose, is very similar to 'A stitch in time saves nine'. And I bring out that proverb, Mr. Speaker, to make this point, but I believe, and let me reiterate it, I have suggested it already, I believe that a bill of this nature should have been introduced into this House of Assembly long, long before now. That is one point that I want to make in connection with preventing something; 'An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure'. But, Mr. Speaker, even though we have this bill introduced into this House of Assembly now, even though we have the bill now, I am wondering how much of a cure it will be. Whether it prevents the young people of today from becoming alcoholics and drug addicts of tomorrow is a good question. I rather doubt that it will prevent that. I think, Mr. Speaker, a second point I want to make in connection with the introduction of this bill, I believe that we should start in our schools.

MR. CALLAN: I talked yesterday with a gentleman from my district who is not a clergyman, even though I speak to some of the clergymen in my district off and on, but this gentleman whom I spoke with yesterday

MR. CALLAN: suggested to me that perhaps the churches in some respects are falling down. Well, Mr. Speaker, that may or may not be. That may or may not be, whether or not our churches are falling down in connection with preventing or curing alcoholism and the drug problem.

Some of our churches we know are doing excellent work, when we think of the Harbour Light and others in and around St. John's. They are doing excellent work, Mr. Speaker, some of our churches, and perhaps all of them in different ways; some are more evident than others.

But, Mr. Speaker, I think that the government - what the churches are doing they are doing voluntarily, perhaps sometimes with financial aid from government and so on, but it is the churches that have more or less taken the lead.

But in our schools, Mr. Speaker, I believe that a lot more can be done. You know, I spent twelve or thirteen years in the classroom as principal and teacher. The first year out I did not do very much teaching, the most I did I think was managing, teaching all subjects in all grades from kindergarden to grade IX inclusive, so there was not much teaching done there. But in later years in my teaching profession I got into subject teaching in various high schools and so I had a chance to get into the curriculum in a more detailed way.

And, Mr. Speaker, it may not be a proverb but it is an old saying, or at least it is a saying that some people have, that our schools should prepare our students for life. Our schools should prepare our students for life. And when you look at the high school and the elementary school curriculum, and especially the high school curriculum, I am wondering what is there that prepares

MR. CALLAN: students for living and for life? A lot of it, Mr. Speaker, a lot that is contained in our curriculum is unnecessary and useless, I believe, unnecessary and useless.

For a number of years, two or three years, I suppose, I taught French in grades IX, X and XI inclusive. And I suppose the foreign language - Latin I think is about gone now and I remember reading in the inside covers of books, you know, Latin is a dead language, as dead as dead can be, and all that sort of thing, but I think that is gone. But perhaps in a bilingual country at least, like Canada, perhaps a foreign language like French is probably a good thing to have. I remember taking students, my French students, down to St. Pierre, you know, and we spent a weekend there, immersed in the French society and so on.

So there are subjects that prepare students for life. But I am wondering how many there are that are totally unnecessary, and I am wondering, Mr. Speaker - now the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) last week when we were on this bill kept waving a guide or something, that is in Grade X, I think she said. I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, and I feel sure that what I am saying is correct when I say that I do not think that particular course of study is compulsory for all students in Newfoundland.

MS. VERGE: It is optional core -

MR. CALLAN: It is optional. Yes, that is right. It is optional -

MS. VERGE: - for Grade X students.

MR. CALLAN: It is optional.

Mr. Speaker, you know, I do not think that a course, not matter how - that is not a full course. It is one of the parts of the social studies course, I believe. It is a full course with all the credits and so on.

MR. W. CALLAN: Between Friday, Mr. Speaker, when I stood here-I did not intend to speak in this debate anyway-but when I did stand on Friday to adjourn the debate, over the weekend I talked to a number of teachers, especially in my own area and in the district of Bellevue, all of course who happened to be Liberals and supported me back in April and I thank them for that, but anyway I was looking for some advice from them and I understand from a lot of these teachers, Mr. Speaker, whom I spoke to that it is optional, it is not a compulsory course. And also I understood that in their schools, you know, it was not offered. But I think it should be offered! I think it should be offered, Mr. Speaker, and Grade X is too late.

MS. VERGE: (Inaudible).

MR. W. CALLAN: Yes, somebody mentioned - I think it was the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) who mentioned last week that they have it in Grade V. You know, I think there is a happy medium in everything, and I believe Grade V is way too young and Grade X is too old. I think there is a place in between there -

MS. VERGE: They have it between too, Health.

MR. TULK: Is that Health Science? Is that what you are talking about, the Health Science course?

MR. W. CALLAN: Health.

I think the course that they have now - what is the name of that? - is that Canadian Issues?

MR. W. HOUSE: Health 1100.

MR. CALLAN: Health 1100.

MR. W. CALLAN: One teacher that I talked to over the weekend told me that in Grade X this year the optional course is Canadian Issues. And there is some mention of drugs and alcohol in there, you know, lost in several hundred pages.

I do not think that is good enough, Mr. Speaker. I think a lot more emphasis should be put on it because, as I said, you know, 'An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure'. And if we can educate our students when they are young enough and before they get into the alcohol and the drugs, if we can educate them then, then I believe, you know, that the old proverb does prove true that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. And then we will not have to spend the thousands and perhaps millions of dollars that we probably will have to spend in the next five to ten years in trying to grapple with this problem and to try and rehabilitate the people who have gone, if not over the brink awfully close to it.

There are many other points, Mr. Speaker, regarding this bill but, as I said, former speakers who spoke in the debate have raised these questions. I see there in the setting up of the commission, Mr. Speaker, that the Chairman, for example, can be - and not only that, of course, not only the Chairman but the majority, the vast majority of the members of this commission are selected by Cabinet. I am not so sure that that is the best way to have it.

MR. HICKEY: How else can you do it then?

MR. W. CALLAN: I think there must be better ways, you know, and it says here that -

MR. HICKEY: That is the way most commissions are appointed.

MR. W. CALLAN: That is the way that most commissions - I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, It says here that the Chairman of the commission shall hold office for a term, again determined by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, a term determined by the Cabinet. In other words, Mr. Speaker, what could be happening here is that if the Chairman of this commission, if he gets too critical of government

MR. CALLAN: and so on, then the Cabinet, you know, can step in and say, Okay, I think we need a new chairman; you know, this chairman that we have now is saying that the government is issuing too many licences for establishments such as alcohol store outlets or night clubs and so on. So I am wondering again: the Chairman of the Commission shall hold office not for any particular period of time, for a term determined by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, by the Cabinet.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: That would be in the Order-in-Council, in all likelihood, appointed for three years or four years or whatever, you know.

MR. CALLAN: Well, no, it says here that the members appointed as representatives of the Departments of Justice, Education, Health and Social Services shall be appointed for a term of three years.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes.

MR. CALLAN: And the others, the ones from the five regions appointed by the Minister of Social Services, shall be appointed for a term of three years, and the ones at large, the four members chosen from the public at large, shall be appointed for a term of five years. But then it said the chairman, in other words, shall hold office until Cabinet decides, for whatever reason, that his services are no longer required.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: That is not the intention.

MR. CALLAN: Now, there are a number of question marks about this bill, but most of them have been raised already, Mr. Speaker.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this bill - even though in my opinion it is too little, too late, way too late - I hope that the bill is effective. I hope that it does the job for which it is intended and that

MR. CALLAN: at least, if it cannot help the people who are already alcoholics or drug addicts or whatever, it will help our future and up-and-coming generations of young people, the men and women of tomorrow.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, I realize that the minister is anxious to get this bill through the House, but because of the importance of it and because of the fact that in my background I had to deal a lot with this particular topic, drugs and alcohol, especially alcohol, I thought I should have a few words on it.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate the former Speaker (Mr. Ottenheimer) and I would hasten to say to him that the bill should have been enacted twenty years ago or more. In fact, it has become something like ribbon development, Mr. Speaker, in the rural areas of this Province. It is very, very hard to stop it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in my travels abroad - and thank God, I had the pleasure to travel in many parts of the world - I always found that the Salvation Army - the people left the Chamber just a few moments ago - have worked very, very hard to arrest the problem of alcohol and drugs. I remember, Mr. Speaker, probably the second last time I visited London, England, I was going down to St. Paul's Cathedral, and passing by we saw a soup kitchen put on by no other than the Salvation Army trying to help victims of alcohol. And this, in fact, could be found in many parts of the

MR. WOODROW: world. And in Canada, especially in Toronto, Mr. Speaker, and in Montreal, you find these kitchens put on by the Salvation Army, especially trying to help victims of alcohol and drugs.

I have talked, Mr. Speaker, with people who were overseas during the war, you know some of them,

MR. WOODROW:

Mr. Speaker, because we both live in the same place, who have told me about the great work done by the Salvation Army to help people who would become addicted to alcohol. Recently, Mr. Speaker, this Summer, in fact, when I visited Toronto I also found out the good works that the Capucian Fathers are doing up there to help out victims of alcohol and drugs also. They have a drop-in, they call it, right down in the heart of Toronto, and they are asking them to come in. In fact, they charge ten cents for a cup of coffee just to make them realize they are not trying to con them in, they are trying to give them the cup of coffee, let them realize that they have to work for the cup of coffee just the same as they have to work to become an non-alcoholic.

MR. NEARY: If the economy keeps deteriorating in the Province we will need lots of soup kitchens.

MR. WOODROW:

Mr. Speaker, in my day when I was in the priesthood, especially on the South Coast, drugs were not so prominent as they are today, so therefore I did not get, we will say, directly involved with people who were addicted to drugs and the like.

But, Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether we as members, and I hope I am wrong on this, but I do not know if we realize the importance of this bill or not. Alcohol and drugs, as you know, are almost anywhere today. There are so many liquor outlets, not only clubs and beer joints and places where you can go in and buy beer, agencies, and also they call them liquor agencies now, in fact, there were just two established in my district, one on the North shore and one on the South shore, I do not know whether they are necessary or not. In another part of the district within an area of three miles, Mr. Speaker, there are three clubs. I do not know whether that is a good thing or not. I really do not think it is.

