

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
2:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
TUESDAY, MAY 2, 1978

May 2, 1978

Tape 1686

DW - 1

The House met at 2:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I am pleased to welcome

to the galleries to the House of Assembly two student groups: thirty exchange students from grade eight from the Hugh McRoberts Junior Secondary in Richmond, British Columbia, accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Dale Ulman and Mr. Art Almis; and also twenty-six grade nine students from St. Francis of Assisi School in Outer Cove accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Tom Gosine. I know all hon. members join me in welcoming these students and their teachers to the House of Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

I will now inform hon. members of my decision on the matter of privilege brought up in the House of Assembly yesterday by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). It is a complex issue and I have endeavoured to discard everything which I did not regard as absolutely necessary, but it is a matter of some complexity. With reference to the point of privilege brought up yesterday, I have for the purpose of my ruling distinguished between two aspects of the matter: (1) whether execution of a search warrant in the precincts of the House with the permission of the Speaker after he has assured himself to the best of his ability that such was a valid warrant, validly issued, is a breach of privilege. In other words, because I think this is a different way of saying the same thing, is there an immunity from service and execution of a search warrant? And the second area, whether the allegations made by the hon. gentleman of certain actions of officials of the Department of Justice and/or others reporting to them have and/or do hinder him in the performance of his duties as a member of the House of Assembly. I will take the first area and dispose of that

4739

MR. SPEAKER: before getting on to the second aspect of it.

I draw the attention of hon. members to Beauchesne, Section 106, subsections (1) and (2). And because of the complexity and importance of the matter, I am going to cover what I consider to be the relevant authorities, hopefully not in exhaustive detail but in sufficient detail. To do less on a question of such importance would, I think, be discourteous to hon. members. That section reads: "Although either House may expound the law of Parliament, and indicate its own privileges, it is agreed that no new privilege can be created. In 1704, the Lords communicated a resolution to the Commons at a conference, "That neither House of Parliament have power, by any vote or declaration, to create to themselves new privileges, not warranted by the known laws and customs of Parliament", which was concurred in by the Commons." And the next section: "The dignity and independence of the two Houses are in great measure preserved by keeping their privileges indefinite. If all the privileges of Parliament were set down and ascertained, and no privilege allowed but what was so defined and determined, it were easy for the executive power to devise some new case, not within the line of privilege, and under pretence thereof, to harass any refractory member and violate the freedom of Parliament." The essential elements there of course are that no new privilege can be created and that the independence of the House depends in large measure upon keeping the privileges indefinite

MR. SPEAKER:

or not endeavouring to make an exhaustive enumeration of them.

I have referred for my first guidance to the precedents of this House. The records show that since 1949 nine matters have been referred to the Committee on Privileges, and these matters go from 1950 to 1977, a number dealing with articles in newspapers, one an allegation that pressure had been exerted during an election campaign for certain people to vote a certain way, one that an hon. member had tabled a petition in the House which was forged, and one alleging assault.

None of these matters are certainly germane and in no case did the Committee on Privileges make any report. I go next to the House of Assembly Act which states, section 19:

"The House of Assembly and the members thereof shall hold, enjoy, and exercise such and the like privileges, immunities, and powers as are now held, enjoyed, and exercised by the House of Commons of the Parliament of Canada and by the members thereof."

Section 4 of the Senate and the House of Commons Act, which is what our act refers to, section 4 reads - it is under the heading, "Privileges and Immunities of Members and Officers - "The Senate and the House of Commons, respectively, and the members thereof, respectively, hold, enjoy, and exercise such and the like powers, immunities, and powers as at the time of the passing of the British North America Act 1867, were held, enjoyed, and exercised by the Commons House of Parliament of the United Kingdom and by the members thereof insofar as the same are consistent with and not repugnant to this Act."

"Such privileges, immunities, and powers as are from time to time defined by act of the Parliament of Canada, not exceeding those at the time of passing of such act, held, enjoyed and exercised by the Commons House of Parliament of the United Kingdom

MR. SPEAKER: and by the members thereof respectively."
There is in Canada no statutory definition of privilege apart from that.

I refer hon. members to Bourinot, second edition, chapter 4, Privileges and Powers of Parliament. This reference repeats, does not add to, does not subtract from, what in general is stated in May and Beauchesne, but it is organized in a very concise manner. One particular part of it I would like to read, page 236, "Whatever Parliament has constantly declared to be a privilege is a sole evidence of its being part of the ancient law of Parliament. At the same time it has been clearly laid down by highest authorities that although either House may expound the law of Parliament, and vindicate its own privileges, it is agreed that no new privilege can be created." The chapter does identify some well established privileges with which, to the best of my knowledge, all members are in agreement and I will just enumerate a few to show the nature of them. For example members are protected in their attendance on Parliament, guaranteed against restraint and intimidation in discharge of their duties. They are exempt from serving as jurors and scandalous and libellous reflections on the proceedings of the House are a breach of privilege, freedom of speech of hon. members, a breach of privilege to assault, menace or insult any member when he is coming to or going from the House. There is no need to indicate it all but to indicate the general nature of the privileges.

Bearing in mind the general nature of privilege, the fact that we do not have a statutory definition thereof, I refer to those cases in the House of Commons which, in my opinion, are the closest, they are not identical, but which are the closest. One, and the reference to this is Hansard debates, House of Commons, September 4, 1973, hon. members might recall that

MR. SPEAKER: on two occasions in 1973 Ottawa policemen and members of the RCMP entered the parliamentary office of Flora MacDonald, member of Parliament for Kingston and the Islands. They were seeking information concerning the disappearance of certain files. Before proceeding to the member's office the police officers did not

MR. SPEAKER:

endeavour to obtain the permission of Mr. Speaker. On the first occasion the member's secretary was questioned concerning the member's activities during the preceding twenty-four hours. The member later arranged to meet with the policemen.

A question of privilege was raised by the member concerned in the House of Commons. The matter was referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections. That Committee found the question of privilege to be well-founded and the Report of the Committee and Privileges of the House of Commons states: "It is well established that outside police forces on Parliament business shall not enter the precincts of Parliament without first obtaining the permission of Mr. Speaker, who is custodian of the powers and privileges of Parliament." The case is not totally analogous; the principle is that in order for police officers to enter the precincts of Parliament the permission of the Speaker was required.

Another case I draw to hon. members' attention, again not directly analogous, but somewhat instructive, and the reference to this is the Hansard of the House of Commons, November 29, 1977, when the Speaker informed the House that he had authorized an investigation by the RCMP into the allegations against another member of Parliament. The analogy there is that this is a situation where the Speaker inaugurated an investigation on his own initiative and then informed the party leaderships and informed the House.

I have gone through in detail the House of Commons records for March 6, 1978 and the ensuing days, and this is with reference to an allegation

MR. SPEAKER: of breach of the Official Secrets Act involving Mr. Cossitt, the member for Leeds, the allegation by him that he was under surveillance and the allegation by him that it had been mentioned to him that if he did not return certain documentation, a search warrant might be issued against him. I have gone through it for the purpose of being complete, but the matter remained entirely hypothetical; it never came to a specific issue.

The final case is one involving the Senate of Canada and the reference is Hansard of November 19, 1975 and November 12th of that same year. This was with relation to the Skyshops incident. The RCMP came to the Office of the Speaker of the Senate with a search warrant and asked her permission to execute that warrant. The testimony in Hansard is somewhat confused. When the matter came up on a point of privilege in the Senate, number one, the Speaker was not there - there was a Speaker pro tem.; number two, Senator Giguère himself was not there; and number three, Black Rod, who was involved, somewhat analogous to our Sergeant-at-Arms - maybe he was there, but, obviously, he could not speak. And there is some confusion as to what specifically transpired. Apparently, Black Rod telephoned Senator Giguère. Whether it was on the instructions of the Speaker or not, the record does not make clear; whether it was to inform him of a fait accompli or to advise him, to ask his permission, none of that is clear.

My impression from reading the Hansards - and I have endeavoured to verify this with some officials in Ottawa who were closer to it, and they share my view - was that what can be abstracted from it is that the police did go to the Speaker of the Senate's Office,

May 2, 1978

Tape 1688

EC - 3

MR. SPEAKER: asked for permission and
received it. The attenuating circumstances

Mr. Speaker: are very vague. This could have been a most helpful precedent if the Committee on Privileges, to which there was a motion in the Senate of referral, had in fact ever met. The Committee on Privileges was set up to look into the matter, to make a report, and I am informed, actually by some of the offices of the Senate, that the Committee was not established and it died on the Order Paper. So the value that it could have obviously is not the same as if we had that Committee, but it is something which I obviously must be aware of. So those are the basic cases and the closest ones.

I will make a few references to what some hon. members referred to yesterday and that is the supremacy of Parliament. My understanding of that is that the supremacy of Parliament does not give an immunity to criminal jurisdiction, and certainly the cases, bearing in mind especially the Flora MacDonald one, would bear that out. Also, and I think most hon. members would share this view, that it is a legislative supremacy - obviously the British North America Act gives a division of powers - and also I think most hon. members would agree and, indeed, affirmed this yesterday, that it is a supremacy within the Rule of Law. A couple of examples would be the division of powers, which this House could not change; the requirement of Royal Assent, which this House cannot change; the requirement of an election, say, within a period of every five years, whatever date or month that might come to, these are such things. So obviously it is a legislative supremacy within the Rule of Law.

Finally I would draw to hon. members that in coming to my decision on this matter I had to bear in mind the very specific and particular situation. Hon. members will recall that in the documentation tabled by the hon. gentleman to my right there was, among other things, what I understand to have been and to be an allegation of misconduct or bribery on the part of another hon. member. So there is a very close relationship, in my opinion, between at least part of the allegation in the documentation tabled and our own Standing

Mr. Speaker: Order (77): "The offer of any money or other advantage to any member of the House, for the promoting of any matter whatsoever, depending or to be transacted in Parliament, is a high crime or a misdemeanour." There is, in my opinion, a very real relationship in at least one of the allegations in the documentation tabled and our own Standing Orders. And just to re-enforce that I will quote briefly from a commentary on the Standing Orders before their revision in 1973, which I understand to be a valid commentary on the present Standing Order (77). And the commentary reads quite briefly, "Both the offer and the acceptance of a bribe is a breach of privilege against the House."

So bearing these matters in mind, it is my decision that it is not a breach of privilege of the House for a search warrant to be executed in the precincts with the permission of the Speaker after and if he has assured himself to the best of his ability that it is a valid warrant validly issued. That is the first part of the ruling, and the longest part.

The second area. As I mentioned before I have distinguished in this the allegation by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) that there had been coercion toward him, a form of supervision or surveillance on the performance of his duties, that he was impeded from carrying out his duties as an MHA, that this resulted from, in his opinion, the actions of officials of the Justice Department and/or those reporting to them. This is the essence of the allegation and the submission made by the hon. member and found in yesterday's Hansard.

With respect to a point of privilege, as hon. members know there are two requirements of the Chair; one, that it be brought up at the earliest possible opportunity—that obviously has been fulfilled; the other is frequently put, in my opinion, in a form of shorthand, which says that there be a prima facie case. Some hon. members might recall last year, in March of last year, my giving a ruling on a matter of privilege. I pointed out that the real meaning of that

Mr. Speaker: requirement is, and May affirms it, and the quotation is direct from May, "that the Speaker requires to be satisfied that privilege appears to be sufficiently involved to justify him in giving the matter precedence."

MR. SPEAKER:

In a serious matter I do not use the shorthand 'prima facie.' It has a connotation of a court process, of the examination of evidence, cross examination, calling of witnesses, all of that which is obviously not the function of the Chair. So what I make my decision on is whether I am satisfied that privilege appear to be sufficiently involved to justify me in giving the matter precedence and I do so judge. Therefore the House will have to determine whether it is a breach of privilege; in the shorthand terminology I have decided that there is a prima facie case. The substantive matter has to be judged by the House. What I would recommend - I can only recommend, I cannot require it - is that the matter be referred to the Committee of Privileges which, to the best of my knowledge, is the normal procedure.

In summary, therefore, I have distinguished this matter under two aspects, and I think I should perhaps refer to what I regard to be two of the responsibilities of the Chair: One, to do what can be done to enhance the dignity and the reputation of the House, or, put another way, put negatively, to avoid doing anything which could bring scorn or ridicule on the House; and that I think is the responsibility the Chair has toward the House, if one wishes, collectively, as a collectivity. Another responsibility of the Chair is to maintain the freedom of members. The emphasis here is on the individual aspect of privilege. Sometimes these might appear to be in conflict, they should not ever be in conflict, but they may appear to be a conflict at times. With respect to the first responsibility, I have given my decision. I will add under this category that among the reasons I mentioned for deciding that there was no breach of privilege in the execution of the warrants per se, among those was my judgement, which is all I can exercise, my opinion that in the circumstances, bearing in mind not only the cases cited but bearing in mind what I consider to be the relationship between at least one of the allegations in the documentation tabled and our own

MR. SPEAKER: Standing Orders, bearing in mind that relationship to have refused permission for execution would have run a serious risk of holding the House open to scorn; that also is among my reasons.

In the second part of my decision, I judged that in the allegations made by the hon. gentleman, the matter of privilege is sufficiently involved that it requires the precedence that such a finding makes, that such a finding requires. I do find that there is a prima facie case which means that priority should be given to the matter. My recommendation there is - but it is up to the House - is referral to a Committee of Privileges.

I thank hon. gentlemen for their patience. I was more lengthy than I usually like to be but, as I said earlier, I think it would be improper not to quote all of the authorities of which I am aware.

MR. SPEAKER: Statements by Ministers.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. ROWE: I expected the Government House Leader to rise and make the formal motion required that this matter be referred to the Committee on Privileges, which is not yet set up, so the motion would have to read, "A Committee on Privileges if as and when it is set up." I will gladly yield to him, Sir, if he wants to make such a motion and, as I say, I would gladly second the motion. Without such a motion I would assume that the matter will not be referred to any committee of this House and the thing will die on the vine, which of course we do not want to happen.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the reason why I had not moved was because it is on the Orders of the Day and I intended to call that particular motion later on, but I will now move that the matter be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved that the matter be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

The hon. member.

May 2, 1978

Tape No. 1690

AF-3

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a point of personal privilege, Sir, among very serious matter that has arisen in the light of wild and irresponsible statements that have been made outside of this House by the hon. the Premier, Sir, in radio and television

MR. S. NEARY:

interviews. The one I watched last night, was where the hon. the Premier said that the member for LaPolle was ungentlemanly, was anything but a gentleman, was less than a gentleman in the way that he handled the tabling of these documents. Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to the House, and I should not have to do this because the House already knows, that under the rules of the House I was forced, I had no choice but to table the second document. But there are some things Mr. Speaker, that hon. gentlemen do not know. The hon. the Premier said in his statement that I should have gone to the Minister of Justice or to the hon. the Premier himself to discuss this matter before it was raised in the House. Mr. Speaker, I am going to table documentation, but before I do, Sir, I want to say to hon. gentleman the hon. the Premier has been less than truthful even with his own members; that on more than one occasion, on at least six or seven occasions inside and outside of this House-I raised it inside the House-I met with the Premier behind the curtain; I met with the Premier in his private dining room. I pleaded with the Premier to set up a commission of inquiry into this whole matter and I have the documentation, I have the letters here to prove it. I wrote the Premier as far back as 1976 to have something done about this. I have an acknowledgement of one reply from the Premier where he thanked me for my letter of May 10, 1976 with respect to the Health Sciences Complex "I will take into consideration", he said, "your suggestion that a staff member from the Auditor General's Department be added to any investigation committee. In addition government will take into consideration your two further suggestions with respect to Scrivener Projects Limited before any final terms of reference are indicated to the committee. Signed Frank D. Moores". I have other letters, Sir, that I wrote the Premier. I even

MR. S. NEARY: went as far, Mr. Speaker, as to recommend to the Premier three people to do an inquiry if the hon. gentleman would set up an inquiry.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!
Perhaps I did not catch it when the hon. gentleman got up at first if he is speaking on a point of order or a point of privilege.

MR. S. NEARY: No, personal privilege, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Personal privilege.

MR. S. NEARY: And I have evidence, Sir, that I want to put on the table that I am sure hon. gentleman are not aware of, will probably see for the first time. I have here a letter that I wrote to the hon. Mr. Basford because I could not get any satisfaction in this House or outside of this House from the hon. the Premier in my dealings with the Premier, being so shifty and cagey and not keeping his promises and telling me things that he was going to do that he did not do, that I wrote Mr. Ron Basford, the Minister of Justice and the Attorney General of Canada, and I sent Mr. Basford a copy of the affidavit. I had a reply back from Mr. Basford on May 10, 1976 after bringing it to the attention of the hon. the Premier, and the Minister of Justice in possession of a copy of the document for over a year. And the hon. gentleman says I was anything but a gentleman in this matter, Sir!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!
The hon. member is aware I cannot allow him to debate matters now. If he wishes to state succinctly the matter of privilege, but I could not allow him to get into debate.