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, since I became involved in politics, which is ten years ago from my days with the Council in Corner Brook, I have made it a point to visit homes. Thank God I feel I can visit any home in my district, but I am always amazed at the homes. First of all, there are people who have lovely homes. I will say to them, 'I do not suppose this is paid for?' 'Every stick in it, every cent', Mr. Speaker. And then they will say, 'But we had to make great sacrifices. We could not afford to buy a bottle of alcohol and the like.' You go into other homes, Mr. Speaker, that are not so good, and I am sure the hon. Minister of Social Assistance (Mr. Hickey) realizes what I am talking about, and what do you find, Mr. Speaker?

You will find the empty liquor bottles and the empty beer bottles; and then these people come crying on my shoulder to try to get some more welfare. I think, Mr. Speaker, they should be taught how to spend what they have, because I do not think that liquor is an necessity of life.

So therefore I just thought, Mr. Speaker, as I was getting these few words ready, I thought, probably you will recall last year when the Premier introduced the Matrimonial Property Act. I think the exact words he used were 'the complexities of life'. In other words, we have not only today what we looked upon as the traditional marriage - it seems to be gone. We have today, Mr. Speaker, common law, we have this and we have that. In fact, life has become so

MR. WOODROW: complex that there are times when you just wonder where everything is going. And added to all this, Mr. Speaker, we have so much technology. And you have the computer system now; in fact, it is becoming so computerized that people, as the years go on, are going to have to ask themselves, What am I going to do with my spare time? And unskilled people are going to find it very difficult to find a job.

I have down here, Mr. Speaker, a little proverb also, 'Idle hands are the devil's workshop'.

MR. MORGAN: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: When people have nothing to do, what do they turn to? They turn to drugs and alcohol. Therefore, it is very important, Mr. Speaker, that research be done, that more research be done and that this topic, I know I just heard the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) recently say that she is already doing her best, in fact, to get this brought into the schools and I hope that she continues.

I cannot stop without mentioning the good work that AA, Alcoholic Anonymous, are doing all over Newfoundland and, I am sure, all over Canada and the United States as well.

Mr. Speaker, I really have had to deal directly - I have had lots of calls, especially when I was in the priesthood. I also spent a while in Halifax, and I had even more call there than I had in Newfoundland. I have had calls on some occasions, maybe the husband was the one who was the culprit, on the other hand it was the wife who was the culprit. Now, what can you do?

First of all, Mr. Speaker,

MR. WOODROW: I think - and we cannot emphasize this enough - kindness: you get more flies with a spoonful of honey than with a barrel of vinegar.

MR. MORGAN: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: But I think it behooves everyone of us, if we want to save our nation, Mr. Speaker, if we want to save our Province, I think that we have to take this matter very, very seriously. One time, Christmas-time, people had a bottle. It lasted almost all the year-round. But today, every day, is Christmas Day with people who like to have a drink.

Mr. Speaker, I have the statistics. I do not think I should mention anymore, they have already been in the papers, but the statistics are frightening, very frightening. You know, Mr. Speaker, it is possible that some of our own children, or our own relatives, could become the victims of alcoholism. I, therefore, Mr. Speaker, want to congratulate the government for bringing the bill in. I also want to congratulate, Mr. Speaker, all the various denominations, but more especially the Salvation Army for the good that they are doing in this regard, especially in the City of St. John's and in our own City of Corner Brook and all over the Province of Newfoundland. I know I, for one member, will do everything in my power to help, not, Mr. Speaker, to be hypocritical about it, we all have our failings, but at least to try to say that

MR. WOODROW: we will do our best to help the unfortunate people who have become victims of alcohol or perhaps who are on the road there.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: hear, hear:

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): if the hon. minister speaks now, he closes the debate.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, in closing the debate I do not think I am going to quote any proverbs but I have a saying that I am reminded of, having heard some of the remarks from the other side, and it goes like this -

MR. THOMS: How about a stitch in time?

MR. HICKEY: NO, it is not a stitch in time. It goes something like this, Some people open their mouths and put their foot in it and others open their mouths to change feet, and I liken that statment to some of the comments that have emanated from the other side.

Mr. Speaker, there are a few things that I should correct that have been indicated by the Opposition because unfortunately and fortunately, I suppose, the spoken word in this chamber is recorded for posterity and I would not want some of the things that have been said to go unchallenged and uncorrected.

I think the classic one, Mr. Speaker, is to be found in a statement by the Leader of the Opposition last week who said something to the effect that the Tory government, because of its failure to produce all kinds of jobs and rebuild the economy, was one of the chief causes of the rise of alcoholism and drug abuse. Now, Mr. Speaker, for a gentleman who proposes on some occasion to be Premier of this Province-I certainly have some doubts about that-but in any event by his position he proposes some day to be Premier of this

MR. HICKEY: Province. To make that kind of statement in the light of statistics given by myself when I introduced this bill just a few days before, Mr. Speaker, in which I quoted from reliable sources that alcohol and/or drug abuse had a significant, very significant effect on the half million dollars lost daily in Newfoundland industry because of absenteeism and low productivity, hearing this kind of statistic, Mr. Speaker, how can the Leader of the Opposition or anybody else in their sanity conclude that the chief cause or one of the chief causes or one of the major causes of alcoholism and drug abuse is unemployment? We all know, Mr. Speaker, that unemployment has varying effects on people. There is not any question about that. But to liken it as one of the chief causes is, to say the least, going too far. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, it is a scapegoat, nothing much better than that. And then there were references made to social assistance recipients. Mr. Speaker, it is not for me to defend any social assistance recipient who spends a penny of the money that is provided by this state for the support of their families on alcoholism or drugs - I should say alcohol or drugs. But at the same time, Mr. Speaker, I cannot let the opportunity pass without coming to the defence of that group of citizens most of whom, through no fault of their own, find themselves in receipt of assistance from this government and the taxpayers of this Province. It is very wrong, Mr. Speaker, to conclude that any drastic percentage of those people are afflicted by alcoholism or drug abuse more so than those who are employed. I do not know of any statistics to indicate that. Certainly the figures that I have just quoted a little while ago from industry and the effects of the overuse or abuse of alcohol and drugs on people who are employed

MR. HICKEY: is devastating. Does that mean that in order for one to be afflicted by this disease, because it is a disease, that one must be unemployed - a prerequisite is that one is unemployed? Nonsense, Mr. Speaker, that is pure nonsense.

Then there was the issue raised by the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) who informed the House that, in his view, the chief cause of the rise or increase in the percentage of drinking and drug abuse in the young people of this Province was the lowering of the drinking age. And again, Mr. Speaker, I say that is nonsense too. It has its effects, yes, certainly. I will not quarrel with that, I will not deny that. Nobody will ever hear me say that the lowering of the drinking age has had no effect, I will not make that statement. But to say, again, Mr. Speaker, that it is one of the chief causes, that is nonsense. Let me tell you, Your Honour, why it is nonsense. Again the hon. gentleman who made that statement did not listen when I was introducing the bill and quoting statistics, and did not read the papers or listen to the media who reported those statistics and, I might say, who reported them in bold print for all to see, for which I am grateful. And I am sure anyone interested in this bill and in this whole problem area is truly grateful because it is time we shook the people of this Province into the realization of the magnitude of this problem. And there is no better way to do it, Your Honour, than to quote statistics of which we cannot be proud, indeed of which we must be very disappointed in having to realize. What was the statistic which makes the statement by the member for Windsor - Buchans so much nonsense? Well, Your Honour, it is this statistic: I said, in introducing the bill, that there had been an increase in a seven year period - I believe it was seven years, anyway, up to 1978, there had been an increase of 90 per cent in teenage drinking. Now, Mr. Speaker, who was I referring to when I used the term 'teenage drinking'? Was I referring to the nineteen and over?

MR. TULK:

(Inaudible)

MR. HICKEY:

Yes. If I was referring to the nineteen year olds and the twenty year olds and the twenty-one year olds, you know, Your Honour, that statement by the hon. gentleman would have made some sense. No, I was not referring to that group at all, Your Honour, I was referring to the age group between thirteen and seventeen. That was the group I was referring to. The lowering of the drinking age; while I will not deny that it has had some effect, possibly some bad effect, but to single it out and say that it was the greatest effect or one of the chief reasons is crazy. It is that kind of crazy statement. Mr. Speaker, that buries the real issue in this problem. Let us face some facts and if hon. gentlemen on the other side did not have enough intestinal fortitude, Your Honour, to cite some of the real causes of teenage drinking in this Province, I will, even if it be at my political peril. And whoever does not like it, well, Your Honour, all I can say is it is too bad, it is unfortunate. But one of the chief causes is the example set by parents in the use and abuse of alcohol. One of the problems we have in this Province is a lifestyle. Let us not just hide it, it is a lifestyle, a lifestyle that we are all very proud of on the one hand, Your Honour, because long, long ago, long before my time, alcohol was used but it was not used by young people. One did not smoke, Mr. Speaker, when I was growing up, in front of their parents, until they were eighteen, nineteen or maybe twenty and they did not drink either.

MR. HICKEY: There might have been a small percentage, but the largest percentage - because of the family unit and the strength of the family unit, and because of the lifestyle and the authority vested in the head of the home, there was not any carry-on like that, Your Honour. that is one of the chief But what is one of the chief causes of alcohol and drug abuse in the Province? Let us not kid ourselves. It is a changing society. That is one of the chief causes of it. It is a more open and free society. That is another one of the causes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HODDER: The fact that it is available on every street corner, does that have anything to do with it?

MR. PATTERSON: No, Liberalism, that is the cause of it.

MR. HICKEY: Oh, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman now is referring to all the licences that were issued I suppose. Well, you know, there is a proverb - oh, my goodness, I just thought of one, Your Honour, 'You can take a horse to water but you cannot make him drink'.