MR. S. NEARY: No, Sir. In order to substantiate my point of privilege, Sir, that the hon. gentleman said I am anything but a gentleman, ungentlemanly. The hon. Premier says what I did was ungentlemanly. And I begged and pleaded the hon. gentleman, and the hon. gentleman knows that, without even tabling the affidavit

MR. S. NEARY:

It is the first time, the first time that this affidavit will be laid on the table of the House is now. I refrained. I was too much of a gentleman and that is what has delayed this thing so long. Mr. Basford told me in his letter, he said, "This is to acknowledge with thanks your letter April 15, 1976 with enclosure respecting the construction of the Medical Sciences Complex at St. John's. The matter that you have brought to my attention is indeed serious," says Mr. Basford. "I have referred the enclosed to my officials in the Department of Justice for their further consideration. Once again, thank you for bringing your interest in this matter to my attention." And the last letter I wrote the Premier, I did not get a reply to it, and that had to do, Mr. Speaker - I even went as far as to suggest three names to the hon. gentleman, three names. I did some research because the hon. the Premier had told me behind the curtain "my problem is that I cannot get a man in Canada qualified to do this kind of an inquiry. He has to have training in legal matters, he has to have to know about construction." And I even went as far as to research the names of three people, and I wrote the Premier on April 14, 1977 and I made recommended three names to the hon. gentleman of people whom I thought were qualified to do inquiry and

MR. NEARY: the Premier did not give me the courtesy of giving me a reply to that letter. Now, Mr. Speaker, is that being ungentlemanly? Is that being less than a gentleman? And according to Beauchesne, Sir, you cannot refer to members in this hon. House as being ungentlemanly, less than a gentleman, and I am going to lay this documentation on the table of the House, Sir, the affidavit, the Watergate in Newfoundland that the hon. Premier had in his possession, and the affidavit that the Minister of Justice and the Premier both had in their possession, and Watergate that my hon. friend from Kilbride (Mr. Wells) read back as far as 1972 or '73 and advised Mr. Davidson to take it to the press.

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

MR. NEARY: So I am going to lay this on the table, Sir, to justify my point of privilege. I can tell you, Sir, that I do so only after almost three years of begging and pleading the hon. gentleman to appoint a commission of enquiry under the Public Enquiries Act into this matter.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: On that point of privilege, the point of privilege that is before the Chair is very simple and very restricted, that the Premier allegedly said that the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) operated in an ungentlemanly or less than a gentlemanly manner, That is the only issue that is before the Chair on a point of privilege and I do submit that on a question of privilege the Chair has to deal with the strict point that is raised with it and cannot expand beyond it.

There are two other points, though, to which I must refer. I have heard this last couple of days allegations, particularly from the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), that the provincial Minister of Justice, myself and/or my department, have been in possession of this alleged affidavit. I knew I was not. I knew I had never seen it. But I cannot account obviously for

MR. HICKMAN: everyone in the department so I had a thorough check made today and it is not true. It is not true.

MR. NEARY: The Premier has it because I saw it.

MR. HICKMAN: Well, I am dealing first with the Department of Justice. The allegation was that the Minister of Justice, and/or his department, had in their possession this affidavit. I say to this House now, categorically and without fear of contradiction, this is totally and absolutely untrue.

Now with respect to the second matter, and that is the tabling of the affidavit, I am obliged, as Attorney General, to advise this House that as a result of a statement carried in the press this morning, attributed to the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) that he intended tabling in this House today a document or documents that obviously related to the matter that is presently under investigation by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, on my direction, at my instructions, which I announced here last Thursday, that the police have asked and said that in their opinion the publication of any evidence relating to this matter may seriously impede their investigation. And I would assume that there is no hon. member of this House would want in any way to impede the investigation of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police into a charge.

MR. SIMMONS: (Inaudible) slimey.

MR. HICKMAN: I overheard what the hon. gentleman from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) said, Mr. Speaker, I ask that you direct him to withdraw it before I proceed further.

MR. NEARY: What did he say? What did he say?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! I would require the hon. gentleman to withdraw his statement.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, what is it I am alleged to have said?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I heard the hon. gentleman say some allegation of being slimey. No wonder he is slimey or some such -

MR. SIMMONS: No, Mr. Speaker, what I said was,
Is it any wonder he is known as slimey?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! That would have to
be withdrawn.

MR. SIMMONS: I withdraw it.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am not satisfied with
that. I move, seconded by the hon. member for Green Bay
(Mr. Peckford), that the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay
d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) be expelled for ten sitting days
for conduct unbecoming a member.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would assume that
that is a debatable motion. There are a few words I would like to
say on the subject.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Before I recognize anybody
on the motion I think to keep track of where we are I should
dispense with the matter of privilege previously raised.

MR. NEARY: Before Your Honour dispenses with the
point of privilege, there is one point the hon. gentleman made
that is very, very important and the

MR. NEARY:

hon. gentleman knows full well, Sir, because the hon. gentleman had a meeting with Inspector Murphy this morning, that I informed the RCMP yesterday when they came to my office at my invitation, when I turned over certain documentation to the RCMP, I advised them that in no way was I giving up my rights as a member of this House and that anything that I gave them I would table it in the House. I informed Inspector Murphy I was going to table this document -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, this is very important.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! I cannot allow any further statement on this now.

My understanding, before getting to the motion, to take one thing at a time, because the matter of privilege is up and I cannot just it in suspense, my recollection is the hon. member raised the matter of privilege with respect to what he believed were statements made by the hon. the Premier with respect to himself being ungentlemanly and not having done this or not having done that, or that type of thing.

I regard this matter of privilege as the one defined by May, page 343: "In regard to the explanation of personal matters, the House is usually indulgent, and will permit a statement of that character to be made without any question being before the House." And further on "no debate should ensue thereon, but if another Member is involved in the personal statement, he is generally allowed to give his own view of the matter and to say whether he accepts it or not."

MR. SPEAKER: I regard that it is a personal explanation with respect to what was alleged to have been said about him, and being of that nature, it is not a matter on which the Chair makes any decision, the matter in that form being disposed of.

The motion before the House now is that the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir be suspended for ten sitting days.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Another point of privilege.

MR. NEARY: The hon. the Minister of Justice, Sir, a few moments ago made another one of his false and misleading statements to this hon. House inasmuch as the hon. gentleman through playing with words somehow or other tried to leave the impression with this House that my laying on the table of the House of documentation to substantiate my point of privilege was there was something wrong with it or something bad about it.

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the hon. House that yesterday when Inspector Murphy came to my office with his colleague at my invitation so I could turn over certain files that I had in my office that they had not gotten during the raid or the invasion of the legislative offices, I told them that in no way was I giving up my parliamentary rights as a member of this House and that any documentation that I gave to them I would table it in the House in due course. Inspector Murphy completely agreed with me, Sir - had no hesitation at all - and I told him the information that they had taken from my office the day before, I would lay that on the table today and the other documentation, I would call him on the 'phone and let him know in advance so that they could tell me whether

MR. NEARY: or not they were finished their investigation with these other documents.

I have other documents, Sir, that I will be laying on the table of the House, and before I do so, I will make sure that the RCMP are finished with these documents, have carried out all the investigation necessary in connection with these documents. That agreement I have made with Inspector Murphy even though I did not have to, but I did it anyway, Sir.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of privilege. What I said - and I did not get a chance to finish before the statement was made by the hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir - I simply said that it is my responsibility as Attorney General, and I am discharging that, to advise the House that I had been advised by the police that the making public of any document in connection with this investigation may impede that investigation. I am not suggesting, nor is any member of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, that an hon. gentleman can be prevented or prohibited -

MR. NEARY: All right, I understand that. That is a different matter.

MR. HICKMAN: - and until I was interrupted by that very unparliamentary comment across the way, that is about what I was leading up to. And, Mr. Speaker, I point out to this House that this investigation was ordered by me as a result of matters tabled in this House.

I would assume that there is no hon. member in this House who would like to be a party in any way to impeding the investigation of the

May 2, 1978

Tape 1693

EC - 4

MR. HICKMAN:

Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

MR. NEARY:

Only co-operate.

MR. HICKMAN:

Only co-operate. And I implore
all hon. members to give that total co-operation.

MR. NEARY:

Do not worry. Providing they get
it from the other side too.

MR. HICKMAN:

Secondly, Mr. Speaker,

MR. HICKMAN: when a document is tabled in this House it can, unless Mr. Speaker rules otherwise, become a public document. And what I would ask Your Honour to consider -

MR. NEARY: No covering up.

MR. HICKMAN: - what I would ask Your Honour to consider -

MR. NEARY: No covering up.

MR. HICKMAN: - what I would ask Your Honour to consider in the interest of the administration of justice and the enforcement of the rule of law, and in the interest of an unimpeded investigation by the R.C.M.P. -

MR. NEARY: Newfoundland's answer to Hitler.

MR. HICKMAN: - I would ask Mr. Speaker to consider whether in his opinion this too should be referred to the matter of privileges and elections to advise the Premier -- to advise Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Sit down boy, and do not be so foolish.

MR. HICKMAN: But I have discharged my responsibility, Mr. Speaker. As the Attorney General I advise this House that it is not in the public interest that that document be made public at this time and may impede the -

MR. NEARY: It is public already.
(Inaudible) had it a couple of years ago.

MR. HICKMAN: - investigation by the R.C.M.P. You can do what you like with it, but I have discharged my responsibility toward it.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The motion before the House now, as I understand, because on that previous matter I do

MR. SPEAKER: not really consider that there is a matter of privilege on which the Chair can make a decision. There is some difference of opinion with respect to whether investigations by the Department of Justice would or would not be impeded, or would or would not be hindered, or would or would not be assisted. These are questions of difference of opinion and I do not consider it a point of privilege on which the Chair can make any decision.

If we are not careful our procedures could get somewhat confused. Having stated that with respect to the point of privilege I do not regard it as a point on which the Chair can make any decision, that it is a difference of opinion, if anything, between two hon. members, I would assume we are back to the immediately preceding motion which refers to the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons).

MR. W.N. ROWE: Sir, I rise on a point of personal privilege or personal explanation, as the case may be, but it bears on the same point raised. I say that to Your Honour because I happened to have been in a room yesterday when the persons who are conducting this investigation on the part of the Department of Justice and the police department, the R.C.M.P., Inspector Murphy and his cohort, Constable Taylor, I guess, two fine, admirable gentlemen, sat down around the table and we discussed what evidence it was that they wanted and what we would turn over to them.

We said right at the beginning that we would turn over the evidence and documents and so on with alacrity, as quickly as possible, all they had to do was indicate what they wanted. In doing so we mentioned to Inspector Murphy that there is no way, part of the condition of turning it over would be the reservation to ourselves as

MR. W.N. ROWE: members of this House, our right to lay on the Table of this House all documents which we thought were in the public interest.

Inspector Murphy and his sidekick agreed wholeheartedly with that. As a matter of fact, he said to us, would we mind delaying two or three days in the case of some evidence which we are going to lay before the House so that he would make sure that they had all the loose ends tied up and all the people contacted that they wanted to contact.

Sir, I had to state as a member of this House and as Leader of the Opposition that in no way can I or members of this House give up our solemn duty to the people of this Province to make public what we believe should be made public. We will not, Sir, we will not be the party to any kind of a cover-up of evidence of information which should be public, particularly when the information referred to and tabled today has already been public, or available to the public for a number of months.

MR. NEARY: A year.

MR. W.N. ROWE: The Premier has had a copy of it. It used to be the hottest selling item in St. John's as far as reading material is concerned there about a year ago. I myself saw a copy which I came across from a member of the Press. So, Sir, we are not serving any purpose by trying to cover up this particular evidence except perhaps to save the government some embarrassment. Our duty to the public, Sir, supercedes any wish to save this government any embarrassment.

MR. PECKFORD: To that point of explanation,
Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. PECKFORD:

To that point of explanation.

Once again we see, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Leader of the Opposition and members opposite are abusing the rules like I have never seen them abused before, trying to make a point of privilege and at the same time the Leader of the Opposition qualifies it with a point of explanation.

Now, in response to what the Leader of the Opposition said,

Mr. Peckford:

whatever it is a point of, privilege or a point of information, let us say from this side of the House that there is no intention on behalf of anybody on this side to try, to use his term, to cover up anything. All the Attorney General was trying to do was to point out advice that was given to him. And there is no point to cover up.

AN HON. MEMBER: There is a cover up.

MR. PECKFORD: The point of the documentation, which now is being awfully sensitive to members opposite because I cannot speak in silence, is that the Attorney General and House Leader was saying that perhaps should be referred either to the Committee that will be established today or to the police in whose investigation now this information is relevant.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. PECKFORD: And that is the point. There is no point, Mr. Speaker, of so-called cover up. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition is trying to pretend that he suddenly is the White Knight on the Great Steed who is going to rescue the Island of Newfoundland in some kind of so-called corruption.

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

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: On a point of explanation, may I repeat once again, because I do not want any hon. member to think that I am in any way trying to impede the right of this Parliament to make public any matter that is tabled, in no way, but I do have an obligation as Attorney General to pass on the clear and unequivocal request that came from the RCMP to me today as a result of an article which appeared in this morning's paper. That is all I am doing. I am not suggesting that this House is bound by that request in any way. But please do not interpret that as anything more than the discharge of my responsibility as Attorney General. And I would be very derelict in my duty if I did not bring this to the responsibility of this House, and that I have done.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, to that matter. Sir, I would just like to point out -

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: - to the House one of the letters that I tabled today addressed to the hon. Mr. Basford a year ago. This affidavit has been in the hands of the RCMP for almost one year, in case the hon. gentleman is not aware of it.

MR. HICKMAN: I am not concerned with that.

MR. NEARY: Oh it has. The document tabled today, Sir, -

MR. HICKMAN: This has no relevancy.

MR. NEARY: It is relevant to this, because the hon. gentleman somehow or other is trying to leave the impression because of the story in the morning News that I was going to table this documentation today that it was going to impede the investigation of the RCMP. They have been investigating this for a year. They have had this affidavit for one year.

MR. W. ROWE: It is time it was made public.

MR. NEARY: And the only thing that is new in this, Sir, is the letters between the Premier and myself.

MR. W. ROWE: Make it public.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Again we are in a situation where there is no bona fide matter of privilege. Hon. members have made explanations, and have entered into debate where the rules really do not permit it. I would now require that this procedure, this process cease.

With respect to the request of the hon. Minister of Justice: As I understand it, it was -

AN HON. MEMBER: A motion.

MR. SPEAKER: This is on a different matter. As I understand it there were perhaps two, or it could be understood as two, one with respect to the tabling of the documents. He stated, in his opinion, this would impede certain investigations. And I think he asked hon. members if they would agree that it not be tabled; I think he did. And I think he asked me what action, if anything, I could take on it or I could refer to the Committee on Privileges.

MR. SPEAKER: Looking at it from a practical point of view, purely from a practical point of view, not even considering what rules or precedence I would have to look at, I cannot see any practical difference if it were not public, if it were not tabled. The hon. member, as long as he does not breach anybody's privileges in the House, can read it, yes, can say what he wants.

So the point of procedure I would have to check on. I am not immediately aware of it, to what extent I, you know, have that power of review of documents tabled, to what extent, if at all I have it. But to the best of my knowledge the practical results would be nil -

MR. SPEAKER: to the best of my knowledge the practical results would be nil. So I leave it at that and give a formal decision, certainly this afternoon. If that is unsatisfactory then I will have to make a quick check of authorities. Pending that I will instruct the table to hold the documents and I will have to review and to see, I would certainly assume this afternoon.

We will come back to the motion.

PREMIER MOORES: A point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of privilege.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, regarding the privileges of this House. I believe the record will show clearly and irrefutably that this administration has without failure acted with dispatch in the setting up of judicial enquiries, or police investigations for that matter. Whenever and wherever there have been the slightest suspicion indication or allegation of wrongdoing on the part of the government, on the part of any department or minister or member of the government, or on the part of any agency directly or indirectly involved with government in any way, we have always acted in every instance of alleged wrongdoing, in the most expeditious manner and we will continue to do so if and when it is required. I believe it is fair to say that the performance of this administration in seeking the truth in this regard, with regard to wrongdoing when it has been alleged, is unprecedented. I can give many examples, Sir, such as the Public Works enquiry, the Gros Morne enquiry, the Minister of Industrial Development involvement now and many others.

Mr. Speaker, in each and every instance where there has been even the slightest hint of wrongdoing, let alone criminality this administration, which I have the honour and privilege of leading, acted in this most responsible manner. We have always done this as a matter of policy and we will continue to do it because we believe it is our duty as an elected government. The various judicial

PREMIER MOORES: bodies were appointed because the public in our opinion have a right to the information obtained as a result of any and all investigations initiated by government. Mr. Speaker, there have been instances where commissions of one kind or another were set up to investigate allegations that were made without a shred of proof or evidence and which, in my opinion, were made for reasons which could only be termed political. Nevertheless, government initiated enquiries in an attempt to set the record straight and to eliminate any thought or suggestion of impropriety

Mr. Speaker, as the elected government we have initiated many legislative reforms, and I want to enter them here, such as conflict of interests, the Public Rendering Act and so on. Mr. Speaker, since the commencement of this session of the House of Assembly we have all witnessed a continuous deterioration of behaviour to the point where bitterness and vindictiveness have replaced decency and dignity. We have in recent days seen an attack on individuals which may well mean that they and their families will be stigmatized even though there has been no concrete proof of guilt. A police investigation has been established and still the vicious publicity campaign goes on.

A point of privilege, Sir. It is only last evening that we witnessed what was described as objective reporting. In the Newfoundland Broadcasting Corporation's six o'clock news it was mentioned that there would be an interview with Mr. Andrew Davidson by Randy Simms who had travelled on, we were told, his own time and paid his own expenses. This interview was subsequently aired and it did cast a derogatory image on this House and its members.

Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested that Mr. Simm's ticket was paid for once again by Mr. Charles Silver. Certainly Mr. Simms, as I understand it, went to the counter and picked up the ticket in the same building as -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

PREMIER MOORES: - and that is fact - in the same building as the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) said paid for his ticket, the same man who has been an associate of John C. Doyle for years, Are we supposed to accept this as objective reporting?

Mr. Speaker, we have reason to believe that individuals outside of this Province, individuals who are enemies of the Province and fugitives from Justice, are making a blatant attempt to smear and undermine the honesty and integrity of this administration and certain individuals in the eyes of the general public. We believe these individuals are aligned with the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) district in this particular endeavour.

Mr. Speaker, I now call upon the Leader of the Opposition to ask that a police enquiry be established to investigate what we on this side of the House regard as a number of grave allegations which have come to light in reference to the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) district who is known to be an associate of one Charlie Silver by his own admission, Mr. Silver, who is an associate of one

PREMIER MOORES: member who was an associate of one John C. Doyle, a fugitive from Justice, and a convicted criminal.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of vital questions which have to be asked and answered with regard to the actions of the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) district, and the only course of action, if we are to clear the air in this matter, is to have a police investigation.

Mr. Speaker, we know the hon. member's airplane tickets were purchased by Mr. Silver, who is an associate of Mr. Doyle. A police investigation is required to ascertain (a) did the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) call Mr. Silver and ask for the tickets, or did Mr. Silver just happen to call after the police investigation was announced? (b) Has Mr. Silver ever worked officially for or on behalf of Mr. Doyle? (c) Did the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) meet with Mr. Doyle, or any relatives of Mr. Doyle, during this weekend? Did Mr. Doyle or any of his agents contribute financially or otherwise to the LaPoile member's campaign for the leadership of the Liberal Party? (d) Who paid for the member for LaPoile's trip taken prior to this weekend, - was it Mr. Silver or was it Mr. Doyle?

MR. NEARY: What about my sex life? Do you want to know about that?

PREMIER MOORES: (e) Does any member of the Opposition have any knowledge or have they been party to attempts of extortion by Mr. Doyle, Mr. Davidson or any of their associates?

Mr. Speaker, we have not hesitated to have similar matters investigated by the police and we believe the people of Newfoundland deserve an explanation of this matter.

MR. NEARY: How many times -

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, apart altogether from these matters which I feel should be the part of a police investigation, there are other questions which the dignity and very survival of this parliamentary institution dictate must be answered at

PREMIER MOORES: this time. Number one, did the Liberal caucus concur with the trip taken by the member for LaPoile? And does the Liberal caucus concur with the tactics and the methods used by the member for LaPoile during the past weekend? Two, when the LaPoile member went to see Mr. Doyle sometime earlier this year, the Liberal leader disassociated himself from that particular trip, Does the hon. leader now defend the actions of Mr. Doyle or the hon. member for LaPoile and what Mr. Doyle stands for?

MR. NEARY: In what -

PREMIER MOORES: Three, does the Leader of the Opposition condone any or all of these actions of his colleague? These are questions that must be answered.

MR. NEARY: Name the -

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, all parties must clean up their acts and prove to the people of this Province that all political parties, certainly the major ones, are above suspicion of any dishonesty.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: The mugs game will not work, 'Frank'.

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

MR. NEARY: Where is the fat man to these days? He speaks for the Premier. Fatso MacLean, where is he to these days?

PREMIER MOORES: Ask John Doyle.

MR. NEARY: No, ask John Shaheen and ask the hon. gentleman, trying to make a deal for Doyle.

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

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I will not cast any reflections on Your Honour but I was very surprised at that document just read by the hon. the Premier.

MR. NEARY: Written by Mr. Callahan.

MR. W. ROWE: Written by God knows who.

MR. NEARY: His hatchet man, his propoganda machine.

MR. W. ROWE: But, Sir, that document, read by the hon. the Premier, and the Premier now associates himself with it - and, Sir, I ask for the same leeway as Your Honour gave the Premier in making these few remarks - is Sir, the most disgraceful document I have ever heard in this hon. House in the eight or ten years that I have been here and in twenty years of reading the Hansard of this House.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible). Come on!

MR. W. ROWE: A disgusting, disgraceful -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. W. ROWE: Now, Sir, we listened in silence to the hon. the Premier -

MR. MORGAN: You do not want to come clean.

MR. W. ROWE: - listened to the hon. the Premier, I would assume I would be accorded the same courtesy, if Your Honour would not mind enforcing the rules in that regard. A disgusting display, Sir, by a man who calls himself Premier of this Province. Obviously the last, desperate gasp of a government, which feels the net tightening. It is obvious that that is what is going on, Sir.

There is already a police enquiry underway which the Minister of Justice stood up and said is going to cover all members of this House, Sir.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. W. ROWE: Any member who is guilty of any wrong doing with regard to this matter is going to be covered by that investigation and, Sir, we welcomed that investigation. We demanded the investigation. We welcomed it when it was announced. It is not up to me, Sir, to be saying when investigations are going to be held by police or not, That is a duty of the Minister of Justice, who has

MR. W. ROWE: allowed himself to be usurped by the Premier in a scandalous political manner.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. ROWE: If I were the Minister of Justice, Sir, I would resign from this House in humiliated disgrace after hearing his colleague, the Premier, make that utterance here today. Sir, if he wants to set up an investigation concerning my colleague, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), or myself, or my colleague the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons), or the member for Lewisporte (Mr. White), or any member of this side of the House, Sir, if the Premier or the Minister of Justice, I say to him now, set up the police investigation if he wants a public enquiry concerning any member of this House,

MR. W. N. ROWE: including myself, my colleague from LaPoile, my colleague from Eagle River or any member of this House, I say to the Minister of Justice, I demand that if the Minister of Justice has any evidence whatsoever of wrongdoing on the part of myself or any member of this House, report it to the police and set up an investigation. I ask him to do that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. N. ROWE: And I would like to see what he says, Sir, in reply to that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. N. ROWE: Any evidence of wrongdoing, Sir, set it up.

AN HON. MEMBER: Set it up, come on.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Set up a police investigation. There is already one in existence which we called for and which the hon. the Minister of Justice delayed calling for twenty hours or forty hours as the case may be.

AN HON. MEMBER: - sat on it.

MR. W. N. ROWE: It should have been called immediately. The result of that, I do not say deliberately or negligently or anything else, but the result of that has been that one of the prime witnesses concerned in the case is not now in this Province, I understand from secondary sources. That was the result of that delay.

Now, Sir, if there is any evidence of criminality on the part of any member of this House -- the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Cross), the member for Green Bay (Mr. Peckford), the member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells), the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), the member for Twillingate district (Mr. W. N. Rowe) - if there is any evidence of criminality then I say set up a police investigation and have that investigated.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. W. N. ROWE: Do not, Sir, allow the Premier of this Province in a last, desperate attempt to cling on to the shreds of power he has left, under the guise of a point of privilege, get up here and slander, Sir, members in this House, slander people outside this House in a blatant political attempt to cover up, Sir, the wrongdoing which is now starting to be exposed with document after document. And, Sir, it will be exposed. I am committed, my colleague is committed, every member on this side of the House is committed, Sir, to exposing corruption and rottenness in government wherever it may occur.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. N. ROWE: And we will continue that. We will not be intimidated by blatant smear campaigns by the Premier or anyone else. We will not be, Sir, intimidated as a result of a timorous Minister of Justice who will allow his colleagues to do anything in a public political way rather than carry out his duties as Minister of Justice. We have now seen the desperation of that minister when he gets up in a fit of pique because of some innocuous remark made over on this side of the House and make a motion to suspend the member for ten days - perhaps, Sir, the largest penalty ever asked for anything in this House in my memory. That is the Minister of Justice, Sir, we have defending our integrity and our justice and our rights in this House, in this Province, Sir? What can we expect from it? I will tell you what we expect from it - we expect the slanderous, political, blatant attempts by a desperate Premier, Sir, to smear everyone in this House and outside the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

In my opinion there have been quite grave abuses of rules on both sides this afternoon and the question comes up of how long it can continue. Obviously, when it happens on one side, another side reciprocates and it keeps going, and one endeavours to balance out, I suppose, the breaches as well as the observances. But I consider the points of privilege raised - most of them, not all of them necessarily - most of them. Some were for legitimate explanation, some to get into debate, but I cannot allow the procedure to continue. As far as I know there has always been a quid pro quo, there has always been at least one response. And I cannot continue to allow this to occur.

Now there is a matter which I do have to decide. I would not inevitably adjourn to do that, but I think it might be a good idea to do so. I am going to adjourn for fifteen minutes and I will give my decision on that other rather technical matter. I say in the interim that I will not allow continuation of this process on either side and I will ask hon. members to realize, whatever differences of opinion there are between them, that there has to be some continuity and order in the Legislature and that they share that responsibility in maintaining it. It is certainly not all on the one out of fifty-one - fifty-one of us share that together. And I ask for and require the co-operation of the other fifty.

The House stands adjourned for fifteen minutes.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

On the technical point on which I to make a decision the only reference, and this reference does not solve the problem, is Beauchesne 159 - 3 "It has been admitted that a document which has been cited ought to be laid upon the table of the House, if it can be done without injury to the public interest". Our practice to date has always been that that is with respect to a claim made by a minister with respect to a state document that it is not in the public interest. In this situation, hon. gentlemen on one side stating that it is not in the public interest and hon. gentlemen on the other side denying that, or saying that it is in the public interest, no authority that I am aware of or cited to me which would give me authority, discretion to examine documents and to come to that decision. I would have to call witnesses, I would have to listen to their evidence and come to a substantive decision. In the absence of any such authority cited to me or of which I am myself aware, because even if it is not cited to me what I am aware of I obviously have an obligation to apply, in the absence then the documents tabled would be treated as any other documents tabled.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

Oh, before we get there, there was a motion with respect to the Committee.

MR. HICKMAN:

Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Justice,

MR. HICKMAN:

The motion that I made today with respect to the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons), is made on the assumption that there was not an unequivocal withdrawal of the unparliamentary remark made by the member, and I seek Your Honour's guidance on that.

MR. SPEAKER: My understanding, and the House -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

The House can be noisy at time, but my understanding was that when required to withdraw the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons), and I ask him to assent whether my understanding is correct, or to inform me by nodding his head, but that is my recollection that he did unequivocally withdraw.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the situation which has now been set up, created by the Minister of Justice, puts me in a very awkward position, because he has conditioned his motion. I would have hoped, Mr. Speaker, that the motion would stand. I hoped it would not pass, but I hoped it would stand. It is up to the House to decide whether it passes. I want an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to defend myself, to demonstrate to the House why it is the Minister of Justice wants me expelled from the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!
All hon. members are aware when certain leniency is given things which can develop. So the situation is a very straightforward one and all I will do is affirm my belief and my knowledge that in fact the hon. member did withdraw.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, may I have one more sentence.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, I will hear the hon. member very briefly.

MR. SIMMONS: I was saying that I was placed in a fairly awkward position. I made a withdrawal. The minister made his motion after that, so what he alleges today, now, is a little hard to understand. But for the purpose of getting the motion, Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of getting the motion on - because he has put it down and I am not going to let him withdraw it on any condition - I will now say that my withdrawal is no more unequivocal than he understood it to be when he made the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. F. WHITE: Let us have it out.

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

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

MR. W. ROWE: A point of order, Sir.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege,
just for clarification, Your Honour.

MR. W. ROWE: Well now what is this?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Actually I think
the hon. gentleman did sort of show his hand there by getting inside
a point of order by saying a point of privilege for clarification, and
that required that I cut him off there. Now the hon. gentleman to
my right does have -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order! I think
there are times when I have to restrict hon. members. Now the
hon. gentleman to my right did stand on a point of order and
nobody else was standing at the time, I will hear briefly that
point.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. ROWE: The point of order is this, Sir,
A motion has been made by the Government House Leader which now is
before this House. We all remember the steps which led up to
it, a remark made by my hon. colleague, a request that it be
withdrawn, a demand by Your Honour that it be withdrawn, a withdrawal,
and after the withdrawal, Sir, a withdrawal which has been accepted,
the type of withdrawal which has been accepted 100 times in this
hon. House, after that the hon. House Leader in a fit of pique,
obviously, says, "That is not good enough. I hereby move that the
hon. member be, seconded by -," he was so upset he could not even

Mr. W. Rowe: identify his colleagues there, seconded by somebody that the member be expelled for ten days. Now, Sir, there is a motion before this House which the Minister of Justice is now embarrassed about, ashamed of, and wishes to withdraw. And, Sir, in order for that to be withdrawn it needs unanimous consent of this hon. House.

MR. NEARY: And he is not going to get it.

MR. W. ROWE: And he is not going to get it, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. ROWE: He has to stand, Sir, on the consequences of his own actions as foolish and as silly as they may be.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order. First of all there was comment made across the House. Secondly, there was a response from the hon. Government House Leader. Thirdly, a few minutes ago, to my knowledge, Your Honour, a few minutes ago -

MR. SPEAKER: I assure the hon. gentleman that only my ears are necessary.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, I am just interested in that Your Honour does hear what I have got to say on the point of order. A few minutes ago Your Honour indicated that he, Your Honour, Mr. Speaker, accepted that there was an unequivocal withdrawal. Now, Mr. Speaker, on the second point the House Leader indicated that he would take guidance from Your Honour as to whether there have been an unequivocal withdrawal. Now these things have all been settled. Whether the hon. member wishes to come forward again and indicate that he wants to precipitate the matter further by almost suggesting to Your Honour and to the House that in fact he did not have an unequivocal withdrawal, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you, is precipitating debate unnecessarily.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: And I will go further and ask Your Honour's guidance

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: - Your Honour's guidance even further, when the hon. House Leader made his motion, at the time he made his motion, I am just wondering the legitimacy or the order in which the motion was made. I just raise that point for Your Honour's response, because the motion was made when the Leader of the Opposition-or the hon. House Leader rather was on his feet on a point of order, if I recall or on a question of privilege. He did not rise and seek Your Honour's consent to rise to make a motion. Now I just raise the question because what we are seeing here is an effort to precipitate debate unnecessarily because the House Leader has already indicated that he is satisfied with Your Honour's guidance, and Your Honour said that he was satisfied that the matter had been withdrawn.

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

MR. NEARY: Two on one side, and one on the other side.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, the -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I will have to ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw that. There are always an equal number of people, in most cases an equal number, usually an alternation. I cannot allow the inference of favouritism.

MR. NEARY: I apologize to the Chair, I thought it was back and forth, Your Honour, but maybe I misunderstood.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, my remarks will be directed entirely on the point of order, of course, to the question of whether or not there is a motion before the Chair. The point is that the motion was made by the hon. the Government House Leader at a time when a point of privilege was under discussion. It is my understanding, and my submission, Your Honour, that when a point of privilege is under discussion nothing else can be entertained, no motion can be entertained, because the point of privilege takes complete precedence, and the point of privilege must be disposed of before anything else can be dealt with.

Mr. Wells:

So therefore it is my submission, Mr.

Speaker, that the motion itself was out of order at the very time it was made. And, of course, if that is correct, if I am correct in that submission, there is no motion before the Chair, and Your Honour is placed in the position of ruling that that is so. If another motion is made, and we want a big row this afternoon, well that is fine. That is something that can be dealt with then. But as far as this motion is concerned, I do believe and suggest to Your Honour that it is completely out of order.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to
speak to the point of order. I think I have seen it all
now, Mr. Speaker. In the last few minutes I have seen it
all.

Mr. Speaker will recall
that on several times during which there were interposing
points of order he reminded the House on a number of
occasions that there was a motion before the Chair. At
that point, Mr. Speaker, there was never any question in
anybody's mind about the legitimacy of the motion. Mr.
Speaker had accepted the motion as being in order and on
several occasions directed the House's attention to it
as the next order of business.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. MORGAN: He was speaking on the point
of privilege, do you not know that?

MR. SIMMONS: So there is no question that
the motion was before the Chair. If members on either side
want to debate whether Mr. Speaker made a proper decision,
there is a method for doing that. I suggest that it is not
the way that the member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) just did it.
But there is a motion before the Chair, as I understand it.
I repeat, on several occasions Mr. Speaker drew the House's
attention to the fact of the motion as being the next order
of business.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. SIMMONS: I rose on one occasion to
begin the debate on that motion and took my seat only because
there was another point of privilege which took precedence
over the debate on the motion before the Chair.

MR. NEARY: So let us get on and prove our case.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I want the motion to stand. I cannot understand for the life of me - and I am only half tongue-in-cheek - I cannot understand for the life of me why the government members are so anxious now to find a technical reason to remove it from the order of business of the House.

The withdrawal I made is no more equivocal now, or no less equivocal now than at the time I made the withdrawal.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Which was not satisfactory to any of them.