AN HON. MEMBER: Come on. Come on.

MR. HICKEY: Oh, come on, he says.

There might well not have been so many licences issued, Your Honour, if there had been a system of licencing under the Liberal Administration, which said only Liberal supporters will get a licence. And if the Tory Government were to make any mistakes in '72 and '73 and '74, I accept my share of responsibility for that, Mr. Speaker, because with the coming of the first Tory Administration came a breath of freedom in this Province, and -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKEY: maybe we went too far, Your Honour -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKEY: - maybe we went too far and maybe we opened up the licencing system through the Liquor Commission Board, maybe we opened that up too much too.

MR. POWER: Made it available to everybody.

MR. HICKEY: Because, you know, you did not get a licence unless you were a Liberal, like you did not get a job unless you were a Liberal.

MR. L. THOMS: And now you do not get a job unless you are a Tory.

MR. HICKEY: And you did not do very much if you were not a Liberal. And now the hon. gentleman is going to go beserk again and tell me that you do not get social assistance, I suppose, unless you are a Liberal.

MR. F. WHITE: Now you do not get a job unless you are in the Tory Government.

MR. HICKEY: But, you know, Mr. Speaker, there are no questions on the applications put out by this government as to what your politics are.

MR. HODDER: (Inaudible) if you are a Liberal in this Province today.

MR. HICKEY: Now, let me respond to the statement by hon. gentlemen opposite about the appointment of the Chairman of the Commission. And let me tell hon. gentlemen that there will not be anyone handpicked. Have no fear. There will not be anybody steeped in politics handpicked. No. There will be a public advertisement inviting applications, Your Honour. There will be a screening process.

MR. HODDER: Like Stephenville.

MR. HICKEY: And let me go further, Mr. Speaker, and say that he or she, whomever appears on top of the list, will be appointed. And if that person happens to be a Tory we will not hold it against him. If that person happens to be an NDPer, or a Liberal, we will not hold that against him either.

MR. HODDER: (Inaudible) work activities projects - in Stephenville.

MR. HICKEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, hon. gentlemen opposite, the only thing I can say, Mr. Speaker, with the exception of maybe two incidents I heard, hon. gentlemen opposite mealymouthed support for this piece of legislation, for this measure, mealymouthed it. What do I mean by that, Your Honour? Simply this, they support it but - There was always that but. It is too late. It should have been done a long time ago. The last speaker from the other side to speak this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, was heard to say, "It should have been done years ago." Well, let me agree with the hon. gentleman. Let me agree with him whole-heartedly and say indeed it should have been. It should have been done, Your Honour, during the twenty-three years of Liberal rule.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKEY: There was alcoholism then. There was child abuse then.

MR. DAWE: Twenty-three years of Liberal rule drove everyone to alcoholism.

MR. WARREN: But not like now.

MR. HICKEY: Oh, is that right? Well you know, there must have been alcoholism then, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. HICKEY: -there must have been alcoholism then, because that government and that party that was in power for twenty-three years, while it was known to waste money, Your Honour, it was not known to waste money by giving it to voluntary organizations, but, nevertheless, we can see that in 1965 it gave the ADAF \$20,000. Was that not fantastic? \$20,000.

MR. T. HICKEY: Let me refer to a few figures, Mr. Speaker. Let me refer to what the budget was on alcoholism in 1972. It was \$35,000.

MR. CALLAN: It should have been done a long time ago.

MR. T. HICKEY: That is what I am listening to the hon. gentleman opposite saying it should have been a long time ago, you know. And we inherited \$35,000 of a grant all in the name of saving those people whom the hon. gentleman opposite this afternoon said, you know, 'Lives could have been saved'. Indeed, I say hear, hear to that! But was there anybody very anxious of saving them in the 1960s? - No. It must be a new norm now to save lives.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell the hon. House what the budget was in 1978/79 - \$389,000; in 1979/80 - \$425,000; in 1980/81 - \$522,000; in 1981/82 - \$750,000. Now, Your Honour, the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) wants to know, and he implores me to tell the House what kind of cuts are going to take place and have taken place in the alcohol and drug addiction budget this year. And, Your Honour, I will tell the hon. gentleman - not a penny, not a red cent of a cut of the \$750,000.

MR. HODDER: How much federal money?

MR. T. HICKEY: 40 per cent, approximately. Thirty-odd, thirty-something per cent.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) federal money?

MR. T. HICKEY: I am getting to that. The hon. gentleman need not worry. I never fail to give the federal government credit for what it does and the money that it spends in this Province. My only complaint is that they do not spend enough. The hon. gentleman would

MR. T. HICKEY: be wise if he would not follow in the footsteps of his leader in agreeing that there are no cuts when we just heard the Finance Minister (Mr. MacEachen) summon the provincial Finance Ministers from across the country to Halifax about what, Mr. Speaker? After we heard hon. gentleman over there all last week saying there were no cuts in post-secondary education and health, what do we hear? Mr. MacEachen summoned the finance ministers to Halifax to talk about what? - cuts in post-secondary education and health. In the name of God, as I must say, when are they going to wake up and find out that they are on the wrong track? They are on a collision course, Your Honour, in backing that crowd up there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. T. HICKEY: Now, Mr. Speaker, somebody wanted to know what was the budget going to be for this cause in the coming year. Well, I am afraid that is one of the things that a minister has to keep close to his chest. But I will tell hon. gentlemen this: there will be no reduction, the pot will be sweetened, and there will be a sizable effort put forward in the interests of this very forward piece of legislation and this very good programme.

Mr. Speaker, let me give the House a couple of more statistics just in case there are some who have not been converted about the importance and the magnitude of the problem we are facing and trying to deal with here. And in case there are some people, Mr. Speaker, who still feel that, you know, this Province is not capable, because of its very unique lifestyle of which we are, as I said, all proud and we try to preserve, because of that, in case there are some people out there who do not realize that despite our unique lifestyle - our life-

Nov. 24, 1981

Tape No. 3702

DW - 3

MR. T. HICKEY: style, Mr. Speaker, is
changing in this Province and will change even more
drastically as we get into heavy

MR. HICKEY: development of oil and gas.

MR. THOMS: (Inaudible) the government want? (Inaudible).

MR. HICKEY: I think the hon. gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) wanted to know.

AN HON. MEMBER: Carried.

MR. HICKEY: Oh, yes. Somebody said 'carried'. They are interested in getting this through now, Your Honour, after we have listened to the garbage coming from across the House for the last few days.

MR. DAWE: Did you hear him say he was not interested in getting that through?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, some statistics on drugs: And I might say that there is limited information available on the drug problem, and we are going to do something about that, we are going to see to it that some figures are updated. But we do have some, and those figures come from the same sources as the ones I gave last week. There was a 300 per cent increase in the past ten years in the use of drugs by adolescents - 300 per cent, Mr. Speaker. Of the general population, 25 per cent have used marijuana within the last twelve months. Of the population between fifteen and seventeen, 60 per cent have used marijuana at least once. Of that 60 per cent 30 per cent are regular users of marijuana.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) the Province (inaudible)?

MR. HICKEY: This is for Newfoundland and Labrador.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. HICKEY: Some people who say it cannot happen here.

Mr. Speaker, in Newfoundland marijuana convictions for 1979 are approximately 1,000. Other illicit drugs are becoming popular, such as LSD, cocaine, are increasing in popularity in Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, our research indicates that should we have a significant population growth with the coming of offshore oil and gas development, other drugs used in the world market would find their way to the Province, such as heroin and morphine which are even more deadly than the ones that I have referred to.

MR. HODDER: Would the minister permit a question?

MR. HICKEY: Yes, certainly.

MR. HODDER: I would like to ask the minister where those statistics come from and how they are arrived at. These figures are astounding. I do not ask in any way to take away from what the minister is saying, but when the minister mentions figures like 60 per cent, I would like to know how they are arrived at. Who has done the figures? Is it Statistics Canada? And the source of his information?

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. HICKEY: No problem, Mr. Speaker. The same source as my other statistics came from which I quoted last week. Those are quoted from Dr. Neville Layne, Acting Co-Chairperson, Expert Committee on Alcohol Statistics, Health Promotion, Director of Health and Welfare Canada. They also come from our research branch of the Province of Ontario.

MR. HODDER: Can the minister make them available to the House?

MR. HICKEY: I certainly have no problem in making the statistics available, Mr. Speaker. I have just read them out for public consumption, so there is no problem in passing them on to the hon. gentleman.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) problem in drinking in Newfoundland, how does that stack up against the national average? Per capita, how does it stack up? You said there were 1,000 -

MR. HICKEY: The 1,000 convictions, how does it stack up with the rest of the country?

MR. NEARY: .Yes, per capita.

MR. HICKEY: With the other provinces.

MR. NEARY: With the other provinces, yes.

MR. HICKEY: I am sorry, I have no idea. I can find out for the hon. gentleman, but I do not know right off hand.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I guess what I am attempting to show the House -

MR. NEARY: Excuse me. This is a simple possession. I presume these are not all trafficking.

MR. HICKEY: No, these are a thousand convictions.

MR. NEARY: Simple possessions.

MR. HICKEY: It does not say.

MR. NEARY: But you cannot separate the number of traffickers from the number who are picked up for simple possession?

MR. HICKEY: No.

What I am trying to do, Mr. Speaker, is to draw attention to the fact that both alcohol and drug addiction, or abuse of either one, is a most serious problem in this Province, far more serious, Mr. Speaker, than a lot of our people are prepared to concede.