MR. SIMMONS: After making the withdrawal - Mr. Speaker, the sequence of events is important here. It was not as though the Government House Leader was out of the House at the time I made the withdrawal, or was preoccupied by some other exchange. He was listening intently to me and retorted after I had made my withdrawal that that was not good enough.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I say to you that my withdrawal now is no more equivocal or no less equivocal than it was at that moment in time. And following that moment in time is when the Government House Leader rose and made his motion which was duly seconded.

Mr. Speaker, another point which I believe is a new one. There is no such thing in this House or any House of Parliament as a conditional motion. You do not get up and move something on condition that the sun still shines till its passed, or on condition this, or on condition that. Do we understand, Mr. Speaker, that when the Government House Leader brings in a motion for Supply that there is a hidden condition that he is going to tell us about it some point down the road? That he really

MR. SIMMONS: made the motion only on condition that certain other conditions apply? How ridiculous, Mr. Speaker! We either have a motion which is a motion or it is not a motion.

As I understood it - I have know the Minister of Justice for a long time and as I understand it, when he stands to make a motion he knows what he is doing, he makes a motion, and he had his homework done this time. I suggest that the incident which I gave him involuntarily was one that he grabbed onto at the moment but I think he knew full-well beforehand that he was going to make a motion and who was going to second the motion, and he just needed an occasion. So with forethought - and forget the argument about forethought because that is an opinion of mine, But, regardless of forethought, in the fashion which he is accustomed to in this House, and which we know him for, he rose properly and he put a motion, he moved a motion which was properly seconded.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Beauchesne, paragraph 49 on page 162, of the fourth

MR. R. SIMMONS:

edition Beauchesne "A member who has made a motion," No reference there to a conditional motion or a probable motion or a motion that you later regret or a motion that you think on retrospect is inadvisable or not very politically smart but a motion, Mr. Speaker, it says "A member who has made a motion may withdraw the same only by the unanimous consent of the House". Mr. Speaker, I submit to you and through you to the Government House Leader that if he wants to withdraw the motion he now notify the Chair that he wishes to withdraw it and then test the House to see whether he has unanimous consent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Pardon?

MR. R. SIMMONS: Could I have just another word? I covered earlier in my comments the matter of the motion being in order, I submit, and did at that time, that the motion was in order by virtue of the fact that Mr. Speaker had attempted to call that order of business on several occasions. In the unlikely event that the motion is technically out of order, which I do not subscribe to, but in that unlikely event I believe the House Leader owes it to me as the member whom he has maligned in his motion, owes it to me to put the motion down properly, if he does not think it is not down properly now, to put the motion down properly and to have it debated. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not anxious to have that motion passed. I was sent here to represent some people and I would like to stay here for those ten days but equally, Mr. Speaker, I want the opportunity to defend myself on this one and I believe it should be given to me. So if there is any technical reason why the motion cannot stand let the Minister of Justice have the courage, Mr. Speaker, to put down a motion about which there is no doubt in terms of its acceptability.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do not wiggle out it.

May 2, 1978

Tape 1703

DW - 2

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

This is a technical matter. It is not particularly difficult, it is just a matter of checking if there are few technical matters here. It is not a question of great judgement. There are a few technical matters but one wants to be right. The House stands adjourned for ten minutes.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

On giving the decision it might be helpful just to review chronologically the sequence of events. When the House opened I gave a ruling on a matter of privilege - twenty or twenty-five minutes. After that the hon. Minister of Justice moved that the matters referred to therein be referred to the Committee on privileges. Immediately there was a point of privilege to my right and hon. members spoke on it. Then there was another point of privilege, and somewhere during submission on points of privilege the hon. gentleman to my left said, I move that the hon. member be expelled or suspended for ten days.

In argument on this matter there were submissions. Number one, that it should be debated whether it was technically in order or not. Of course, that is not a matter which I can get involved in. And it was submitted that since there was debate on a point of privilege, or a point of privilege is before the House, another motion could not be put. And in counter argument to that it was stated that the Chair had put it. Actually, with respect to that motion being in order or not, the Chair had no time or opportunity to turn its mind to it at all. But actually there is a very basic and technical reason the motion is out of order, and that is Standing Order 29: "Twenty-four hours notice shall be given of a motion for leave to present a Bill, resolution or address, or for placing a question on the Order Paper." There is only one situation with respect to a motion of suspension where notice is not required and that procedure was not in process. There is no notice of that motion so therefore it would -

MR. SIMMONS:

Which Standing Order?

MR. SPEAKER:

Twenty-nine.

MR. SPEAKER: Statements by Ministers.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of privilege.

MR. WHITE: You wanted to throw him out a minute ago and now you will not let him talk.

MR. SIMMONS: If I may just take a moment, because this all happened very quickly. I just want to make sure that I understood the implications of Standing Order 29 to which Mr. Speaker referred. It says that twenty-fours notice shall be given of a motion for leave to present a Bill or for placing a question on the Order Paper.

Mr. Speaker, my point of personal privilege is that the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Hickman), the Government House Leader earlier this afternoon in attempting to move a motion which was later ruled to be technically out of order, in attempting to move that motion to have me expelled from the Chamber for ten days has, in so doing, cast aspersions on my performance in the House and I should have a full opportunity to debate that issue, as I am sure other members of the House would want to debate the issue.

MR. WHITE: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: There are two possible ways of doing this, Mr. Speaker. We can assume, and the Government House Leader can affirm that this is the case if he wishes, we can assume that under Standing Order 29 that he has today given

MR. SIMMONS:

notice, and again, if that is a technical problem let him have the courage now to give notice. I make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that I am not asking the majority of the members of the House to flick me out of the House, I want to be here, I was sent here to do a job. That is not the issue right now, Mr. Speaker, The issue is whether the Government House Leader is now going to follow through on his intention to give the House, and this is all really he did, he did not decide to flick me out because it is not his to do, but what he did, Mr. Speaker, whatever the technicality is, what he did was give notice that he wished to debate the issue of whether I should be in the House or out during the next ten days; that is the issue. He gave notice that he wished to have debated the question of whether or not I should be in the House for the next ten days, Whether or not that question is carried is up to a majority of the members of the House.

His having given notice, and perhaps it was improper in the parliamentary sense and perhaps he would have to do it formally now, but his having given verbal notice that he wished to have that matter debated, I think it is less than courageous on the part of the Government House Leader to now attempt to get out of it on a technicality. I would appeal to him, I would appeal to him to give notice that he intends to put that motion down tomorrow, that I and maybe other members of the House can have a full opportunity to debate the question which he has raised verbally, namely, whether I should be in the House for the next ten days or not. I have said it is a matter of personal privilege, I do not have any motion, I would be prepared to move the appropriate motion that the minister be instructed to give the appropriate notice.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the House can instruct anybody to do anything. It can instruct that I leave here for the next

May 2, 1978

Tape No. 1705

AH-2

MR. SIMMONS: ten days. I am sure, therefore, Mr. Speaker, it can instruct that a member of the House do something. If he does not wish to do it that is another issue, that is not the motion. Perhaps the member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells), who looks so all-wise in these matters, can -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: - tell us the issue. The issue I want to make,

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: - the point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, because I am prepared to move -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I must require the hon. gentleman when the Chair interrupts to take his seat. I realize it is human nature that members do not wish to be interrupted, but there are times when the Chair has to do it and has to insist. I must require the hon. gentleman to avoid debate and to keep his remarks relevant. I would think he has explained in quite some detail. I would ask him to conclude his remarks on this point.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I persisted because I was about to come to my closing sentence which was mainly that I am prepared to move the appropriate motion. I was wondering out loud and I now realize that in that respect it was a silly thing to think that the House or anybody else could legislate courage when it comes to the hon. minister. But I would move the appropriate motion as is required under a matter of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I do not consider that this is a matter on which the Chair is involved or make any decision.

ooo

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the point of order is that the minister this afternoon for some time, using fairly intimidating

MR. SIMMONS: tactics, cluttered up the procedure of the House by giving notice that he was going to put a motion. Now I ask him as the Government House Leader does he intend to put down that motion or does he not intend to put it down or does he have the guts to put it down? What is wrong with him all of a sudden?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! This is a matter which does not involve the Chair and is not a point of order. If there is going to be notice of motion or not notice of motion of this matter, it does not form part of a matter of order and does not involve the Chair and no decision of the Chair can be made on it.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. ROWE: We are getting there, Mr. Speaker. Sir, I will see now if I can ask a question of the Premier and get a sensible answer from him. In view, Sir, of the very serious matter, Sir, I hope that the Premier will deal with it very seriously. In view, Sir, of the recent application by a private company, Newfoundland Light and Power Company for a 10.3 per cent increase on the average in rates on top of a 8.3 per cent increase recently granted apparently by the Public Utilities Commission, I would ask the Premier what steps will the government take on behalf of the poor, harried, harassed consumers of this Province

MR. W.N. ROWE:

to prevent this further increase in the cost of their electricity, Sir, from taking place.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES:

Mr. Speaker, first of all

the Public Utilities Board, as the hon. member well knows, is set up to give an unbiased judgement of what rate increases are appropriate and which ones are not. Whether they will rule in favour of this or not is something that remains to be seen. We are concerned about the rate increases for electricity the same as any other government today. Even when we look at Nova Scotia, I think it is something like 50 per cent that their rates are going up to their highest in Canada today. It is not something, Sir, that we as a government want to see. We will do everything we can about but until the Public Utilities Board have analyzed the situation of the application, until they have made a finding, it certainly would be inappropriate to take any other position.

MR. W.N. ROWE:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W.N. ROWE:

The answer, Sir, to the question which I addressed to the Premier by the Premier is the government will be doing nothing. If I am wrong in that, Sir, let the Premier correct me. Sir, let me ask the Premier this. Is it the intention of the government to at least take the elementary step, the basic step of intervening before the Public Utilities Board with legal and technical advice in order to try at least to put a stop to this attempted and unwarranted increase by Newfoundland Light and Power Company Limited?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of detail I would ask the Minister of Mines and Energy, who has more backup than I do at his fingertips, Sir, to answer the question.

MR. S. NEARY: Who is running the Province?

MR. E. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not John Doyle.

MR. E. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. Premier has already indicated this is an application by Newfoundland Light to the Public Utilities Board and we will not know what rate increase that the Public Utilities Board will bring down, number one. Number two, part of the supplementary that the Leader of the Opposition asked, 'Will the Government entertain the notion or the idea to intervene?' In response specifically to that question, Mr. Speaker, we do now intervene in an indirect way because the Government does finance the Federation of Mayors and Municipalities who have taken up the cudgel, if you will, to represent the majority of consumers in this Province, and it is through this agency, because we fund it to a large degree, that we think the consumers are getting a fair and decent intervention into any applications by Newfoundland Light. It might also interest the Leader of the Opposition to know that sample monthly electricity bills across this country show that Vancouver, for example, comes out at around Twenty-four Dollars and Ninety-eight Cents; Edmonton is a little over Twenty Dollars; Regina is Twenty-one Dollars; St. John's, Newfoundland is Twenty-two Dollars; Charlottetown is Forty-six Dollars; Yellowknife is Thirty Dollars; Halifax is Twenty-seven Dollars. So, when one puts it in proper national perspective, albeit that our electrical bills are higher than they were years ago and months ago even, it is still a good pointer to indicate that in relation to other parts of Canada we still have very reasonable electrical rates, given all the circumstances.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, original questioner.

MR. W.N. ROWE: I am glad to see the Minister of Mines and Energy is in favour of this increase or at least wants to bring us up to some national average, if I can draw that -

MR. PECKFORD: Do not miscontrue -

MR. SIMMONS: That is what you said.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W.N. ROWE: Sir, let me by way of preamble mention to the hon. Minister of Energy that we also have one of the lowest income levels in Canada, Sir, and we in this Province can least afford to pay any increase in electricity rates. Let me by way of -

MR. MURPHY: First time I have heard of it.

MR. SIMMONS: You were in Florida, how would you know?

MR. W.N. ROWE: Let me by way of further preamble -

MR. S. NEARY: Down in Sarasota the rates are lower.

MR. MURPHY: Definitely higher down there

MR. S. NEARY: Are they?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. W.N. ROWE: Ten weeks at the Government's expense, you know, takes care of some of the cost.

MR. SIMMONS: He was not on salary down there, was he?

MR. W.N. ROWE: I hope not.

Let me, also, by way of preamble, Sir, to my supplementary question mention to the hon. Minister that thousands of people in this Province were encouraged by Government and companies and by the Hydro Corporation to invest and get involved in electrical heating in the Province on the promise, Sir, the electrical rates would remain low in this Province which, of course, was a promise which again was not kept. But, Sir, my question is this,

MR. W. N. ROWE:

and I address this to the Premier and I hope the Premier will answer it instead of - you know, Who is on control over there, Mr. Speaker?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Nobody.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Let the Premier answer it on his own.

The feasibility, Sir, of the government taking over Newfoundland Light and Power Company - a study to determine the feasibility of that step by the government - Will the government take that step in order to see whether, in fact, this is the most efficient and cheapest way to distribute electricity to the consumers of this Province? Or whether, perhaps, by the removal of the middleman, the distributor - because all generation now takes place directly or indirectly by Newfoundland and Labrador Power Corporation, Sir - whether by the removal of this middleman there would be a decrease in the electrical costs to the consumers of this Province? Will the government get involved in a feasibility study to determine that essential question on behalf of the electrical consumers of this Province?

MRS. McISAAC: You are a real Premier -

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for St. George's (Mrs. McIsaac) for that comment. It is unlike her.

Mr. Speaker, I might say that Nova Scotia Light and Power was taken over by the government and the rates have gone up faster than anywhere else in Canada.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Not for that reason.

PREMIER MOORES: But also, yes, there was a feasibility study done on the taking over of Newfoundland Light and Power, a very substantial one, at the same time as the Churchill Falls-Brinco negotiation was going on.

AN HON. MEMBER: When was that? (inaudible)

PREMIER MOORES: No, it was about five years ago. All aspects of which was the best method of creating and distributing electricity in the Province was looked at and it was decided at that time, Sir, and I do not think the position has changed, that this was as reasonable a way to do it as any. We found that private enterprise operated in the distribution system certainly as efficiently, if not more efficiently, than government could, and, Sir, the difference is philosophical. The party on this side of the House believes in private enterprise as opposed to nationalization which the hon. member suggested.

MR. W. ROWE: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Is that why the government took over Brinco at the cost of hundreds of millions of dollars of public monies

MR. NEARY: The member says the best comrade citizen we had, the member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) on the tapes.

MR. W. ROWE: Oh, yes. The member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) will have some words to say about that, Sir, when the documents are tabled, on that takeover and what he thought of it.

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

The hon. gentlemen to my right and to my left are not permitted now to enter into debate but to ask questions and to answer them.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. ROWE: Sir, let me ask the Premier's comment or response to this particular question. The general manager of the Newfoundland Light and Power Company has said that one of the reasons, one of the prime reasons for an increase being necessary in the rate of electricity now is that the cost of electricity has gone up so much that it has had the effect of decreasing the amount of electricity used which by way of a vicious circle has increased the overall costs and therefore they must go to the people once more to look for an additional increase in the cost of electricity which will in turn have the effect of decreasing, depressing usage once more and we will see the company back in another four or five months or even sooner for another increase to take into account the fact that electricity use, Sir, is being depressed again. In other words, we have got ourselves into a vicious circle situation and it is the consumer, Sir, who is being mashed to death in this vicious circle.

Now I ask the Premier if his administration is prepared to do anything either by way of takeover of the company or by way of enquiring into this problem, this vicious circle that we are now afflicted with and which the consumers are suffering from, if the government is going to try to do anything to get the consumers of electricity in this Province, Sir, who have to pay higher and higher rates for a basic commodity, to get the consumers of this Province out from under in this vicious circle or whether he intends, as he has indicated earlier, to allow the circle to continue and continue until we do find ourselves in the position where people in this Province, even now and certainly in the future, will be forced to go cold in our climate.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, first of all the federal government and ourselves have both been talking about conservation of power. This vicious circle that he talks about, that the President of the Newfoundland Light and Power has talked about, is one of people using less power. That is understandable with the prices like they are; of course, people are conserving power. And also of course the less that is used in demand by a company, that is depending on a certain volume, once again that in time, I would suggest, will adjust itself. But in the meantime, Sir, whilst it will adjust itself in time as any of these things do, also any additional power we have created in the Island part of the Province has been very, very costly. It has either been thermal or very expensive hydro development.

Premier Moores:

Hinds Lake, for instance, will be very expensive power. The new thermal units going on at Holyrood once again are very expensive power. And, Sir, I might suggest when the discussion took place about BRINCO that was taken over for two reasons; one, to get the water rights; secondly, to get the generation of power as a natural resource as opposed to a distribution -

MR. PECKFORD: Right.

PREMIER MOORES: - thirdly, to get thousands, tens of thousands of acres or square miles of land that were tied up, and also for government to finance the Lower Churchill, or whatever river in Labrador, so that we could insist that the power be brought to the Island part of the Province to lower the cost rather than give it away as had been done before.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NOLAN: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Conception Bay South, a supplementary.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder would the hon. the Premier consider, because this is a very serious matter which is not going to die here in this House by merely chitchat back and forth, would the Premier consider the feasibility or otherwise of appointing a committee of this House to look into any information or studies that may have already been collected four or five years ago, any additional information that we can now lay our hands on with the power to call the necessary expertise, and so on, a committee of this House to look into the possibility and feasibility of nationalizing the Newfoundland Light and Power? I realize the Premier says that he is for free enterprise. We all are. But the thing is that the people of this Province, and I am sure the Premier will agree, are most suspicious of, one, the Power Corporation, and Newfoundland Light and Power. Newfoundland Light and Power has a monopolistic position. Why will not the Premier agree then to set up a committee of this House? I am sure he can see the benefits of it.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, exactly those terms of reference are the terms of reference as set up for the Public Utilities Board, and that is hopefully what they are doing as an independent body. And with all due respect, Sir, with the happenings of the past few weeks I would suggest exposing ourselves to each other is enough without exposing any poor innocent company to the same thing.

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary to the minister, with a short preamble, is that one of the reasons, and probably the greatest reason that we are seeing increases by Newfoundland Light is because Newfoundland Hydro is continually increasing the charge to Newfoundland Light for the power that Newfoundland Hydro is generating.

Now roughly a year ago in this House the Minister of Industrial Development indicated that there were negotiations ongoing with ERCO, Price (Nfld.), Bowaters, with a view to increasing the revenue from those companies to Newfoundland Hydro, which if in effect came about could possibly have the affect of reducing the cost of electricity to Newfoundland Light. Would the Premier or the Minister of Energy indicate what the status of those negotiations are? And how long we will expect to be subsidizing ERCO, Bowaters, and Price to the limit we are?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, it is a simplistic suggestion to indicate that some increase necessarily, some increase in industrial power necessarily means a reduction in domestic power. That is a very simple way of doing it. I know it demonstrates it in a dramatic fashion, but it is very simplistic now.

On the idea of the Long Harbour, ERCO situation, there is a committee that is now meeting with ERCO with the idea of increasing their price for power. As everybody knows, Mr. Speaker, there is an agreement that was signed by the former administration

Mr. Peckford: for the supply of power to that operation. That is a firm contract.

MR. MURPHY: What price?

MR. PECKFORD: It is at around two or two and a half mils. The company has indicated that they are willing to sit down and negotiate with the government and show the government all the information and data concerned with that operation that as soon as it turns around and makes a dollar they are willing to negotiate higher power prices. That is the Long Harbour situation. Those meetings are continuing right now, and we are getting additional information, and hopefully we will have something to report very soon on it.

On the Price (Nfld.)-Bowaters situation, it is a tiny bit different. They are paying a lot more for their power than is Long Harbour, let us be clear on that, that Price (Nfld.) and Bowaters are not getting cheap power in the same way as Long Harbour is or in the same way as Hydro Quebec are on the Upper Churchill power contract. So we are talking a different situation altogether. Here we have to be extremely careful about the viability of those industries. They are also exposed right now to new federal regulations which incur additional expense on their behalf. And we have been in the last number of months, and the hon. the Premier especially has been close to the scene as it relates to making sure that the federal government realizes that the additional expenses that the companies, Bowaters and Price, will have to incur because of new

environment regulations might impair the ongoing viability of those two major employers in the Province. So we have as a government held off any severe negotiations on those two companies until the other Federal regulations which would impair them are cleared up and then when they are we will then negotiate higher rates for those two companies.

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. FLIGHT: I would like to hear the Minister of Energy reconcile his attitude, his position with Buchans American Smelting and Refining Company a year ago when he allowed \$150,000 per year in increase for electrical rates to that company that was facing collapse. How did he reconcile his attitude to Price and Bowaters with his attitude to American Smelting and Refining Company less than a year ago?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. PECKFORD: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would be very happy to do so for the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans. We had indicated a year ago here in this hon. House and outside this House that we were prepared as a government to consider additional financial assistance to the American Smelting and Refining Company if in fact it meant that that increased power rates would impair the natural close-down that they had previously predicted would be the case. And that offer still stands for the mining company in Buchans. We had indicated last year, and we indicate and reiterate again today, that if the company in Buchans says that the natural close-down, everything being steady, all prices being steady is August 1979 and that because of power increases they will be closing down in May 1979 we would ensure that those power increases did not occur so that they would stay open the natural predication that was given hitherto for the increases going into effect.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile followed by the hon.

MR. SPEAKER: members for Trinity - Bay de Verde and Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations. Sir, last night on television a Mr. Andrew Davidson whose name is becoming well-known to gentlemen in this Province because of his associations with the Premier and other members on the government side of the House, the hon. gentleman stated that the Minister of Manpower forced him to go down and sign a letter. Did the hon. gentleman tell Mr. Davidson, as Mr. Davidson stated last night, that in order to get any work from this government he would have to sign a letter for the Premier saying that he the Premier was not involved in any of this wrongdoing? Is that true?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I have not seen what Mr. Davidson said last night. Okay? That is number one, because he said it between nine and ten o'clock or whenever it was -

AN HON. MEMBER: Get a transcript.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes, I am getting a transcript. The hon. Leader of the Opposition paid me the courtesy of mentioning that he had said it and I think I have said unofficially what the feeling is. I will have a statement on that when I see what he said. I have no idea what he said.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Sir. Immaterial as to whether the hon. gentleman saw the tape or not, would the hon. gentleman tell the House if at any time he indicated to Mr. Davidson, when Mr. Davidson was doing work for the government, that in order to get any future work from the government when the minister was Minister of Public Works that he would have to sign a letter for the Premier exonerating the Premier of any wrongdoing in connection with this Scrivener affair?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, I did not. If that is the substance of what was said last night-I do not know what else was said, so I withhold on that question that was asked by the hon. member, the answer is no.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Is the hon. minister aware of a letter that the Premier has signed by Mr. Davidson saying that the Premier himself is not involved in this wrongdoing? Is the hon. minister aware of that letter?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I have heard allegations of it in this House. I do not know who it was from. But I have not seen the letter nor am I aware of it outside the allegations made to it.

MR. W.N. ROWE: A supplementary on that subject, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. W.N. ROWE: I would like to, on this general subject raised by my hon. colleague, I would like to ask the Minister of Justice in view of the fact that the former Treasury Board president, the Minister of Transportation and Communications presently, yesterday admitted that the amount of \$5,000 was apparently paid properly to one Davidson -

MR. DOODY: That was not an admission. It was a statement.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Stated, came out with it in a forthright, manly fashion, that \$5,000 of public money had been given over to a Mr. Davidson for services done for the government, apparently quite properly, and in view of the fact that the police, acting, I would assume, on instructions from the Department of Justice which the minister heads, went down and got search warrants based on an allegation sworn to that this \$5,000 was extorted from the government,

MR. W. ROWE: will the minister now inform the House whether there is in fact a second \$5,000 which Davidson extorted from the government or whether the warrants, search warrants, were obtained from a magistrate in this Province under false pretenses?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the search warrants -

MR. W. ROWE: It is either one or the other.

MR. HICKMAN: Listen to the hon. gentleman who gave us such a dissertation on bad law yesterday that most law students have not recovered from it. The simple fact is, Mr. Speaker, that there was no misinformation filed by any officer of the Crown or any police officer with the magistrate in question who issued the search warrants, who ordered the issuance of the search warrants.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. ROWE: Would the minister care to elucidate? In his usual fashion, Sir, he apparently does not want to divulge all the the information to us for reasons of his own.

MR. HICKMAN: That is right.

MR. W. ROWE: I will not accuse him of another cover-up or trying to muzzle an hon. member earlier today. Sir, is the minister aware that a search warrant was obtained by agents of his department based on reasonable and probable cause having been shown to a magistrate that this fellow Davidson extorted, was involved in the crime of extorting, did induce the government by extortion to pay him \$5,000? Is he aware of that? And if he is aware of that, then how does that jibe with the statement made yesterday by his colleague that Mr. Davidson did not extort this \$5,000 from the government but that this amount was paid through normal channels in a proper manner? Now how do the two jibe?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Leader of the

MR. HICKMAN: Opposition knows better, he knows the answers to all those questions.

MR. W. ROWE: What is the answer?

MR. HICKMAN: The answers to these questions are very simple. Number one, the hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services said yesterday in response to a question that the sum of \$5,000 was paid at some time to this gentleman Davidson for work done for the Government of Newfoundland in connection with the project that has been referred to in this House as the Grimsby Project. This, by the way, was not the first time that the hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services had brought this advice and information to the attention of the House during this session. He had already made the same statement in the House in response to a question, as I recall, about a month ago. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, the affidavits filed by the police with the magistrate in question, and I cannot advise the House because I do not know as to what transpired in their presentation before the court, were certainly in order and Mr. Speaker, -

MR. NEARY: They were not in order.

MR. HICKMAN: They were in order.

MR. NEARY: They were not.

MR. HICKMAN: Well if they were not -

MR. NEARY: They were malicious. It was malicious and false.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, every time you try to bring to the attention of this House rules and regulations etc. you get accused of trying to cover up something. I want to once again remind this House that I was the one who ordered very promptly this particular investigation, more promptly, I would suggest, than any investigation of its kind has ever been ordered by any Attorney General anywhere in Canada. That is when I ordered it, within a matter of a day and a bit from the time of the filing of these alleged affidavits.

MR. NEARY: Two and one half years later .

MR. HICKMAN: And, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to be derelict in my responsibility as Attorney General to make public any information which will in any way -

MR. SIMMONS: Is that a new resolution?

MR. HICKMAN: It has always been my resolution, I have never made public in any way any information, either when I was a practicing lawyer or as Attorney General, that has come to me in my professional or ministerial capacity and there is no one knows that better than the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. He knows what I am saying is 100 per cent true, correct, and he knows it. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, when one gets into the question of the applicability and the authenticity of the affidavit that was filed by the Crown Officers in the person of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and the decision of the court

MR. HICKMAN:

based thereon. I will repeat that it was perfectly and absolutely in order. Having said that and having repeated it I am obliged, Mr. Speaker, to draw to Your Honour's attention that all of these questions and all of my answers have been totally and absolutely out of order because we are questioning a decision of the courts. We most assuredly are.

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. HICKMAN: Oh yes, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. HICKMAN: Oh yes, Mr. Speaker. And in that respect, Mr. Speaker, may I draw Your Honour's attention to page 333 of May which says, "Questions which reflect on the decisions of a court of law are not in order. The Speaker has ruled privately that questions relating to a sentence passed by a judge and to the circumstances under which rules of court were made and issued by the Lord Chancellor were inadmissible." Now, Mr. Speaker, I draw that to your attention because we are, there is no question about it, we are bringing into question a judicial decision, the judicial decision being the issuance of the search warrants. And there are all kinds of remedies available if that judicial decision was improperly made.

MR. NEARY: Violating the Criminal Code.

MR. HICKMAN: If there was a violation of the Criminal Code of Canada, Mr. Speaker, there is a simple process.

Any lawyer will advise any aggrieved person as to what to do. There have been appeals on it. Indeed a gentleman named John Christopher Doyle took that appeal right to the Supreme Court of Canada on grounds very analogous to what has been raised here and the Supreme Court of Canada threw it out not too long ago.

So it is an issue with remedies.

It is a judicial decision. And whilst I have been reluctant

MR. HICKMAN:

to bring this to the attention of the House because every time one does it one is accused of trying to cover up something. I do have a responsibility as Attorney General to see to it that matters that come before the court are protected, that the court is defended, that judicial decisions are defended and that investigations that are being carried out by the police are not in any way impeded. And more than that, that information that comes to me in my ministerial capacity as Attorney General of Newfoundland cannot under any circumstances be made public.

MR. SPEAKER: I will just point out because I think there is a point of order more or less before the Chair, with respect to the issuing of warrants and what transpires with and by a judge, then I think obviously that is sub judice. I distinguish from that what happens in a government department. But I would say the sub judice applies to what actually transpires with a judge or a judge's actions. That matter would be sub judice and would be contrary to general rules and to our precedents not to observe that.

The hon. Leader of the
Opposition.

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, let me make two points, Sir, since they were raised by the hon. Minister of Justice. One is, Sir, that I do not doubt his integrity or his honesty or even his knowledge as a lawyer, personally. I do criticize, Sir, hopefully quite forefully, his actions as a minister where I think he falls down on the job quite badly. Sir, again let me say this that I am not questioning the decision of the magistrate. I am prepared to believe that the magistrate himself was duped, that in the circumstances he made the proper decision himself. What

MR. W. ROWE:

I am asking the minister is, Sir, whether he will look into the possibility within his own department that in the drafting of the various documentation and so on for presentation to this magistrate, Sir, who is an excellent gentleman - we all know him in the practice of law and we are all aware of his great abilities - Sir, will the minister look into the possibility that there may have been some drafting based on false pretenses? and that, Sir, if it was not false pretenses, in view of the information given by the hon. Minister of Public Works, then there is somebody in his department, Sir, who is incredibly stupid and negligent and should not be in charge of drafting documentation for presentation to court, magistrate or otherwise. I ask the minister if he will look into that state of affairs.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, there is no one in my department, no law officer of the Crown who is incredibly stupid. I do have in my department as strong a staff on the prosecutorial side as could be found in any Attorney-General's department in this Nation. And I not only deny but I suggest that the statement by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition is unprecedented, That kind of an accusation against a law officer of the Crown when the hon. Leader of the Opposition as a lawyer knows

Mr. Hickman: the responsibility is to show reasonable and probable cause. It has nothing to do with guilt or innocence, nothing at all, Mr. Speaker. The guilt of any person, the guilt of any person, Mr. Speaker, will be decided if and when a charge is laid and not before. And until that decision is made that person is innocent, totally and absolutely innocent.

And let me assure this House there has been no act of impropriety on behalf of any law officer of the Crown or any police officer in connection with this particular incident which we are discussing. And the hon. Leader of the Opposition is again skirting very cleverly but I do not think he is succeeding in skirting around that ruling. In the order that I just referred to, to say that a magistrate is able or a court is able, or has been duped, is still bringing into question the decision of the court. There is no question at all that after that decision is handed down the administrative procedures that flow thereafter are perfectly and properly the subject matter of questions in this House. They have been raised and they have already been debated, but not the decision of this court.

And, Mr. Speaker, I repeat that the law officers of the Crown are competent, exceptionally competent. We have never had such a strong prosecutorial division in the history of Newfoundland. And the allegation and comment made by an officer of the court in the person of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition is not only totally untrue, but is very unbecoming of any officer of the court.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. HICKMAN: Committee of Supply.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is that I do leave the Chair.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, under Standing Order 23 I ask leave to make a motion for the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing what to us in Labrador is a matter of urgent public importance. Mr. Speaker, the Government of Quebec realizing

Mr. Strachan:

the political consequences of having both physical and economic ties with Labrador to further their territorial aspirations that they awarded a contract for construction of sixty miles of highway, and have further encouraged and allowed striking iron ore workers working freely to construction forty miles of dirt road using mine equipment also given freely, in order to physically link Labrador West with that Province, causing as a result of their actions the people of Labrador West to become extremely upset over their future ties physically, and now economically, and possibly, subsequently political ties with the Province of Quebec.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to move this motion. We believe in Labrador that the freedom Road for Labrador has now gone West instead of East, and we believe it is of major and public importance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Under this Standing Order, our precedents, of course, are quite clear. One of the matters to be satisfied is obviously the urgency of the matter being conceded, and even the urgency of debate. There is an additional step that one has to go and that is the Chair must decide whether within a reasonable period of time there will be an opportunity to debate that matter. Whether within a reasonable period of time. So obviously I have to go by the Order Paper there, and it would appear to me that in a reasonable period of time there are two motions on the Order Paper in which the hon. gentleman would be entitled to speak. I do not know the exact number of hours left in estimates, but, you know, not a large number. While obviously I do not know which order is going to be called when, our precedents and the general rules would confirm my opinion that granted the urgency of the matter and granting even the urgency of debate, that I do have reason to believe that in a reasonable period of time the hon. gentleman will have an opportunity to debate that.

MR. STRACHAN: I cannot appeal that can I?

MR. SPEAKER: No. Order, please!

MR. STRACHAN: Can I use a point of explanation to assure the urgent importance of the matter?

MR. SPEAKER: No. If I were to hear the hon. gentleman, no I would be acquiescing an infraction of the rules by the hon. gentleman, and in so doing would be doing so myself.

MR. STRACHAN: I believe it is very important.

MR. SPEAKER: It would be very difficult for me to call other hon. members to order if I were to put myself out of order.

MR. HICKMAN: Motion 5.

On motion that the House resolve into Committee of the Whole on Supply, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. W.N. ROWE:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

1801-01, Public Works and

Services. The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W.N. ROWE:

Mr. Chairman, I assume, Sir,

we are still on the minister's salary in the Department of Public Works, and there are one or two very brief comments - how much time do we have left, by the way, Mr. Chairman, in this particular heading?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

One hour and twenty-one

minutes.

MR. W.N. ROWE:

One hour and a half.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Twenty-one.

MR. W.N. ROWE:

One hour and twenty minutes.

I want to make a few brief

remarks. I will not delay the House at all, Sir, because most of what I say will be a reaffirmation and a confirmation of what the hon. Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee had to say yesterday. But I do want to go on the record on one or two very important matters.