I dealt with the alcohol aspect in introducing the bill and I felt I would deal with the drug side of it in my closing remarks. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that those statistics, which are as valid as the other ones I gave, clearly tell us that not only is it both timely and appropriate that a Commission be established but that also, Mr. Speaker, as I said when I introduced the bill, and I repeat it now - and despite my saying it, hon. gentlemen from the opposite side kept telling me, 'I hope the minister does not think that this is going to be a cure-all.' My goodness, Mr. Speaker, the first thing I said in introducing the bill was that this was but a major step. It was not a cure for the problem, it was a major step forward, and anyone who cannot concede that, well, Mr. Speaker, you know, there is something wrong with him. What one has to acknowledge is that this establishment of this Commission is the

MR. HICKEY: vehicle by which this problem can be tackled most effectively, the vehicle, the organization, the nucleus around which to build, through all the volunteers and the human resources throughout this Province who are concerned with this problem. And, Mr. Speaker, let me say while it is fresh in my mind, I do not believe there are too many people in this Province, I do not think there are too many adult citizens in this Province, who cannot say that they have a relative, a friend, an acquaintance or someone who has been inflicted by and who has suffered from the effects of alcohol and drug abuse. In saying that, Mr. Speaker, it should therefore follow that this Commission when in operation will have no difficulty in finding volunteers to help in its work in organizing this whole problem, to make one of the most aggressive attacks on this problem that this Province has ever seen.

The figures I gave when I introduced the bill, Mr. Speaker, clearly show some of the tremendous effects of the overuse or abuse of either alcohol or drugs. The child abuse that is involved, if there were nothing else but just that in itself, surely that is enough to rally the people of this Province in support of this measure and especially in support of the Commission to be established.

Mr. Speaker, I would want to say as well that I will be working as hard as I can, as long as I am minister of this department with some responsibility for this area, to see to it that there is sufficient funding put in place to allow this Commission to do its work.

We do not have our heads buried in the sand, Your Honour. We are acutely aware

MR. HICKEY: that this Commission will not do the job unless it is funded, will not bring the kinds of treatment and cure unless it is funded, and most important of all, Your Honour, will not have the desired effect through an aggressive education programme, which will have the effect of prevention, unless there are funds to get out all over the Province and advertise and educate as to the effects and the dangers and the implications of the overuse or abuse of either alcohol or drugs.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, in winding up the debate I have left this item for last because I want to single it out and I want to put emphasis on it. We talk about drug abuse, we talk about the effects of drug abuse. I gave some statistics about convictions and so on. Well, Mr. Speaker, there are, to the best of my knowledge, no statistics available about the abuse of prescribed drugs by doctors in this Province. I would not want to close this debate without placing emphasis on that very important area. It is not just enough that the drug problem be tackled from the point of view of those drugs, hard drugs as they are referred to. There are people in this Province, Mr. Speaker, for the longest time, who have suffered from drug abuse and it is not hard drugs, so to speak, that they have suffered from. One might say, and it is probably not the right term to use, but some people are almost drugged to death. It is questionable, Mr. Speaker, how many days of their lives, at a given point in time, when they are ill or when they are chronically ill, how many days in a given year they know clearly what is going on about them. And that, Mr. Speaker, has to stop just as much as the attack has to be made on hard drugs and their effects.

Mr. Speaker, I am in no position to say, number one, the size of that problem. I am in no position to say I have any ready solution but, Your Honour, I can say this, that the commission will be asked very, very early as it takes office, to tackle that problem with the same vigour as it will the problem of hard drugs. There are a number of areas, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to prescribed drugs that we have some control over and that we can do something about, and I think that that is the area maybe where we will ask the commission to start. In any event, Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by saying that I

MR. HICKEY: am happy to have the opportunity to have introduced this bill and to have had something to do with it. As I said, the success of it in relation to the problem, be it treatment centres, be it education programmes or rehabilitation, whatever, will depend, one, on funding and, two, on the kind of support that it can get in the community through the voluntary sector. I believe, Mr. Speaker, I am optimistic, I believe that it will get both and in this vein I have real pleasure in moving second reading.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Establish The Alcohol And Drug Dependency Commission Of Newfoundland And Labrador," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No. 109)

MR. MARSHALL: Motion 14 Bill 104.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Workers' Compensation Act (No.2)." (Bill No. 104)

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, this bill is not a very complicated piece of legislation. As the bill says, it is consequential upon the Municipalities Act which was passed in this House last year, and, in fact, it is necessary so that we can implement the accidental insurance plan for volunteer firefighters in the Province as outlined in the budget address.

MR. DINN:

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is about the third or fourth major step that we have taken with respect to Workers' Compensation in the Province, and by agreement with the Workers' Compensation Board and the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing, some 4,500 volunteer firefighters in this Province will be covered by Workers' Compensation. Mr. Speaker, they will be covered under the second amendment in this piece of legislation, The coverage will be provided for volunteer firemen from the time that they leave their place of residence to go to a fire until such time as they have returned to their place of residence, which is the second amendment in this piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, as a Minister of Municipal Affairs previously, and as other ministers of Municipal Affairs found out, we found out that many of our volunteer firemen in this Province were covered by a small insurance programme that they had themselves or that a municipality had. This amendment, by the way, makes sure that all of these volunteer firemen will now be covered by Workers' Compensation. And the assessments that will be paid with respect to this bill, the assessments will be paid for by the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing so that there will not be a problem with respect to collecting assessments from different municipalities, and in those areas, for example, as hon. members will know, that are not covered by municipalities. So I am informed that because of these amendments all of our volunteer firefighters in the Province will be covered and, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird):

The hon. Opposition House Leader.

MR. CALLAN:

All Liberal policies.

MR. DINN:

You did not do anything about it

for twenty-three though.

MR. CALLAN:

I was not here for twenty-three.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird):

Order, please!

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to say -

MR. CALLAN:

You got us all in the hole now go on

and finish the job.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. HODDER:

That is okay, Mr. Speaker, I have

an hour, I think.

Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to congratulate the minister for bringing in this particular bill. It is a piece of legislation which I think is well deserved and it is a move that is certainly one that would seem an obvious move by the government to protect volunteer firemen when they are on the job.

Mr. Speaker, since we are on the Workers' Compensation Board and on the Workers' Compensation Act, I understand it is in order to make a few comments about the Workers' Compensation Board itself. And I would like to take this opportunity to do that, because one of the most persistent problems that I have encountered since I have been elected to this House, as a member of this House, is the anguish that a person must go through when he has become disabled and is no longer able to support his family in the manner to which he had become accustomed. And very often this loss of ability to work seems to cause a loss of self-esteem and in some cases the person has nowhere to turn but to social assistance. Now, most of these people who I am referring to are the partially disabled. In many parts of the Province a person who has lost a limb cannot easily become a night watchman or do the type of part-time work in this Province that you might find in other provinces across Canada or in higher employment areas. particularly in areas of high unemployment like, we will say, in Bay d'Espoir area, the Roddickton area, the Bay St. George area, the type of job that is open to a person who has become disabled is limited but yet, Mr. Speaker, the rule as

MR. HODDER: to the type of compensation a person receives does not take into its concern the fact that in some areas people can find work and in other areas people cannot, even with a slight loss of a limb.

Mr. Speaker, there is another area about the Workers' Compensation Board which I also consider to be a major problem, and that is where there are non-defined

MR. HODDER:

injuries. And I will talk about non-defined injuries and these are the ones I think that most members in the House would agree with me, are the cases which are the most tragic and which give individual members of this House the most problems.

In cases where a person has an injury, say the loss of a finger, the Workers' Compensation Board will pay a certain amount for the loss of that particular limb. However, if that person suffers persistent pain, and I know of cases where this has happened, if the Workers' Compensation Board doctors did not diagnose that pain, then the Board will go no further. And I think in the case of one gentleman, who I believe was to see the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer), was to see the Minister of Health (Mr. House), was to see the former Minister of Justice, and probably the former Minister of Health, certainly he has been to see the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) and he has been in my office once a week, one day every week for the last six years pretty well, when I am there, and has been from doctor to doctor. And it was only when he came to the Department of Health here and was diagnosed by a doctor working with the Department of Health that, you know, his injury was defined. I spoke to the doctor, I do not know if I should mention his name or not, but I spoke to the doctor and while I will not go into the symptoms, the doctor said that he had no doubt in his mind that this man was suffering from that previous injury. Now both the Minister of Health and myself, and the Minister of Justice, I suppose, the former Minister of Justice at least, and the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), who used to be the member for Port au Port - this case has gone on for seven years, - and plus the Human Rights Society, plus the Ombudsman, he has gone to everybody. He has not gone federal yet, but he has been to everybody. The Workers'

MR. HODDER: Compensation Board will not pay him any more money. They also will not pay his expenses. I mean, they just said, no, we have gone this far, our doctors say - some of the reports said, that he was a malingerer, some reports say that he was not too smart, all sorts of things have been said about him. But, yet, finally a doctor diagnosed that there was something wrong with this gentleman. And he is still without help and he is still suffering pain.

Now, I think, Mr. Speaker, that there should be some method whereby an individual - I speak for one individual here, but there are many like it, and, as I say, every member of this House has someone in his district who is in a situation similar, although this one may be a little more dramatic. But there is no help for this person. To him the answer is no. And over the period, I suppose, the Board has spent perhaps \$40,000 or \$50,000 on him, but yet he is not cured and he has to live on social assistance and bring his family up on social assistance.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in specific cases like that I would like to see the Board have some sort of an appeal procedure, a little more compassion, particularly where there is a diagnosis. Because I do not care if ten doctors diagnosed one way, one doctor diagnosed that this man is in pain, and that doctor was a member of the administration of the Department of Health. And yet the Workers' Compensation Board - and the Minister of Health (Mr. House) had to write the gentleman and say, 'We can no longer help you, nor can the Workers' Compensation Board,' because he had intervened. And the Premier's office had also intervened. I told him to go to the Premier's office. I told him to go everywhere. So he is finished.

But for those people with non-defined injuries, that is what I call them, 'non-defined injuries', I think there should be some sort of a procedure

MR. HODDER: whereby the Workers' Compensation Board can review their case again, particularly if there is a considerable amount of evidence that the person's pain came originally from that injury.