Sir, we have a government which must be the most examined by police and enquired by public enquiry commissioners, Sir, in the history of this Province. The hon. the Premier rose in his place today and with some kind of perverse pride, Sir, pointed out all the enquiries which the government have been forced to call, and establish, and set up into various allegations of wrongdoing by his administration, allegations of corruption by individual ministers, allegations of this, that and the other thing, Sir, which the government have been forced by this House, or by public pressure into setting up. He took pride in that Mr. Chairman. I never saw the like of it in my life. A Premier, a leader of an administration standing up and taking pride in the number of public enquiries and

MR. W.N. ROWE: police investigations which his administration of this Province has necessitated in order to try to keep a few things straight.

We have had, Sir, directly under this department an enquiry set up into the general spending practices of the Department of Public Works concerning which I am not at liberty to make any comments because it is a matter which is under the scrutiny now of a commissioner of a public enquiry.

We have had set up, Sir, a police enquiry - an investigation at any rate - into the goings on in the Department of Fisheries and subsequently charges were laid there. I suppose, as I understand it, the police enquiry into that department, the scandalous goings on in that department continues to go on now.

We had set up here, Sir, in the last few days a police enquiry announced - called for by this side of the House, and finally after a couple of days delay announced by the Minister of Justice - an enquiry into allegations of wrongdoing by a Minister of the Crown and by other individuals.

There has been a scream, Sir, a veritable scream, publicly, for a public enquiry into the goings on at Exon House which we referred to yesterday. The government has not consented to that yet thereby giving the impression, publicly, of wanting to cover up some unsavoury, unpalatable, perhaps at the very least negligent goings on in that particular government institution.

And, Sir, public pressure is building now - we have seen the odd editorial, I mentioned it myself publicly a couple or few days ago - public pressure is again building now, Sir, for an enquiry into all aspects, all the ramifications of the Health Sciences Complex there on Memorial University Campus, Sir -

MR. W.N. ROWE: the reason why there was an incredible cost overrun of some 100 per cent, and an enquiry into the allegations made by this Mr. Davidson and other people into the building of that particular complex, something, Sir, which I believe is urgently required, urgently required for the same reason that the government was forced into setting up a public enquiry on the general spending practices of the Department of Public Works even though a police enquiry was going on on hangar 3 particularly, I believe. A public enquiry on the general spending practices was set up, Sir. I believe that even though there is a police investigation into the allegations made in this document by Davidson and by Terry White, the minister's executive assistant, into any criminality, I believe there should be a public

MR. W.N. ROWE: enquiry into all aspects of the building of that Health Sciences Centre in St. John's, Sir, and the Carbonear Hospital. As a matter of fact, since the Department of Public Works is involved in these matters, Sir, at least marginally, and that is why I bring them up now, there should be a public enquiry into the building of these public structures - the Carbonear Hospital, the Health Sciences Centre and perhaps one or two others which have slipped my memory at the moment, Sir, concerning which there have been allegations of wrongdoing and concerning which there have been incredible cost overruns involving scores of millions of dollars of public money, much of it Provincial public money coming out of the pocket of the hard-pressed, harassed taxpayer of Newfoundland and Labrador. Let us have that kind of a public enquiry.

The Premier in a scurrilous fashion called upon me today, as if I had the power to do so, to appoint a public investigation, a police investigation into goings on on this side of the House. Foolish and silly and scandalous, Sir, action by a Premier of this Province, which I welcome by the way. If the Minister of Justice can get up the courage to do that or the energy to do that I would certainly welcome the appointment of a public enquiry or a police investigation into anything I or my colleagues have done in public life or privately affecting the public administration of the Province. I would welcome it, Sir, and I indicated that, I hope quite forcefully, to the Premier following his foolish statement which he read out here today. So, Sir, I throw back the challenge to the hon. Minister of Public Works, and the Premier, and the Minister of Justice. I say there has been enough alleged publicly concerning the Health Sciences Centre, and concerning other public buildings in which the Department of Public Works has been involved, at least marginally, with regard to expertise, advice and so on. Perhaps the department has been involved in the awarding of contracts. I am not quite at this moment - I have not looked at the file for a couple of years that I have built up on it. I am not quite sure how the department fits into it, Is the

MR. W.N. ROWE: Department of Health and so on involved as well?

But, Sir, there has to be a public enquiry into the inflated costs of that building. We had an enquiry which the minister tabled or mentioned some time ago, some enquiry or other but that was not enough, Sir, we need a public enquiry where witnesses can be brought before a commissioner and required to give evidence under oath as to what went on when Scrivener was involved in the building of the Health Sciences Centre. As the project manager this fellow Davidson said enough last night, Sir, to scare the wits out of anybody in public administration in this Province. That has to be -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I do have to bring to the attention of the hon. Leader of the Opposition that whereas there is undoubtedly a public enquiry, or an enquiry of some aspect into Public Works, it would place the Chair in an awkward position if from that point arguments were developed into the whole question of public enquires or other forms of enquiry into all other aspects of government operation. So I would ask the co-operation of the hon. Leader of the Opposition in not complicating the work of the Chair in this regard.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I would assume that the Department of Public Works and the minister is involved in some way in a ministerial capacity in the building of public buildings and so on. The minister nods his head in assent, Sir. I mean, I do not want to get into a public enquiry into, say, the conduct of the member for St. John's East as interesting as that might be to us all, or boring as the case might be, I do not know. What I am talking about, Sir, is public buildings, buildings to which the public has pumped untold millions of dollars at least, as I said, marginally affected by the Minister of Public Works and his department in some way, shape or form. The fact that they might be turned over to a body or maybe owned technically by Memorial University, although I doubt that as I believe they are all owned by the Department of Public Works in title

MR. W. ROWE:

if not in practical operation. Sir, I submit to the minister who by the way, Sir, is the minister who has my admiration and I believe the admiration of most members of this House in the way he conducts himself as he pursues his ministerial responsibilities. I think he is interested in trying to get to the bottom of skulduggery and allegations of corruption. I am ignoring the chuckle emanating from my left here, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, we cannot get any action on the car wrecks for some reason or another.

MR. W. ROWE: Maybe my hon. colleague does not share my view. We do not see eye to eye and our hearts do not beat as one on all issues.

MR. NEARY: Only 99.99 per cent.

MR. ROWE: Most of them. And, Sir, I would commend to the minister the need for a public inquiry into the shenanigans, the allegations of hanky-panky, corruption, skulduggery, negligence, inflated costs, things mentioned in this most recent affidavit by one Mr. Davidson involving the Premier of this Province, for example, the former Minister of Public Works, all these things, Sir, should be the subject of a public enquiry. Because, Sir, there may not be any criminality involved - that is something for the police and the Crown prosecutor to determine - But, Sir, there may be evidence of gross mismanagement, incredible negligence, activities, Sir, which are close to the line when it comes to talking about corruption or criminality but which may not form the basis of a criminal prosecution but which the public should know about.

Therefore, Sir, I call upon the Minister of Public Works to indicate today what he thinks should be done and I call upon him to try to persuade his reluctant colleagues, the Premier and others, to get a public enquiry into the goings on there at the

MR. W. ROWE:

Health Sciences Complex. I noticed the Daily News, The Evening Telegram, I believe, perhaps the Daily News as well, but certainly The Evening Telegram some time ago mentioned the possibility of a public enquiry on all these matters in addition to the police enquiry. And the two things are not necessarily mutually exclusive as the Minister of Justice tried to indicate there the other day standing up and giving us a sermon as usual on his concept of law and procedure in which he indicated that I cannot have my cake and eat it too, I cannot have it both ways, a police investigation or a public enquiry. Of course we can, Sir.

MR. NEARY: We do have it now.

MR. W. ROWE: And to try to indicate otherwise is to fudge the issue and to give the impression of wanting to have as little said or done publicly about these matters as possible. We have a police enquiry on a particular matter now, hanger three, if that is what it is, a police investigation which has been apparently in the office of the minister.

MR. NEARY: Hang 'em three.

MR. W. ROWE: Hang 'em three. In the office of the Minister of Justice, not his office perhaps, but in the Department of Justice for a number of months. And we have an ongoing public enquiry about the allegations of the mis-spending of public money generally in the Department of Public Works on which I will make no comment. So I ask the minister to get involved in that.

I would also, Sir, like to direct a few comments to the Minister of Justice. It is my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that so far back as a month or so before Christmas of 1977, six months ago or around Christmas time, Sir, his department was in a position or

MR. W. ROWE:

just about ready to decide whether they were going to press charges or not against individuals or an individual, a person in connection with the police enquiry into the Public Works involvement in that hanger, \$300,000 worth of expenditure, I understand, from my hon. colleague. That was six months ago.

Now, Sir, I do not know what the situation is now. I acted as the Minister of Justice for a few weeks one time, Sir, just prior to the demise of the former administration which by the way, Mr. Chairman, is starting to look better and better by comparison with this hon. crowd. The much maligned former administration is starting to look very good, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY: Angels.

MR. W. ROWE: Angels and paragons of virtue, Sir, and brilliant policy makers compared to this particular administration. We are going to have a new former administration, Sir, as I have mentioned often to kick around.

MR. NEARY: No witch hunts.

MR. W. ROWE: No witch hunts, no. We will just run the Province. No minister over there need fear anything, Mr. Chairman, because there will be no witch hunts.

MR. NEARY: What about the bench?

May 2, 1978

Tape No. 1717

RT - 1

MR. S. NEARY: Will we get his royal highness on the bench?

MR. W.N. ROWE: I am still almost prepared to recommend that the hon. Minister of Justice go on the Bench. I am almost prepared -

MR. S. NEARY: He will have to go back to law school first.

MR. W.N. ROWE: - although, Sir - because I admire the man so much as a lawyer, you know, as a lawyer within that narrow context, a lawyer.

MR. S. NEARY: He will have to do a refresher in Law.

MR. W.N. ROWE: As an administrator, as a minister of the Government, I have my own views but I am prepared to believe that he will give good, sound, technical decisions on the law from the Bench, not too much in the way of policy development in the law but good, sound, legal judgments. I may be prepared, Sir, to recommend him at some point in the future.

MR. S. NEARY: But you are going to have a battle with your colleagues over that one.

MR. W.N. ROWE: I know. At least I will not have - At least, Sir - Oh, I had better not say it. I was going to say that he will not have the same problem as he had with -

MR. S. NEARY: Flick him in the Senate. Put him in the Senate. He will be harmless up there with the rest of the old codgers up there.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Judging from what the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. T.A. HICKMAN: Point of Order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Point of Order.

MR. T.A. HICKMAN: I do not think it is proper for any hon. gentleman in this House to cast reflections on a member of any Parliament of Canada. There has been a gross reflection cast by the hon. member

MR. T.A. HICKMAN: for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) upon the father, amongst others, of the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. S. NEARY: To save Your Honour time I withdraw irrevocably, Sir, I completely withdraw that statement.

MR. W.N. ROWE: But, Sir, I am not satisfied with that.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order has been taken.

MR. W.N. ROWE: I am not satisfied with the withdrawal.

MR. T.A. HICKMAN: And the gentleman has to be named.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I am not satisfied. It was the grossest kind of reflection on someone very close to me, Sir, and I move that the member be expelled for ten days.

MR. T.A. HICKMAN: Second.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, that was tongue in cheek, you will understand.

But, Sir, the point I was making - Yes, if we put the hon. member in the Senate he would be right where he belonged judging from the report given to us today about what goes on in the Senate when a point of procedure comes up. Incredible confusion, a mishmash, Sir, no meetings, nobody knows what went on there, all they know is that nothing happened, and the Minister of Justice would feel right at home in that milieu I am sure. Sir, maybe the Bench is not the spot; perhaps the Senate is the spot for the Minister of Justice.

MR. T.A. HICKMAN: - a really outstanding Newfoundlander, a relative of mine a great constitutional expert, Senator Eugene Forsey was on that Committee.

MR. S. NEARY: He would be ashamed of you if he -

MR. W.N. ROWE: He must have been absent at the time.

But, Sir, getting back to this police investigation -

AN HON. MEMBER: As Forsey would say, Relatives you are stuck with.

MR. HICKMAN: A great man.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Sir, getting back to this police investigation into allegations of wrongdoing on hangar three -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W.N. ROWE: Sir, I realize I am trying to break some kind of a sound barrier here. Sir, I say I make this comment to the minister, and I am not alleging any kind of wrongdoing on his part whatsoever, but I do think, Sir, that when five or six or seven months have gone by since, as I understand it from impeccable sources, the Department of Justice has been just about ready to lay charges against a person or persons in connection with that police investigation, Sir, it seems very strange, in passing let me say, that no charges have yet been laid and the Minister of Justice has not come to this House and said that we have been advised by the police and confirmed by the Crown Prosecutor that no charges should be laid. Perhaps even tabling a report, although that may not be correct.

MR. HICKMAN: The hon. gentleman really does not -

MR. W.N. ROWE: But, Sir, let me say this, when I acted as Minister of Justice for a few weeks, it took a few weeks succeeding the hon. gentleman opposite, Sir, and we cleaned up most of the mess left in that period of time. Oh yes, Sir, we got an appeal court going. Anyway, I have two minutes left so I cannot allow myself to be sidetracked.

Sir, the police when they had investigations to make would follow the proper channels, the report would come in through the Department of Justice and ultimately they reached me. I did not ask for them but they ended up on my desk, brought in to me by officers of the Crown.

MR. HICKMAN: By whom?

MR. W.N. ROWE: By the Deputy Minister in that particular case. I had two or three - You may remember certain vile allegations were made against by colleague and a police investigation was commissioned

MR. W.N. ROWE: by the former administration into the allegations. The police report came in. The minister -

MR. S. NEARY: Right. I am the only one that has a clean bill of health in this House.

MR. W.N. ROWE: I had the task, the pleasant task, Sir, the redundant task but the pleasant task of clearing my colleague of all wrongdoing, allegations of wrongdoing, based on this police report which was brought to my attention. Now it little behoves the minister to keep getting up here and saying, Sir, that, 'I am the Minister of this Department of Justice yet I do not know what is going on in the Department, no one brings reports to me, I do not know whether the police investigation is completed, or ongoing, or what they recommended, or whether somebody should be charged or not'.

Mr. W. Rowe: If he is that kind of a Minister of Justice then I would submit, Sir, that he step down and allow someone to get into it who in fact wants to run the department in a proper way.

MR. HICKMAN: Is the hon. gentleman saying that there is a kind of a vacuum because of the actions used in laying charges or not laying charges?

MR. W.N. ROWE: No, I did not.

MR. HICKMAN: That is right.

MR. W.N. ROWE: I did not, Sir. What I am saying -

MR. HICKMAN: Nor did any other minister.

MR. W.N. ROWE: - is that reports were brought to my attention with recommendations by civil servants as to how they felt about certain matters in the report. And usually, Sir, the Minister of Justice usually will make his decision based entirely on the recommendation of the senior law officers of the Crown.

MR. HICKMAN: But he does not make the decision, the Director of Public Prosecutions has always made them.

MR. W. ROWE: In any event, Sir, -

MR. HICKMAN: In your day he made them too.

MR. W. ROWE: The point I am making, Sir, is that there is something wrong with this police investigation. There is something, Sir.

MR. NEARY: It is a stall.

MR. W. ROWE: I will sit down with this: it is not delay by the minister I know, because he has assured us. Maybe there is some kind of a stall, maybe people are not energetic enough to get moving on it, I do not know, Sir, but I do know that there is some attempt somewhere to stop the embarrassment which would accrue from charges being laid by certain persons, public or private, in connection with this particular police investigation, Sir. And I call upon the Minister of Justice, and the Minister of Public Works, Sir, to get this police investigation, have a look at it, and order that either charges be laid or people who have been accused, you know, either privately or publicly, speculatively, and so on, be exonerated, Sir, one or the other.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. W. ROWE: Well I am about finished now, you know,

so the member can make a speech if he wishes.

MR. MARSHALL: Permit a question -

MR. NFARY: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Ferryland.

MR. POWER: Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to speak on the Department of Public Works and Services, but it seems that the only way a private member can speak in this House is if he uses every simple opportunity he has to speak in the estimates. I bring this point up now, I seriously thought about considering - I had seriously considered bringing up another point of personal privilege today after the Speaker had ruled on the previous points, and I failed to do so, I did not do so simply because I knew that it would hinder the House worse than it has been done in the last week or so. And my point as a private member is this, it seems that we, I know I as an individual was elected to represent a district to do certain work, to speak for the people of Ferryland on the problems that face them. I think the other fifty-one members of this Province were elected to do the same thing. And it seems that here in this House now there is almost never an opportunity to discuss the problems that face this problem. I would challenge any member opposite to stand up and tell me when they last asked a question about the unemployment situation in the Province.

MR. R. MOORES: Last Friday.

MR. POWER: The member for Carbonear (Mr. R. Moores) asked a question last month, late last month about Summer employment -

MR. R. MOORES: Last Friday.

MR. POWER: Which was last month.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. POWER: Which was last month, Friday was. He asked the question about Summer employment. But Summer employment only concerns our young people and our students when they get out of Trade School and out of Memorial. But what about the real problems of this Province, the unemployment problem, the education problem. Today in Question

Mr. Power: Period the Leader of the Opposition began a very sensible question period by asking questions about the Public Utilities Board and the electricity rates which will effect every individual in Newfoundland.