Mr. Speaker, another thing I would like to say about the Workers' Compensation Board is - I will not say lack of counselling because there are some good counsellors with the Workers' Compensation Board, but the inadequate counselling because of lack of manpower. I feel that the Rehabilitation Branch are not active enough, and that after a person has suffered an injury

MR. J. HODDER: and has to apply for Canada Pension, if he is lucky enough to have Canada Pension rights, after that person must be counselled, sometimes re-trained and directed to another vocation, if there is one for him, I feel that in that particular area, while there are good people in the Workers' Compensation Board to do this, I believe, Mr. Speaker, we should beef up the counselling aspect of the Workers' Compensation Board. Because anyone who has any sense of decency, who cares anything for people—and again every one of us here in this House sees this, particularly if you live in a rural district. I do not know what happens in an urban area like St. John's where you have more medical facilities and things like that, but all of us see people who suffer injuries, particularly if you live in a mill town or you live in an area where there is a lumbering industry or where people are fishing and that sort of thing, you do see quite a few injuries and you see the trauma that people suffer. The need for counselling is great amongst the people at the Workers' Compensation Board.

The other thing, Mr. Speaker, is that those people who are on Workers' Compensation should have their pensions indexed according to the consumer price increases or at least somewhat. I think, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps we should pay a little more for Workers' Compensation to get a little more benefit back. Because when a person has been pensioned, he is not able to be sent to school anymore, or is on some sort of a pension from the Workers' Compensation Board, very often he cannot adjust to the rising cost of living, and the amounts paid are not high enough.

MR. J. HODDER: The other thing - and I am going to ask this one to the minister and I would like the minister to address himself to it when he sits down. Statistics Canada published a booklet in 1980 which compared Workers' Compensation benefits across the country - and I know the minister is out there and I hope he takes note of this question, because I was amazed in reading this booklet that a lump sum is payable, on acceptance of a death claim, to a widow in all jurisdictions and to a dependent widower in all jurisdictions other than Newfoundland. Now, that was what the - this was 1980; the booklet said that a lump sum is payable, on acceptance of a death claim, to a widow in all jurisdictions and to a dependent widower in all jurisdictions other than Newfoundland. Now the question I have for the minister there is is this still the case?

They go on to say - and this is the Statistics Canada booklet - it goes on to say that with acceptance of death claims monthly allowances become payable to children of the deceased and to the widow in most jurisdictions. A dependent widow would also be eligible for an allowance, but legislation in Newfoundland requires that the widower be an invalid. Is that still the case, Mr. Minister? Now, that was written in 1980 and it was in a Statistics Canada comparison of Workers' Compensation across the country. Must the widow of a person on workers' compensation - so that the minister gets the question - to be eligible for allowance must she also be an invalid? And are we the only province in Canada still where a lump sum payment is not paid the widow -

MR. MOORES: Allocated.

MR. HODDER: - allocated, after the person on Workers' Compensation is deceased?

MR. J. HODDER: If this is the case, Mr. Speaker, I think it is very wrong. And there are many widowers in the Province who are unable to work or provide the extra money to keep the family fed and clothed, even though they are not disabled - and if that is still the case? And again I put it to the minister because it was in a 1980 Statistics Canada bulletin.

I want to finally, Mr. Speaker, turn my attention to the doctors. And unlike some comments, I do not want to talk about their salaries. But I do want to say this about doctors, Mr. Speaker, that in a number of instances - and this is a personal gripe with me - I have run into situations where doctors did not submit reports to the Compensation Board for months

MR. HODDER:

And I know as well that these are not isolated cases, they occur frequently, because I have talked to people and I know that they occur frequently, that doctors do not submit reports to the Compensation Board for months, and the person who is looking for compensation is then held up because of a doctor's report, until Workers' Compensation gets a report from that doctor.

Now, Mr. Speaker, somehow or other, we in this Legislature have got to do something about that. I do not know if you can legislate a doctor to send a report in but, I mean, it is a doctor who is malingering.

MR. THOMS: In personal injury cases the same thing is true.

MR. HODDER: My hon. friend here, who is a gentleman of the law, says the same thing happens in personal injury cases.

But if there is anything that is frustrating, Mr. Speaker, if there is any group of people in this Province who should care about the people whom they are serving, it is the doctors.

MR. MOORES: Right on!

MR. HODDER: And when a person has the misfortune of being injured and has to go to the Workers' Compensation Board and has to wait for payment from the Workers' Compensation Board because of a doctor's report, then, Mr. Speaker, we should find a way to get that report to them. Mr. Speaker, I think it is a travesty of justice and I think that there are workers in this Province who suffer needlessly for that reason.

Finally, I have another question for the minister when he stands to close the debate.

MR. THOMS: That is not this afternoon.

MR. HODDER: Probably not this afternoon, but I would like these questions recorded, because I understand that no compensation is given to a deceased worker's widow - he can correct me - unless the widow has been living common-law for seven years before his death and if there are - wait now - 'is given to a deceased worker's widow unless the widow has been living common-law for seven years before his death if there are no children, and for two years if there are children.' So this means this is antiquated in this day and age if this is still so. I would like the minister to address himself to that.

But, Mr. Speaker, these are just a few points that I wanted to make. This is a good bill. This is one of the best bills that have been brought into the House in this session of the Legislature. It is a good liberal bill. But I would like to say - and I am sure I speak for everyone on this side of the House - that we will be supporting this piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I would like to bring a number of matters before the House, and I feel very seriously about them, that people with non-defined injuries, as I spoke about - people with non-defined injuries should have a second chance, Mr. Speaker. I think there is a need for counselling. There are counsellors, but there is a need for more counselling for people who have suffered in Workers' Compensation. I think people who have to deal with Workers' Compensation should receive more funds. I want to know if the statements by Statistics Canada which I quoted here earlier concerning death claims are accurate, if we are the only province. And, Mr. Speaker, I would like to see the minister take some action to make sure that the doctors of this

MR. HODDER: Province can find the time to make sure that when an accident happens that they can get the report in to the Workers' Compensation Board so these people can get paid because it is pretty frustrating when you have to wait two or three months because a doctor cannot sign his name to a piece of paper.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WOODROW:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

The hon. the member for Bay of Islands.

MR. WOODROW:

Mr. Speaker, this is indeed, to my mind, a very important bill. In fact, it is probably one of the more important bills that we have brought into the House, because, Mr. Speaker, it deals with human beings, directly with human beings who are sick, and sick, in many cases, through no

MR. WOODROW:

fault of their own, but because they got into an accident.

Mr. Speaker, I would like, first of all, to say that probably, and I will match this with any member of this House and have them look in my files, there is hardly a member in this House, I feel sure, who has had more calls than I have had on this topic. Since 1975 I have been dealing, in fact, on almost a monthly basis with people trying to get workers' Compensation or get it adjusted, or get it reinstated or something.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, I would certainly like to congratulate the minister. I would like to say to the minister there are many times I had to call him or write him directly. I believe, Mr. Speaker, in putting my problems down on paper so it will go in the record. I can say very frankly that he gave me full co-operation. This also, Mr. Speaker, applies to the workers. I think especially of Max Bursey here in St. St. John's, I think of Don Byron, who is an old friend of mine, and many others. I also think, Mr. Speaker, of the employers, as well, in the City of Corner Brook. I have always found them to be very amiable and understanding where possible.

One of the problems that I have found, Mr. Speaker, is with people who are permanently partially disabled. I do not know whether the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) mentioned that or not, the permanently partially disabled. I knew several in the Corner Brook area who were receiving \$98 a month. I am thinking of one person especially, who worked with Newfoundland Tractor and Equipment making, in fact, to the tune of around \$600 per month, and when he got disabled

MR. WOODROW: he was receiving \$98 a month. What helped him along was the fact that his wife is teaching. He came to me, pleaded with me to try to help, which I did. He had a mortgage on his house, he was trying to pay off a half ton pick-up as well. I contacted the minister and the people in his department many times on this particular case.

But I understand now that people in that category, their amounts have been increased by 10 per cent, but I doubt very much if this is enough.

I have also, Mr. Speaker, had people who had been on workers' compensation, they probably were just given their clean bill of health by a doctor in Corner Brook, or by a doctor in St. John's, and something reoccurred again. It is very difficult for us, as members, naturally. We cannot judge these cases, we have to depend upon medical advice.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to say - and probably the Minister of Health (Mr. House) should be here, or within hearing distance of this - it is rather unfortunate that people in the West coast area, especially in the Corner Brook area, have to come to Corner Brook when they have an illness which centres around Workers' Compensation. It is too bad we do not have a specialist over there. I know it is impossible to get men like Dr. Maroun, but like the other doctors who are there in Corner Brook. They have to

MR. L. WOODROW: come over here to St. John's to get an assessment of their ailment. And, Mr. Speaker, it is very hard. Sometimes they have to travel by bus, although in most cases I notice now that the people are given aeroplane tickets. And I think, as the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) already mentioned, it does take a long time to get the reports back and forth. I do not know what the trouble is. I suppose it is, perhaps, because, like in every field today, it takes time to get the problem assessed.

I hope that the minister will do all he can to see if we can get this thing speeded up and get more doctors, if possible, in the city of Corner Brook. Because when people are suffering like that, I know they just simply want to get an answer as quickly as possible. And you have to, probably, - to walk in a fellow's moccasins before you realize what he is going through.

There is also, Mr. Speaker, I found as well - and this is important. I think we have to bring this point in as well - there are people who try to cheat the Workers' Compensation like people who try to cheat social assistance.

MR. S. NEARY: Oh, go on.

MR. L. WOODROW: Now, I am not playing politics, my hon. friend for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). I am trying to be honest. The member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) and I, because we spend a lot of time in Corner Brook together, we share our load. If we need the hon. member for Humber East (Ms. Verge), she is always there to assist us and to get information as well. But we work together very closely and we talk every case over. So when cases are

MR. WOODROW: doubtful, naturally- lex dublia non obligetur- doubtful does not oblige anybody. And, I suppose, you know you have to be aware of wolves in sheep's clothing. So, Mr. Speaker, these things have to be worked out. Maybe there are times when, because of my nature, I get a little anxious, I would like to have this problem solved right away. But it takes time. It takes time, in fact, and you got to -

MR. HISCOCK: (Inaudible) has no heart.