MR. NEARY: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order.

MR. NEARY: My understanding of the rules of this House, Sir, the hon. gentleman is new so he may not be familiar with the rules, my understanding is, Sir, you have to be relevant to the subject under discussion, We are discussing the Minister of Public Works salary, Sir. If we are going to have the Throne Speech debate well I would suggest that the minister call it, or the Budget debate. We are quite prepared, Sir, to enter into a debate with the hon. gentleman any time. Well you have to be half relevant anyway, Sir, to what is under discussion.

MR. HICKMAN: To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. HICKMAN: Firstly in response to the rather gratuitous comment made by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) we did call the Throne Speech debate for five and a half days, and out of consideration and sympathy for his hon. colleagues opposite who are so upset that he would not allow them an opportunity to speak we decided to move into estimates.

But, Mr. Chairman, I thought that the hon. the gentleman for Ferryland (Mr. Power) was certainly as relevant as his predecessor who participated in this debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! In regard to the point of order, on salaries the Chair traditionally allows some latitude, but on the other hand the latitude should not be extensive, the remarks should not be extensively off the point, and one expects that the argument would be brought back to the heading or the subheading under consideration.

The hon. member for Ferryland.

MR. POWER: Mr. Chairman, I respect your ruling, obviously. What I am saying again is that the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) confirms my viewpoint, that I as a young member who does not understand all the rules of the House, is that unless I am terribly skilled in Beauchesne and the rulings of the House I am not allowed to speak. When I say something sensible, when I say something that the people of this Province are concerned about, about unemployment, irregardless of the heading, I know that an awful lot of things have taken place under the headings that are quite irrelevant, much more irrelevant than what I have said. But I will say this that earlier today in Question Period there was a series of questions involving public Utilities which were very important. But they got off those questions like they were a hot potato because they were so interested in getting involved in the Public Enquiry. This is the point I wish to make as a private member, is to get down to the things that this Province has to deal with, unemployment, the problems of our young people and others. Once the Public Enquiry was called then why hammer the thing to death? Why not wait for the results of the Public Enquiry and then get back on that issue? But for the time being during Question Period and during this House those points of personal privilege are not nearly as important as the people who are unemployed, the people who do not have the money to pay their rather high electricity rates and so on. And I say that just in prefacing my remarks on Public Works because, as I said, I had not intended to speak on the estimates of this department but it seems it is the only chance to say a few words.

When I looked at the amount of money being spent in Public Works, something like \$44 million - \$31 million being spent in other departments and about \$13 or \$14 million being spent in Public Works - I said to myself, my God there must be something there which has some good in it, it cannot be all negative, it cannot all be

MR. POWER: the subject of an enquiry. Every civil servant of the many hundreds, I imagine, who work down in that department cannot be all corrupt, Somebody must do an honest days work down there, There must be some good things involved in that \$13 million, or that \$44 million being spent in total, There must be somebody down there who is doing something honest and something good. When I looked down through the headings of Public Works and Services I came on something like the Newfoundland Information Services.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is a dandy.

MR. POWER: I looked into it. Okay!

AN HON. MEMBER: That is a beaut.

MR. POWER: Well I will go through and tell you -

MR. NEARY: Is that where the Premier got his propaganda today?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. POWER: Poison like beauty is in the eyes of the beholder or the ears of the beholder.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. POWER: Obviously again here is another example, that the Newfoundland Information Services serve no function other than to spread scandal and rumour and gossip. The function of the Newfoundland Information Services, is in a general scale, to communicate, to allow our information as a government, Now what we are saying is that you also said the Action Group is wrong because that gives out information, and the Newfoundland Information Services are wrong because we give out information. But what is the purpose of a government programme if you do not tell people that it is there? And you have got to have some kind of a facility other than the capitalistic press, if you want, to distribute your information.

MR. W. ROWE: Oh, listen to him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

May 2, 1978

Tape No. 1719

AR-3

MR. POWER: That is exactly what they are.

MR. NEARY: And there is no propaganda machine.

MR. POWER: No. There are certain good things which take place in government, there are certain good programmes, there are certain Ministerial Statements, like the Minister of Fisheries statements of last week, that need to be taken and passed out to the public. Why should we as a government or the Liberals as a government take a chance on not having that distributed?

MR. NEARY: What about the Newfoundland Bulletin that used to be (Inaudible)

MR. POWER: The purpose of the Newfoundland Information Services was not a propaganda machine, which is the previous one you are talking about. We changed it around a little bit and we made it into a functional, workable organization.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. POWER: Well that may be, but the work that is done by the Newfoundland Information Services is very valuable work. It allows ministers and members of the Opposition to issue press releases to tell the public what is taking place in public life, what programmes are available to the people, it answers public enquiries both by phone, by letter and in person, it does research both for our members and for members opposite, in means of doing, it issues publications, directs Public Service Programmes, gives information to many groups which do work with government which are either sponsored by government or partially funded by government. Is it wrong for us as a government to help a 4H group or a drug and alcohol addiction group? Is it wrong for us to give them information, to give them the facilities to issue press releases to announce their meetings, to announce some things in fund raising? Is that wrong for our government? It is not a terrible thing to do, we spend as a government only a very small amount of money, a little over \$100,000 on that, but it is money that is well spent. There are people in the public service and

May 2, 1978

Tape No. 1719

AH-4

MR. POWER: in the Department of Public Works who are actually working quite hard and quite diligently for the money that they earn. They are not corrupt, they are not involved in bribery, they are not involved in police enquiries all day long,

MR. C. POWER: the vast majority. And I say this also that the vast majority of the civil servants in the Department of Public Works, as the vast majority of the members of this House, are quite decent and honest people and it is very unfortunate that our society and our House of Assembly now, which should know better, plays on the one or two things which are negative and does not take into account the ninety-eight or ninety-nine per cent that is good and that is unfortunately what has happened in our society. It has happened in Public Works. It is happening in this House of Assembly. You take something like the Department of Public Works has done, like the Public Tendering Act, do you tell me the Public Tendering Act is wrong? Sure there are infringements of it and sure there are wrongdoings, for whenever you have any kind of human beings involved there are bound to be certain human frailties there. But tell me that the Public Tendering Act is worse than the cost-plus system that was used before the act was put into place. I mean, if I were a contractor nothing would make me happier than to deal with a government who only issued cost-plus contracts. How can you lose? Where is the gamble?

MR. NEARY: How about Crosbie buy backs -

MR. POWER: The cost-plus contracts were exactly what were there. The Public Tendering Act has replaced and at least tried to change it. We have not done it all but we at least have tried. You have to learn to crawl before you can walk or run. And again in our case as of government we have not done it all in five or six years but we have at least tried. And under the philosophy that you are using as Margaret Mead, an anthropologist, might say the best way not to break the law is not to make it at all. We do not give in to that theory. We believe that there has to be certain laws and certain rules and regulations set down, knowing in our hearts and minds that they will be broken on occasion as every law probably is, otherwise you would not need the law at all.

You take the Public Service Commission. Is the

MR. C. POWER: Public Service Commission that is put there now worse than the system that was there before? Sure it has misgivings.

MR. NEARY: Is it better?

MR. C. POWER: Yes it is.

MR. NEARY: It is better? Well we saw what happened recently with Mr. Syrett (Inaudible)

MR. POWER: In any human - I just wonder where any member of this House or any person thinks that he is -

MR. NEARY: How are Norman Butler Associates when we get around to it?

MR. POWER: I mean, are any of us above and beyond making a mistake?

AN HON. MEMBER: He never had the guts.

MR. NEARY: We will have it, do not worry.

MR. POWER: Mistakes when any human being - The Public Service Commission is run by human beings.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) better or worse.

MR. POWER: I feel as an individual member of the House that it is. I feel that they are trying to do something which needs to be done, to give all persons an equal and ample opportunity.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) did not know what they were doing. The other crowd of people that were there, good Newfoundlanders, did not know what they were doing.

MR. POWER: They made mistakes.

MR. NEARY: And this crowd do not?

MR. POWER: Yes, they do. I did not say that. I say that now the thing has been changed around and rectified somewhat to eliminate some of those problems or pitfalls that ordinary human beings may fall into.

The printing services department of Public Works provides its valuable service both to members of this House, to the government - it has to be done. If printing services was not there you would simply have to go out and pay for it from someone else. Is it not much better to do it ourselves? Again today you are suggesting in one hand that we as a government should socialize, take over the Newfoundland Light and Power. The public indicates of printing services on the same

MR. POWER: theory, printing services is work done by government and if it was not done by government it would have to be done by private, capitalistic people. So if it is right on one hand it has to be right on the other.

In the case of the government purchasing agency, those individuals who work in government purchasing agencies and who may make honest, legitimate mistakes, but could a government function without them? How would you work if you did not have a purchasing agency? Would you allow every individual who works for government to go out and buy what he wants from whom he wants with absolutely no controls? Is that what we are anticipating payoffs? All I am saying is that in this case that I as a private member for a district that does not come in contact with Public Works at all, it is not a very visible department, but as an individual I just fail to believe the Opposition theory that all that \$13 million or \$44 million is spent and every dollar should have a public enquiry tagging along behind. I find that very difficult to believe and I find that the press in this Province, if they do not bring this idea to our public, the idea that all our civil servants are not corrupt and that all our politicians are not corrupt, then our government, the parliamentary system that we use, will simply fail. When people, when we destroy each other as politicians, when we cause our citizens to lose faith in the civil servants who work on their behalf, then the only end result can be chaos as happened in Germany in 1925 and 1926 and 1927 when Hitler came along and said, we have to change things but we will not put something logical, an alternative in its place, we will just change. And change for the sake of change, Sir, is no purpose unless you are going to put something solid and constructive in its place.

And in the case of Public Works, I take this very small, simple opportunity to commend the ministers, who is doing a very difficult job, the civil servants in that department who for the most part are extremely honest, diligent and

MR. POWER:

hardworking people and I commend them for their efforts on behalf of the Province and on behalf of the district of Ferryland where we do not even have a great deal to do with them. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: I should not really comment on what the hon. member who just took his seat, the statements made in his few remarks. I saw the hon. Minister of Public Works over there cringing in his seat as the hon. gentleman brought up Newfoundland Information Services.

MR. W. ROWE: Last thing he wants to hear.

MR. NEARY: That is the last thing the hon. Minister of Public Works wanted to hear.

MR. NEARY: I only spoke on it last night.

MR. NEARY: He spoke on it last night, Sir. It is nothing more than just a propaganda machine for ministers and for the government of this Province and should be abolished, wiped out and the money used to pay for childrens' dental care or put towards a hospital, eliminate the three dollar charge on hospital beds in this Province. And I do not mean, Sir, to put the people who are in it out of a job but put them in positions where they can do something useful for the people of this Province. It is a propaganda machine, Sir, of the worst kind. And we saw an example today.

The Premier has a press secretary and he has Newfoundland Information Services, and we saw the kind of propaganda that comes from these ghost writers, that comes from Newfoundland Information Services and from Mr. Gary Callahan. Mr. Jerry Korbai has been promoted to protocol officer for the administration and now we have Mr. Callahan who is writing the propaganda for the hon. the Premier. I hope that that document that

MR. NEARY:

the Premier read in this House today will not be processed through what they call in the news media the manure machine, the machines that have been put out in the various newsrooms across this Province so that the government could pump its propaganda into the various radio stations and newsrooms across the Province, and all it does is just create a pile of paper on the floor. I have been into the newsrooms and I have seen the propaganda coming in and all it does is just the machine is going clicking away, the paper is piling up on the floor. It might be good for the newsprint industry in this Province but nobody ever bothers to read it.

The hon. gentleman says, well what about the 4-H clubs and what about this one and that one. The press will manage to give the 4-H clubs and all these other people the coverage that they need. Mr. Chairman, you do not need a Newfoundland information services to use that to try to justify Newfoundland Information Services. We have a free press in this Province thank God. But I wonder about it sometimes with the way the hon. Premier treated that poor little girl over at the CBC there a month and a half or so ago.

MR. W. ROWE: Engineered her firing.

MR. NEARY: That is right, Sir. Mr. Chairman -

PREMIER MOORES: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order.

PREMIER MOORES: I heard the Leader of the Opposition say that I engineered the firing of a person at CBC. That is totally untrue and I would ask him to withdraw it.

MR. W. ROWE: Sir, I am not certain of what is going on. Is the Premier saying that what I said is out of order

MR. W. ROWE:

or unparliamentary or what, Sir. I mean, it is a matter of opinion between two hon. members as far as I can see. I do not think there is an precedent, Sir, for that kind of language being out of order. If so, Sir, we might as well close up the House because, Sir, members are not going to be able to differ in their opinions if that is held to be out of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

The point of order comes up over a remark that was made by a member who did not have the floor at the time and related to whether or not another hon. member carried out a certain action, that action being outside the House and clearly therefore outside the Committee. Accordingly I do not feel that the Chairman of Committees has any authority in that area and I would ask the hon. member to continue his remarks.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to just say to the hon. gentleman who just took his seat that there was no criticism of the printing offices, the printing services of this government. As a matter of fact, it was the former administration who established it. And there was no criticism of the other things that the hon. gentleman named. I forget the other branch of that department the hon. gentleman named.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: But, Mr. Chairman, I want to say this, that I completely agree with the hon. gentleman that the administration, the government are spending all their time down on the Eighth floor trying to prop themselves up, trying to shore themselves up because of the corruption and the political patronage and the allegations of improper and wrongdoings on behalf of the government.

May 2, 1978

Tape 1721

IB-4

MR. NEARY:

That is not our fault. It is our place, Sir, to expose that, to bring it out into the light of day. And if we have what appears to be, Mr. Chairman, a corrupt administration in this Province that is not our fault. That is the hon. gentleman's fault.

MR. POWER: That is only one of your responsibilities.

What about unemployment?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, we do not get a chance, Sir, in

MR. NEARY:

this House to discuss unemployment. The government calls the orders. It is the government who regulates the House. It is the government who calls the orders. It is the government who gives us - we are in the government's hands, Sir, when it comes to debating matters in this hon. House. And the hon. gentleman will not get into the Cabinet by getting up and making speeches like he just made. He will not suck his way into the Cabinet. The hon. gentleman for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) now I am convinced does not want to become a part. I thought one time the hon. gentleman was, although he was over in Norway recently and I was having grave doubts about him again. But the hon. gentleman cannot wait for the election to be called to get out of politics, to bow out. The hon. gentleman cannot wait.

MR. SIMMONS: He is going to run for the leadership.

MR. NEARY: No, the hon. gentleman is not even going to stay around for the leadership. The hon. gentleman cannot wait for the polling booths to open so the people can file in and we will not find the hon. gentleman's name on the ballot.

MR. POWER: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Chairman, getting back to my hon. friend.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order.

MR. POWER: The trend of conversation is totally irrelevant to the discussion of Public Works and Services and is out of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

The point of order relates to relevance and I would make the same remark as before, that is that some latitude is allowed in the heading 01 but that the remarks should stray not too far from the

MR. CHAIRMAN:

subhead itself. So I would ask the hon. member to continue.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Now, Mr. Chairman, I hope I have dealt with the hon. gentleman, Sir, because there is nothing that he said really that amounted to very much. I looked over at the hon. Minister of Public Works when the hon. gentleman was talking about Newfoundland Information Services. He slinked down in his seat, could not believe it, could not believe that the hon. gentleman was holding this up as an example of the wonderful things that this government has done in this Province, their propaganda machine.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder, Sir, would it be in order to ask the Minister of Public Works - I am sure I saw the Minister of Justice going out with a copy of this document that I have in my hand. There has been a new twist on the Scrivener scandal, as hon. members probably know, that there is a letter making the rounds that was delivered to the press today, via Newfoundland Information Services, I might add, which makes it relevant to this debate, and it was delivered, I understand, to the news media upstairs and it is allegedly signed by Mr. Terry White. Did the hon. gentleman see this? Does the hon. gentleman know what is in it?

MR. HICKMAN: The hon. gentleman did not see it.

MR. NEARY: Well what it says, allegedly signed by Mr. - nobody seems to know where it came from and I am asking the hon. -

AN HON. MEMBER: Came from Terry White.

MR. DOODY: Who signed it?

MR. NEARY: Terry White. Terrence White.

MR. DOODY: Maybe it came from Terry White.

MR. NEARY: It could have, Sir, I certainly hope that it did because it confirms everything that we have been saying here for the

MR. NEARY:

last week or so and it also states that, if it is true, if it is indeed from Mr. White, that he says "Also to this I have to add a clarification. I do not take drugs, only medication, prescribed pills and specific instructions to control migraine headaches I suffer due to eye surgery."

So it sounds to me very much like it is from Mr. White because he does have eye problems. He told me about them several times recently.

MR. MORGAN: Are you going to make it available to the RCMP?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) all he is saying.

MR. NEARY: All he is saying! Ah, all he is saying! Is that all he saying? I better read it for the benefit of hon. members, Sir, who do not have it.

"At this time I would like to advise the people of Newfoundland the reason for my leaving the Province on April 27. On that date I flew to Montreal to see Mr. C. Flamm, a lawyer, and also met with the Davidsons. But before going to Montreal I talked to the housekeeper at the Davidson's residence to advise her I was on my way to Montreal. Upon arriving at the Davidson's residence I was advised that they would like to see me in Miami." Now that is a name that came up last night and came up recently in this House. "And my ticket would be waiting for me at the airport." No Mr. Silver involved in that or Mr. Doyle. A ticket would be at the airport, left by the Davidsons I presume.