MR. WOODROW: I am sorry.

MR. HISCOCK: The administration has no heart when (inaudible).

MR. WOODROW: Well, Mr. Speaker, the minister has many cases. He has Newfoundland on his shoulders and probably when he speaks he could tell us the number of people who are under Workers' Compensation to give you an idea of what he is doing. And not only that, Mr. Speaker, also he has labour as well, and labour today in our Province is not an easy portfolio for any minister. Well, Mr. Speaker, I thought I would get those few words in because I feel that the bill is very important. I will be anxious to hear what my hon. friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has to say. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, very much.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, one thing I want to say to the hon. gentleman through you, Mr. Speaker, is from the way he spoke he led the House to believe, and maybe he thinks this himself that the Minister of Manpower (Mr. Dinn) is the boss over the Workmans' Compensation Board. Now, if the hon. gentleman thinks that - at least that is the impression he left - but if the hon. gentleman thinks that that is wrong, it is incorrect.

MR. DINN: I did not say he was the boss.

MR. NEARY: Well, who is the boss?

MR. WOODROW: The Board.

MR. NEARY: The Board is the boss. But who is

November 24, 1981

Tape No. 3711

RA -3

MR. NEARY:

The boss of the Board?

MR. WOODROW:

But the minister is in charge.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, that is what I thought the hon. gentleman said. That is what I thought he said and let me tell the hon. gentleman that the minister is not in charge. The minister is not in charge. And I hope I never hear a member of this House, who is supposed to know better, ever repeat that again in this House. All the minister does, all the Minister of Manpower does, if the hon. gentleman would just listen for a moment - I am not

MR. NEARY:

lecturing the hon. gentleman, but the hon. gentleman should know better, what the Minister of Manpower (Mr. Dinn) does is report to the House. The Workers' Compensation Board is set up under an act of this Legislature. Now, does the hon. gentleman understand?

MR. WOODROW: Yes.

MR. NEARY: Set up under an act of this Legislature.

MR. WOODROW: I said, he is the head of the department.

MR. NEARY: It reports to this Legislature only.

It reports to no minister. It reports to the Legislature.

It makes an annual report. The bridge between Workers' Compensation Board and this House, happens to be the Minister of Manpower. It could be any other minister.

AN HON. MEMBER: And a very strong bridge it is.

MR. CALLAN: Of course it could.

MR. NEARY: No, it is not a very strong bridge, it is a very weak bridge, Mr. Speaker.

So my first duty is to try to educate the hon. gentleman.

MR. WOODROW: You cannot do (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: No, I know. You can lead a horse to water but you cannot make him drink, Mr. Speaker. But I am sure the hon. gentleman knew, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Manpower was not in charge of the Workers' Compensation Board. I am sure the hon. gentleman, even though he said that, he was only joking. He was only joking, and I accept that. I accept it in the spirit in which he said it. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman was just kidding, pulling our legs. The hon. gentleman is no ignoramus when it comes to these matters and he knew the difference, he was just testing me out.

Mr. Speaker, the other thing that the hon. gentleman said that I was rather intrigued with was his record of success, going to the minister and asking -

MR. WOODROW: Not always the minister but the Board.

MR. NEARY: Going to the Board, not always the minister. Mr. Speaker, I was wondering why the hon. gentleman would bother to go to the minister. Why would the hon. gentleman go to the minister? Why would he not go directly to the Board who is responsible to this House? What would you expect the minister to do? What would the hon. gentleman expect the minister to do? Because let me point out to the hon. gentleman that the reason for making the Workers' Compensation Board completely independent, impartial, and independent of political pressure -

MR. WOODROW: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: That is the reason it was set up under an act of this Legislature. So why would the hon. gentleman go to the minister?

MR. WOODROW: That is a good reason.

MR. NEARY: Why?

MR. WOODROW: Seeking advice , boy!

MR. NEARY: Can the hon. gentleman tell us why?

MR. WOODROW: Did anybody go to seek advice from you when you were a minister?

MR. NEARY: Not on that particular matter, because I would refer him to the Workers' Compensation Board, and I was acting Minister of Labour for one year.

MR. WOODROW: And you would not give him advice.

MR. NEARY: Yes, I would give them advice as was my duty to do.

MR. WOODROW: Well, is not that advice to tell them to go (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, I would not -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: That is what is known as political interference with the Workers' Compensation Board.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: I am sure the hon. gentleman would not do that.

But I would like for him to tell us about how he has been so successful with the minister.

MR. WOODROW: Do not make me cry.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the reason I ask the hon. gentleman to tell me how he has been so successful with the minister is because I have here in front of me a raft of correspondence between a group of employees in Labrador West, in the mining industry, as a matter of fact there are thirty odd employees, - let me see how many there are - thirty-two, I think, it is, thirty-one individual employees, thirty-one individual petitions of employees who work in Labrador West in the mining industry, and these employees have been trying now for several years, since 1978 or 1979, they have been trying to get the Minister of Manpower (Mr. Dinn) to use whatever influence he can on the Workers' Compensation Board to include their disease, silicosis, or to use another term that they have in here, it is quite a word 'pneumoconiosis', which is a disease of the lung, an industrial disease brought about by the dust hazard in Labrador West. They have been trying for three years to get the minister to recommend -

MR. WOODROW: I am sure he is working on it.

MR. NEARY: - to the Workers' Compensation Board that their disease be recognized as compensable under the Workers' Compensation Act.

Now, have they had any success? Have they had the success that the hon. gentleman has had?

MR. WOODROW: They are trying.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: No, they have not. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I will,

MR. NEARY: now that the hon. gentleman has told us how successful he is with the minister, have all these letters and petitions xeroxed and passed over to the hon. gentleman and perhaps he can get the recognition for these workers, these employees in Labrador City and Wabush, recognized under the Workers' Compensation Act.

Now, Mr. Speaker, just to show members what it is we are talking about, over the past five and a half years at least thirty-three persons have been medically diagnosed as having silicosis and at least another ten are under investigation of having same. All of these people in Labrador West have had their miner's medical certificate cancelled. Over these past years they have been advised by the Workers' Compensation Board that although they have an industrial disease there is nothing wrong with them and they have no claim against the Board and that they are not eligible for Workers' Compensation. In October, 1979, they contacted their MHA, the member for Menihek (Mr. Walsh), to see what he could do for them. Apparently he contacted the Workers' Compensation Board and was advised that they had no claim. The group then wrote a letter to the member and asked him to ask the Minister of Manpower (Mr. Dinn) to intercede, to try to get the Workers' Compensation Act amended to include compensation for silicotics. The member for Menihek advised this group that a petition would carry more weight. So the group went and circulated a petition. The group thought their petition was going to be presented in the House. Maybe through some misunderstanding - I will give the member for Menihek the benefit of the doubt, he is not in his seat to say whether or not it is correct - instead of presenting the petition in the House the member took it to the Minister of Manpower who in turn replied to the member's letter on March 3, 1980.

MR. NEARY:

Now, what did the Minister of Manpower (Mr. Dinn) say in his reply to the member for Menihek (Mr. Walsh) who had a petitioner that he was supposed to bring on the floor of the House, but he decided to work quietly behind the scenes with the minister thinking he would get more success, thinking he would be as successful as the member for Exploits (Dr. Twomey). Well, let us see what the Minister of Manpower told this group, this compassionate minister, this minister who brought in this major reform today. What did he tell this group in Labrador West who have an industrial disease, silicosis?

"Dear Peter," he says, writing to his colleague, "I am writing you as a follow-up to my letter of 31 December, 1979, wherein I advised you that I had requested the Chairman of the Workers' Compensation Board to do a thorough assessment on the thirty-one individual petitions which you submitted to me from workers in your district and the impact which an amendment to the Workers' Compensation Act would have in order to remedy the problem to which they refer.

"As you probably already know, the Workers' Compensation Board is keenly aware of the potential problem resulted from the dust situation in the mines in Labrador West. In fact, the Chairman advises me that over the past two or three years a number of workers have been brought to St. John's and examined by a Medical Review Committee set up under Section 94 of the Workers' Compensation Act. It should be noted that the recommendations of that Committee are binding on the Workers' Compensation Board.

"While the Committee has determined"- listen to this, Mr. Speaker -"while the Committee has determined that several workers have contacted pneumoconiosis, if that is the right pronunciation -so far no disability has been demonstrated and there is nothing to indicate that the worker could not resume his usual employment."

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, when the minister made that statement these workers had been moved, relocated by the company, to a lower paying position and their incomes dropped from \$20,000 a year down to \$10,000 a year. "If at some time pneumoconiosis becomes disabling or partially disabling, then the Workers' Compensation Board would become involved on a financial, medical and rehabilitative basis." Listen, just listen to this statement, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman is going to sit back and wait for these people to become invalids or have one foot in the grave. Just listen, I will read it again in case hon. members think that I am misquoting or misinterpreting what the hon. gentleman said in his letter. "If at some time" - now, first of all they admit it, they admit that there had been disabilities - "If at some time the pneumoconiosis becomes disabling or partially disabling, then the Workers' Compensation Board would become involved on a financial, medical and rehabilitative basis. However, the Board makes it clear that they cannot pay compensation where no disability exists." What a contradictory statement. First of all, let me go back the beginning of the paragraph. "While the committee has determined that several workers have contracted pneumoconiosis" - which is really, to put it in another way, silicosis, miners lung. That is what it is, it is miners lung, caused by the dust from the ore, Mr. Speaker - "I would like to make it very clear to you and to the workers involved, that neither I nor the Workers' Compensation Board are minimizing the potential problem in this case and that we are all acutely concerned with it. Nevertheless, action to amend the Workers' Compensation Act at this time to accede to the request of the petitioners would be highly questionable, particularly in view of the current study on the dust problems in Labrador West." Wait for

MR. NEARY: them to die, wait for them to fall down victims in their tracks before doing anything about it.

MR. DINN: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Because the problem was not there, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, no, no, no.

MR. DINN: Tell me about St. Lawrence.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we dealt with St. Lawrence. The hon. gentleman knows that, we dealt with St. Lawrence when we had the opportunity.

MR. DINN: You never (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: We dealt with it far better than the hon. gentleman is dealing with it now.

MR. DINN: Something will be done by the end of this year.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious situation. These men have miners lung, silicosis or pneumoconiosis, and they cannot get recognition under the Workers' Compensation Act. And the minister has told them, in no uncertain terms in this correspondence which I can table, 'Yes, we admit you have this disease, but we are not going to amend the Worker's Compensation Act to see that you get what you are entitled to in the way of benefits under this act. That is terrible Mr. Speaker. It is a terrible dereliction of duty. And the minister should go to bat at once.

MR. WOODROW: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: No, he should go to bat, he can recommend just the same as I am doing right now in this House. No control, no influence, but he can recommend. The hon. gentleman reports to the Workers' Compensation Board from this House, and he should report today from this House that a member brought up this very serious matter in Labrador West, that something should be done about at once. These people now have been three years trying to get action on this matter. And I

November 24, 1981

Tape No.3714

RA- 3

MR. NEARY: think, now, it is time that
the Workers' Compensation Board faced up to their
responsibility and brought an amendment into this
House, like the one we have here this afternoon,

MR. NEARY: bring in an amendment before the House prorogues before Christmas, simple amendment to include this industrial disease under the Workers' Compensation Act. Because that would only be fair and just and it should be done without further delay. And the only other point I have to make, Mr. Speaker, while we are talking about this Bill and Workers' Compensation-and I support, the Bill, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman, every time he brings in an amendment to a bill, other ministers who bring in amendments to bills, Mr. Speaker, my mind cannot help going back to what administration it was that have brought in these reforms in this province. Who was it, that brought Workers' Compensation to Newfoundland? It was the Smallwood administration that brought in, at the time, what was considered to be the finest Workers' Compensation Act in the whole of Canada. Now, that was reform Mr. Speaker, that was reform. We have not seen the likes of it since. Now, anybody can amend it; anybody can amend a good piece of legislation and that is what we have being seeing now for ten years. They have been building on the foundation that was started by the Liberals. The workers - my hon. friend knows the Workers' Compensation Act, which was the finest Act of its kind back in 1950 and '51 in the whole of Canada, because after Confederation the government had an opportunity to take all the other Acts in the nine provinces of Canada and steal all the good things out of the Acts, especially the one in Saskatchewan that was brought in by an NDP government, and put it all, consolidate it all in one Act, and come up with the finest Workers' Compensation Act in the whole of Canada at that time. And it probably still is a pretty good Act, but it is pretty easy to amend it.

MR. NEARY: The foundation was put there for the hon. gentleman, and if he did nothing else but just sit back and wait for the odd amendment to come in, Mr. Speaker, life has to go on. We do not stand still. And so, the member for the Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) may think that these are all great reforms because he does not - what is he stacking them up against? How is he judging it? A great reform compared to what? What he means by a great reform, Mr. Speaker, he is saying that it is one of the greatest reforms that he has seen. It is one of the greatest reforms he has seen in ten years of Toryism. Because they have not had any reform, he thinks this is a great reform. What would he say about MCP? What would he say about Family Allowance? What would he say about Canada Pension? What would he say about the Old Age Pension? What would he say about Unemployment Insurance? What would he say about MCP? Mr. Speaker, what would he say about all these things? If he thinks that a simple amendment to the Workers' Compensation Act is a major reform, then, what would he say about Petro Canada? That would be some reform. He would be so overcome he would hardly be able to speak - and all the other major reforms that were brought into this House. Mr. Speaker, this is - unless we are going to stand still, unless we are going to stand still in this province, you would expect ministers to amend legislation that we brought in - would you not? - to conform with the times. Let them bring in something original, let them bring in some big reform, some major reform in this House. If they get their jollies out of amendment, what kind of a kick would they get out of a big reform, a major reform? We have not seen one in ten years, we have not seen one since the Liberals left office.

MR. CARTER: That was a great reform.

MR. NEARY: That was a great reform? Well, that reform is about to end.

MR. CALLAN: The biggest reform was when you got defeated on

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, you know 'motherhood' - what else can you say about it? It is a motherhood issue, it is an amendment to an Act that was brought in by another administration, and when we see some major reforms coming into this House, then it is time for the members supporting the government to get up and blow their own horns.

And, Mr. Speaker, before I take my seat, there is another point that I want to raise in connection with Workers' Compensation, and that is that nothing irritates me more, and I am sure it irritates other members of this House, than to see a worker injured on the job and then after he gets the clearance from the doctor to go back to work, he reports to the company and the company says, I am sorry but we have no employment for you. In some cases, the doctor may recommend light work. The doctor may say, The man is suitable for work, not the same job that he was working on when he got injured, available for light work, and when he reports to the company, they say, I am sorry. The door is slammed in his face. He is thrown out in the unemployed -

MR. CALLAN: In the gutters.

MR. NEARY: - heap. Kicked out, removed from the payroll and told point blank there is no job for him.

Mr. Speaker, that is morally and legally wrong. And the Workers' Compensation Act should be amended to force companies, to make it mandatory for them to re-employ people who have been injured while in the employ of that company.

MR. HISCOCK: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Now, I would consider that to be a pretty good reform and a pretty good piece of legislation. It would be a very popular thing to do.

MR. HISCOCK: The Year of the Disabled.

MR. NEARY: I will repeat it again because I hope the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) will make this a plank in his platform in the next election along with all the other things - nationalization of Light & Power Company, freezing of the assets of the two mines in Baie Verte that the government have not had the courage to do yet, expanding the terms of reference of the Canadian Saltfish Corporation or setting up another corporation to market all the produce of the sea, establish better relations with Ottawa - all these things I hope the hon. Leader of the Opposition will include in his platform. Nationalize the fishing industry to a certain degree, at least take over the marketing.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is not a bad idea.

MR. NEARY: - No, it is not a bad idea. It is not to be sneezed at. These things with -

AN HON. MEMBER: Do not give it all to them.

MR. NEARY: I am not going to tell them all our secrets, but I am hoping, along with the one that I just mentioned -

MR. CALLAN: Abolish school taxes.

MR. NEARY: - and I will repeat it for the benefit of the Leader of the Opposition who, I hope, will make it a point in his platform and it is this: The Workers' Compensation Act should be amended to make it illegal - or to make it mandatory, to put it another way, a positive way - to make it compulsory for all employers to re-employ workers injured on the job while in the employ

MR. NEARY: of these companies, when they get doctor's clearance to return to work, whether it be for light work or whether it be to reinstate them in their old jobs. Mr. Speaker, I think it is criminal the way that employers in this Province have gotten away with giving workers, good and faithful servants - workers, good and faithful employees of a company, giving them the flick and throwing them out in the unemployed heap.

MR. HISCOCK: The Minister of Education (Ms. Verge), in the Year of the Disabled, she should recommend that.

MR. NEARY: Well, this is the Year of the Disabled. It might be a good time to do it, but it should be done, Mr. Speaker. I think it is very important. I feel so helpless and I am sure other

MR. NEARY: members of this House have felt the same way, so helpless when a man looks you straight in the eye and he says, 'I was in there on the job. I have been on Workers' Compensation now for the last nine months or a year. My Workers' Compensation is cut off. I have got clearance from the doctor that I am fit for work. And I went down to my employer and he told me to go to hell, there is no job for me'. How many times has it happened to the hon. gentleman? He is nodding his approval, it has happened. I am sure there is not a member of this House who could not get up today and tell us the sad story of employees who could not get their jobs back or the company would not take them on and give them light work, find suitable employment for them. And I am not talking about little, two-bit operations, I am talking about multi-nationals. I am talking about employers who have picked the pockets of the workers of this Province for too long and gotten away with it.

MR. HISCOCK: And the government has condoned this.

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

MR. HISCOCK: And the government has condoned this.

MR. NEARY: And the government has condoned this. The Workers' Compensation Board have let the employers get away with it. You talk about rehabilitation, Mr. Speaker. It is heartbreaking.

MR. CALLAN: They are betwixt and between.

MR. NEARY: They are.

MR. CALLAN: They cannot get sick disability or Canada Pension because of the doctors.

MR. NEARY: That is right. I will tell you what they are faced with. They are thrown over on my hon. friend, the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey). That is where they end up, most of them.

MR. CALLAN: That is after they have spent all their savings. They cannot have any money.

MR. NEARY: That is right. After they have spent all their earnings, their life's earnings.

Mr. Speaker, one other point. I have a couple of more minutes. But the hon. member for Bay Of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) reminded me of something. The hon. gentleman said there are abuses of Workers' Compensation. I have no doubt about that, but I would not belabour that point because there seems to be a new philosophy developing now in various government departments. They are making the innocent suffer. They are coming down like a sledge hammer on the heads of social assistance recipients and Workers' Compensation recipients and making the innocent suffer because of the abuse by a few people. That is the new philosophy that is developing and that is the philosophy the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) told us about in this House yesterday. Five million in ten years he told us, hair raising examples, trying to drag in a red herring for putting the screws to all recipients, all clients of the minister's department.

MR. HICKEY: Why is it always over ten years?

MR. NEARY: Over ten years, the hon. gentleman said.

MR. HICKEY: That is not necessarily abuse.

MR. NEARY: That is not abuse.

MR. HICKEY: (Inaudible) I am talking about.

MR. NEARY: I see. Well, that is not the way it was quoted in the morning news: "Hair examples, the hon. gentleman said". Mr. Speaker, I hope they are not developing a philosophy of putting the screws to innocent people because of the handful that abused the system, but that is what it seems like. The minister is saying, No cuts in programmes. I am going to make my contribution to the deficit by putting the

MR. NEARY: screws, by tightening up, by making it more difficult and causing all kinds of pain and suffering in the process. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that that is not what the hon. gentleman for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) meant when he talked about abuse of the system. There is abuse in every system, but I do not think it is all that bad, Mr. Speaker. I am sure Your Honour will agree that it would be very unfortunate, indeed, to put the gears to all the other recipients of social assistance or Workers' Compensation because the system is abused by a few people.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, if this is a major reform I am about to make the most dramatic, the most emphatic and the most vibrant speech I have ever made in this honourable House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

I am going to say something, Mr. Speaker, that has not been said in this particular bill. I am going to wait until everybody gets ready, but I am going to say something that has not yet been said about this particular bill. Now, Mr. Speaker, if this is a reform bill, I will say the minister will hardly go down in history as a reformist. Because, number one, if it is a reform bill the minister did not tell us a big lot about it. He never told us too much about this particular bill.

MR. FLIGHT:

I do not think he knows much about it.

MR. LUSH:

Now we on this side have said that we are supporting this bill in principle. Because in principle is all we can do. Because the minister told us so precious little about the details of this particular bill, we are supporting something of which we do not know the details, and we must know the details of this before we can call it any kind of a bill, whether it is good, bad, indifferent, or anything else.

So, Mr. Speaker, the minister did a very poor job in introducing this bill - this amendment rather, that he labels to be a major piece of reform. So, Mr. Speaker, what is it that we do not know about this bill? First of all, all we know about the amendment is that it is going to extend the coverage, and that is fine, Mr. Speaker, it is going to extend the coverage from the time the person leaves from the call of a fire until he arrives back home again. So it is covering the coverage period, or extending the coverage period for firefighters from the time they get the call. In other words, up to now if a fellow fell down over the steps and broke his neck going to a fire, he got no coverage. So under this particular bill now, this will be corrected, this will be taken care of. I do not know about corrected, but it will be taken care of, that if a person falls

MR. LUSH: down on his way to work and breaks a limb well, then, he is covered under the insurance.

But, Mr. Speaker, what type of coverage is it? I have not been told. We know that the general policy is \$100,000 life insurance. We know how that works. I suppose, if a person gets killed the family will receive \$100,000. Then it goes on to say that there is going to be a disability insurance provided. What is the amount of that insurance? Is it now in place? Is the disability insurance in place?

MR. FLIGHT: What is it based on?

MR. LUSH: Is this in place or is this - this will not be affected, I suppose, by the \$16 million cut in the budget? We failed to ask that question of the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn).

MR. FLIGHT: The other one is based on earnings. It is based on the earnings of the employee.

MR. LUSH: We never ever thought that, since his is not a large spending department, maybe this is the department that is going to get the kick right in the shins, maybe this is the department that is going to absorb the total impact of that \$16 million loss. But anyway, Mr. Speaker, we know nothing about the disability insurance. How much will it be? And then it goes on to say, 'That there will be guaranteed income benefits to dependents'.

MR. FLIGHT: Based on what?

MR. LUSH: Now, Mr. Speaker, what is going to be the amount of these various components of the insurance policy? What is going to be the payment of the disability? What is going to be the guaranteed income benefits? What is it going to be? What is it going to be based on? Is it going to be based on work that the volunteer firefighter happens to be engaged in, whether he is a teacher, or whether he is a

MR. LUSH:

whether he is a plumber, whether he is a logger? Is it going to be based on that?

MR. FLIGHT:

The minister is not listening.

MR. LUSH:

In which case, of course, people will be getting unequal amounts. If a logger breaks a leg and has to stay at home because of an accident, then he will get less money, I would expect, than if it happened to a teacher. Maybe it would be the other way around. But, whatever, I am just wondering what the guidelines will be. What are the guidelines for setting up the components of this \$100,000 insurance? And one would have thought that the minister would have said that, because that certainly would shed some light on whether this bill was an excellent bill, of whether it was a fair bill. To say that we have insurance coverage is one thing, and all members agree to that, but what is the extent of the insurance? What is the extent of the coverage? That is the important thing, and that is something that I have not heard the minister talk about. It is something that I have not seen written down. It is something that I have not heard the minister get up and tell the people of this Province, or tell the firefighters. Now, maybe the firefighters know, maybe they

MR. LUSH:

know, but I am doubtful that they know what the benefits are under this particular insurance scheme. And so if the minister can provide us with some of these details, that will certainly shed a little more light on this bill and certainly enable us to decide whether or not—or how adequate this particular insurance scheme is. And I think the minister has an obligation to inform hon. members, respecting some of these very important details, to let us know just what precisely is the kind of insurance that we are talking about, precisely the coverage that people who incur accidents, injuries can expect to receive under this particular insurance policy. And I am surprised that the minister did not tell us that. That should have been the first thing that the minister should have told us, whether when a man receives an injury whether he is going to receive \$1,000 a month or whether he is going to receive \$1,500 a month or whether it is going to be \$150. It makes a lot of difference, Mr. Speaker, if a volunteer firefighter is going to be receiving \$150 a month or whether he is going to be receiving \$1,000 a month, that certainly will be the measure of the bill. That will be the criteria by which to measure the effectiveness and the adequacy of this particular bill. To get up here, Mr. Speaker, and to just simply say that this is a reform bill because we are giving blanket insurance coverage to all the firefighters in this Province is not enough. That is not enough, Mr. Speaker.

The hon. minister is obligated to inform hon. members of the details of this insurance policy, to let us know what kind of compensation we are talking about, to let us know what kind of benefits the people can expect to receive, firefighters and members of the family, can expect to receive under this policy.

Mr. Speaker, again I am not sure how this policy is to be administered. I am not sure that the minister went into any great kind of detail on that, how this

MR. LUSH: policy is to be administered in terms of who is going to pay the full shot. Is the government going to pay the full shot all the time, from now until -

MR. DINN: You were not in when the

MR. LUSH: I realize that. But it is not something that I have heard before, how I have heard various stories, Mr. Speaker. I have heard that maybe municipalities will be expected to pay some of the premiums, I have heard that. I have heard such stories going around, that municipalities may be expected to pay some of the premiums. Well, Mr. Speaker, if that is so well that is certainly not going to be much of a major reform, if the government is going to slough that responsibility of payment of premiums off to some other body or agency. So the hon. minister should be specific and tell us exactly who is going to pay the premiums for this insurance policy and how long they plan to pay the premiums, whether the government will be picking up the -

MR. BARRETT: (Inaudible) That is the member for DAC.

MR. LUSH: So the minister should tell us who is going to pay the premiums. If the government is going to pay them, how long are they going to pay them. Are they going to pay them now until perpetuity? What are they going to do, Mr. Speaker?

So these are some very important questions, Mr. Speaker, that the minister should clarify. These are some very important details that the minister should let hon. members of this House know so that we can know the adequacy and the efficiency of this particular bill to look after the needs of the volunteer firefighters in this Province. Mr. Speaker, excuse me for a moment, my water is gone.

Well, Mr. Speaker, after raising these rather important and significant questions, I shall take my seat and allow the minister to clue up the debate or whatever.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower. If the minister speaks now he will close the debate.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if I can answer all hon. members' questions in five minutes. That is going to be a very difficult task. But I will start with the last first. I answered all the hon. member's questions, the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), I answered all of his questions in my introduction. It was not a very long introduction but it was enough of an introduction to answer all of the hon. member's concerns. The hon. member took twenty minutes to ask the questions. I took five minutes to answer the questions when I introduced the bill.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, who pays the premium? If the hon. member had been here he would understand that the Department of Municipal Affairs -

MR. LUSH: I met with a Salvation Army Delegation to explain the operations of the House of Assembly.

MR. DINN: - Mr. Speaker, the Department of Municipal Affairs will pay the premium, will pay the assessment, will pay the approximate five dollars for the 4,500 firemen in this Province, volunteer firemen who should have been covered years ago, who will now be covered as a result of this amendment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what will the firemen receive? What is the compensation that they will receive? Well, Mr. Speaker, they will receive, if anybody knows what the Workers' Compensation does, they will receive exactly the same as any person in Newfoundland would receive under Workers' Compensation. And I outlined to the hon. member -

MR. STIRLING: Based on what?

MR. DINN: The hon. members had their opportunity. The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) did not speak in the debate and now he is asking questions. If the hon. Leader of the Opposition had been interested in Workers' Compensation for the 4,500 volunteer firemen, he would have gotten up in his place at the appropriate time and asked the questions. Well, Mr. Speaker, I will answer the questions asked by those members who were interested enough in Workers' Compensation for the 4,500 volunteer firemen, I will answer those questions now.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what will they receive. Well, they will receive, as outlined earlier in this sitting of the House, Mr. Speaker, effective January 1, 1982, they will receive compensable earnings up to \$21,000, or 75 per cent of \$21,000, which comes out to approximately

MR. DINN: \$15,750, approximately.

MR. LUSH: Twenty-one thousand is the ceiling, is it?

MR. DINN: The ceiling is \$21,000.

So a volunteer fireman who works going to a fire, Mr. Speaker, and gets injured, will receive in compensation, as a result of the assessment paid by the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing, up to 75 per cent of \$21,000 per year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, along with that will go increases that will become effective in January of 1982, increases that I outlined for hon. members in this House earlier in this sitting. Obviously, they were not listening then, so I will give them a rundown, basically, of what they will receive. Mr. Speaker, they will receive an increase effective—and this, by the way, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. members had read the bill, this becomes effective retroactively to April 1, 1981.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is six o'clock, I will move the adjournment.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) moves the adjournment of the debate.

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I believe the debate was adjourned, was it?

MR. SPEAKER: By the hon. minister, yes.

MR. MARSHALL: I see, okay. I am sorry. Unaccustomed, I was not listening.

Mr. Speaker, I move the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday at 3:00 p.m.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, at 3:00 p.m.