"The purpose of my trip was to know exactly why a little address written by me addressed to Mr. C. Flamm, a lawyer, sealed with specific instructions to be held in safe keeping, was released and passed on to the press. Also I wanted to know of other important matters. I personally found out from his son, Andy, Jr., that it was deliberately opened by his father and sent to Steve

May 2, 1978

Tape 1722

IB-4

MR. NEARY:

Neary," etc. "I did not want to be interviewed by the press. I did not want" - what is the hon. gentleman -

MR. W. ROWE: Gone off the head, boy. The strain is too much for him.

MR. S. NEARY: The strain is too - "I did not want to be -"

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY: Listen to this, Mr. Chairman:- "I did not want to be interviewed by the press because I wanted my total statement to go directly to the R.C.M.P. who, incidentally, know of my whereabouts at all times. I have since given my statement to the R.C.M.P. and have taken a polygraph lie detector test to prove I am telling the truth and of my innocence. I wish others included would so the same."

I wish the hon. the Premier would go and take a polygraph test and I wish the hon. gentleman would take a polygraph test about the helicopters. At this time -

MR. MORGAN: What helicopters? Dirty innuendo!

MR. W. ROWE: That would show a lot.

MR. S. NEARY: "At this time I imagine everyone in the Province including the media"- Listen to this, Mr. Chairman, "Everybody in the Province including the media thinks I am a crook, a deserter and a fugitive on the run. "No chance". Even though it was the easiest thing I could do I knew after it is all over if I can survive that long, The police -" and that is why I would suggest, Sir, that the gentleman left the Province, "The police investigation will prove beyond a shadow of doubt I am innocent and not guilty of any kickbacks or sorts from either the Davidsons in any part or of Government or any other matter. Also to this I have to add clarification -" and listen to this, Sir, and we heard the propaganda, I do not know where it originated from, probably pumped out via some Government source, the propaganda machine, "Also to this I have to add clarification, I do not take drugs, only medication." And the C.B.C., the national broadcasting company, the national media, who like to go out and try to dig up little bits and pieces of scandal that they can get a hold of, like yesterday they fed the Premier a little bit of information about

MR. S. NEARY: a ticket. And they thought they had it all, this is it, playing the mugs game.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who did that?

MR. S. NEARY: The CBC. Helping the Premier play his mugs game, doing little favours for the Premier in anticipation of jobs in the future on the government payroll.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

I do have to remind the hon. member of subhead under discussion.

MR. S. NEARY: The final analysis -

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) attack on CBC.

MRS. H. MCISAAC: (inaudible)

MR. S. NEARY: What is that? Oh, yes.

"I do not take drugs, only medication prescribed pills -"

Incidentally, Sir, I might say, in my reference to the CBC, I am only speaking about one or two individuals, I am not talking about all the news people and all the staff at the CBC. The hon. gentleman looked at me and I figured I had better clarify that. There are pretty good people working at the CBC, especially in the newsroom, but one rotten egg can spoil a whole barrel or one rotten apple, one rotten apple can spoil the whole barrel, as the hon. gentleman should know from sitting on that side of the House.

MR. SIMMONS: Are you talking about his client?

MR. NEARY: Who is his client?

MR. SIMMONS: Not his client. Not his client.

MR. NEARY: Who is his client?

MR. SIMMONS: I cannot say that here, can I?

MR. NEARY: Does he have a client? Not A.B. Walsh, surely? No? The hon. gentleman has a lot of clients.

And he says, "I do not take drugs only medication prescribed pills -"

MR. SIMMONS: One of his clients.

MR. S. NEARY: One of his clients is the CBC? No wonder -

AN HON. MEMBER: No, at the CBC.

MR. S. NEARY: At the CBC.

"The final analysis will show up in court at a later date. When the complete RCMP investigation is over, then

MR. S. NEARY: We will know who is guilty or innocent.
Please note, this is the only words I have to say to the press.
Yours truly, Terrance G. White."

Now, Sir, we do not know at this moment
if that is a fake, we do not know if it is a fictitious letter, we
do not know if it is a forgery, we do not know what it is.

MR. W. DOODY: It did not come from Information
Services.

MR. S. NEARY: It did come from Information Service,
so I am told, Sir, delivered to the Press Gallery.

MR. W. DOODY: I just got a note from Information Service
now saying they deny that the White letter was delivered through them
or by them.

MR. J. MORGAN: A good organization.

MR. S. NEARY: Well, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman,
I presume, knows I cannot disbelieve the hon. gentleman. I was told
by somebody from the 10th Floor, on the 10th Floor -

MR. J. MORGAN: Yes, somebody.

MR. S. NEARY: - a representative of the media -

MR. J. MORGAN: A phantom! A ghost on the
tenth floor.

MR. S. NEARY: Does the hon. gentleman want me to talk
about his use of the helicopter? Does the hon. gentleman want me
to put this document on the table of the House?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. S. NEARY: I will if the hon. gentleman keeps at it.

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman is -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

Is the hon. Minister rising on a point
of order?

MR. MORGAN: On a point of order, yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On a point of order.

MR. MORGAN: No, on a point of privilege, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On a point of privilege.

MR. MORGAN: The hon. gentleman is threatening me with if I do not keep quiet in the House that he will table information with regards to the use of helicopters by myself.

Mr. Chairman, I have nothing whatsoever to be ashamed of in my use of government helicopters any time in the past number of years. And if the hon. gentleman feels he has information different to that or contrary to that, I would ask him to table in the House of Assembly all matters containing same.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, that is not a point of order, as Your Honour knows.

MR. MORGAN: It is a point of privilege.

MR. MORGAN: If the hon. gentleman tells me, Sir, that he has nothing to be ashamed of well then I accept the hon. gentleman's word. But if the hon. gentleman wants me to table any documents I will gladly oblige, Sir. You know, the hon. gentlemen asked me, forced me before, to table documents, and if they force me again, but I do not think they can this time because I have not quoted from the documents, but if they do, Sir, I will be very happy to lay the document on the table of the House. I mean I do not mind.

MR. MORGAN: Table them.

MR. NEARY: Well I will in due course. Sir, that is not a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, the fact is, look, I am sitting in the House of Assembly as a member here, and I am having innuendoes cast at me that the hon. gentleman has a threat of information indicating that I misused government helicopters.

MR. NEARY: No, I did not say that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, he did.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: No. No.

MR. MORGAN: I am not going to tolerate innuendo cast at me indicating that I was dishonest any way in using government monies of any sort.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Sit down!

MR. MORGAN: So, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman is going to have to table information and prove his documentation, if he has anything to table, against me. I am not going to stand in this House or sit in this House and listen to innuendo cast at me which is dishonest.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: Dishonest.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: On a point of privilege, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order!

MR. NEARY: On a point of privilege, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: I am on a point of privilege.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of privilege is before the Chair, and the Chair can only entertain one point of privilege at a time. I understand the hon. minister is still speaking to the point of privilege.

MR. MORGAN: Right.

MR. NEARY: - A point of order the hon. gentleman made, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, a point of privilege.

MR. MORGAN: No, a point of privilege.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: Now, Mr. Chairman, it has gotten to a point in this House of Assembly that members in the Opposition feel they can get evidence or documentation or affidavits or statements or documents as he called them, about individual's dishonesty, misuse of government funds, in this case a charge, a misuse of government helicopters.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what I am saying is when the charge is made against me I am not going to tolerate that kind of innuendo and charge made against me. And if the hon. gentleman has the courage he will table any documentation he has which he might indicate or which he feels might indicate my dishonesty as a government minister, but at the same time table all documentation relating to same in this House right now. I am not going to tolerate innuendo cast at me as being dishonest as a minister any more. If he has documentation, table it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order, the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Your Honour knows full well that is just a way for the hon. gentleman to sort of hit back at the Opposition. There is no point of privilege, Sir. There was no document quoted from. The hon. gentleman was not accused of being dishonest as the hon. gentleman says. And talking about that, Mr. Chairman, to hear this hon. sanctimonious gentleman get up who last night pointed across the House at my friend, why did you go to Paris? Why, Paris? The hon. gentleman was saying. And that

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - hon. gentleman has the gall and the face to talk about innuendo.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please!

The point of privilege before the Chair, I think, revolved around whether a threat was made against another hon. member of the Committee. My recollection is that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) did hold some papers aloft and stated that if the hon. minister continued to make interjections he would have to table such papers. And the implication is that these papers would have something that would be of a threat or embarrassment to the hon. minister. I think it is clear that a threat to an hon. member in regard to what he should or can or might do in the House is not a point of privilege, I would say, but certainly is out of order, and I would ask the hon. member to withdraw any implication that there was a threat against the hon. minister, against his speaking in the House.

MR. NEARY: Of course, Mr. Chairman, there was no threat, Your Honour knows that .

MR. NEARY: and if there was any indication of that of course I withdraw it. But if the hon. gentleman invites me to at some future date, if the hon. gentleman invites me I would be very glad to table a letter from the hon. gentleman's constituent and his reply to that constituent - or to me as my result of sending the documentation to the hon. gentleman.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Any time. Just invite. Mr. Chairman, anyway I am finished with the White letter. But what I want to know from the minister, has the minister seen this letter? The Minister of Justice grabbed it and rushed down to his department. Perhaps the Minister of Justice can tell us if this is authentic, this document that I am holding in my hand signed by Mr. Terrence White. The minister had it. I saw him going out of the House with it.

MR. HICKMAN: You mean that press release that was circulated (Inaudible)?

MR. NEARY: Yes, is there any authenticity to it? Is it fictitious?

MR. HICKMAN: I have no idea.

MR. NEARY: Is it a fake? Is it real? If it is real then I would say China is not far enough for the half of that crowd on the other side to go.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. minister.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Chairman, if I could just deal briefly with some of the points that have been raised during the past hour or so. I am afraid the estimates for the Department of Public Works have become somewhat lost in the histrionic shuffle of the past day and last night.

The first point I would like to clarify is the statements that were made about the Newfoundland Information Service. I have a note from the people down at Information Service who deny quite vehemently the delivering of that so-called White letter to the press gallery or to anywhere else, whether that is relevant or not. I suppose it is kind of by the point.

MR. NEARY: It is not so, is that it?

MR. DOODY: But it says here quite clearly that the White letter was not delivered through or by Newfoundland Information Services, signed by a person in whom I have complete confidence and is dated 5:32 P.M. of this date. So I just want to make that clear for the

MR. DOODY: record because it had been indicated otherwise. And Newfoundland Information Services it has been gone through its usual tirade of abuse by the hon. member for LaPoile. He refers to it as the propaganda machine and the bulletin and so on. We have all had our experiences with the bulletin and we have seen the bulletin in action before.

Newfoundland Information Services is a relatively small organization which tries to perform a public service and a public function. The people down there over the past few years have been much maligned publicly and I think rather unfairly. I would like to - I will not dwell on Information Services very long. The hon. member for Ferryland has dealt with it -

MR. NEARY: Will the minister permit a question?

MR. DOODY: I do not know. Yes. I cannot guarantee you an answer but -

MR. NEARY: Those who push the carts around the building, you know these little carts that look like -

MR. DOODY: Yes, I have an application in for one of them.

MR. NEARY: Do they come under the minister's department?

MR. DOODY: They are with the mailroom.

MR. NEARY: But are they under the minister's department?

MR. DOODY: Yes, they are in some department or other.

MR. NEARY: Well could the minister find out if it was one of these carts that this Terry White letter was carried in?

MR. DOODY: When the cart came up was there anybody riding shotgun on it?

MR. NEARY: No, they are waiting - As soon as the minister gets over on Bell Island the next time they can get a crack at him he will either have his hand down in a pickle barrel or he will be doing what he just said.

MR. DOODY: I was over on Bell Island Wednesday morning and they wished you well, two people wished you well.

MR. NEARY: Yes, I know. And the hon. gentleman did not use the

MR. NEARY: government helicopter to go over this time.

MR. DOODY: As a matter of fact both of your friends were there.

That is right he did once.

MR. NEARY: He did once and he got caught and that was it.

MR. DOODY: That is right. I had to attend a funeral the funeral of a good friend.

MR. NEARY: But could the minister find out if these letters were delivered by the messengers who go around delivering mail in the building? Could the minister find that out for us?

MR. DOODY: I can certainly get all my super-sleuths on it if you are not using them today.

MR. NEARY: No, that is right. Was the hon. Premier pushing the CBC -

MR. DOODY: If you can spare me one or two of your super-sleuths I will certainly give it the full benefit of all the people in the various departments.

One item only on the Newfoundland Information Services which I think is worthy of attention to the committee and I think it speaks more of the sort of work that they do than all the vitriol and all the abuse that hon. members opposite have heaped on that organization. It is a letter addressed to the Newfoundland Information Services from Newfoundland and Labrador Armature Sports Federation and it is addressed to Mr. David Butler, Director. It says, "Dave, We did it again. I know the tremendous coverage of national and provincial games must be second nature to you now but I could not allow your recent achievement to go unnoticed from this quarter. The coverage that Newfoundland Information Services provided for all our news media during the recent 1978 Newfoundland and Labrador

MR. DOODY:

Winter games is one of the main factors and a tremendous success. Having now sat on both sides of your telex I can really appreciate the tremendous service that Newfoundland Information Services provides amateur sports. I felt your recent games effort was the best in a succession of success efforts by you and your staff for amateur sports within the Province. Please convey my congratulations and gratitude to all of your staff who are involved in your latest achievement. Yours in sports, D. Murphy, Executive Secretary of the Newfoundland and Labrador Amateur Sports Federation."

Now, D. Murphy, I would accept his opinion as being one of an impartial nature, certainly not one who is going out of his way to try to apologize for a propaganda machine but a gentleman who is quite sincerely interested in public service and is appreciative of the efforts done by the people downstairs. And I think that that speaks more for this sort of work that Information Services are capable of and are performing over the past years than any amount of rhetoric could probably do.

Sir, the Printing and Photography Division, as was mentioned briefly, surprised me. Not even the members of the Opposition could find anything to criticize in that particular division of the Department of Public Works and Services. I think that is properly so. They are probably one of the most efficient and dedicated groups of people that we have in the public service. Very little is heard of them. They are very rarely seen. I think any of us who have been involved in the budgetary process here in the Province of Newfoundland can really appreciate

MR. DOODY:

what these people are capable of, how efficiently they can work, how little regard they have for time or for hours and how many miracles they manage to perform in the rather cramped quarters downstairs in the bowels of the earth with the very limited facilities and obsolete equipment that is available to them. And I think that they are to be congratulated and I am very proud to be associated with them in the ministry now as I have been through Treasury Board and Finance over the past years.

AN HON. MEMBER: Could the hon. minister give us a copy?

MR. DOODY: Certainly.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is this for the press?

MR. DOODY: No, this is addressed to Dave Butler. I have his permission to -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MURPHY: I think it is the press one.

MR. DOODY: Is it? I have not got the other one. I did not see it.

MR. MURPHY: Okay. I just wanted to know.

MR. DOODY: I do not know. I will table anything that is here, the St. John's Evening Telegram, the budget address. I do not mind.

The mail room from the Department of Finance delivers all incoming mail and operates the mail carts. I interrupt the programme for an unsolicited public announcement for the attention of the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) if he is within hearing distance. The mail room within the Department of Finance delivers all incoming mail and operates the carts. So if that letter purportedly or allegedly coming from one White was delivered to the press gallery

MR. DOODY:

in one of our carts the hon. Minister of Finance is one of his outriders. One of his bulletin boys delivered the message. So I cannot accept responsibility for it and I refuse to be waylaid and sidetracked from my discourse any further.

MR. HICKMAN: That is not the cart that tipped over going down the corridor is it?

MR. DOODY: No, it is one of the carts that keep fouling up the elevators in this building, that keep hitting the edges of the doors, knocking them off center and the elevators are fouled up for days as a result. Get rubber carts for your people for heavens sake!

The hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Rowe) in a more serious vein, Sir, raised an item, a subject that was raised last night and we went into it in some detail last night, and that was the suggestion that a public enquiry be held into the Health Sciences Complex or what was perhaps more colourfully referred to as the Scrivener affair. Well, we have been informed by the secretary of the judicial enquiry, the Mahoney Commission who are looking into the spending practices of the Department of Public Works and Services, that their terms of references are broad enough to include enquiries into the Health Sciences Complex as it relates to the spending practices of the Department of Public Works.

Presumably the Carbonear
Hospital

MR. DOODY: as well can be covered through the same terms of reference. It would seem to be superfluous and redundant even counter-productive and wasteful to set up another special enquiry when an enquiry is already in place that is quite capable and quite able to look into the matters referred to by the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Rowe) the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

The hon. Minister of Justice once again was questioned by the Leader of the Opposition on the lack of speed with which the appropriate authorities have launched the charges against the alleged culprits in the so-called hangar 3 enquiry. The hon. Minister of Justice has assured me and has assured this House and all in it and all outside it that the investigation into the hangar 3 situation is an ongoing process that will be brought to trial as quickly as possible, providing there is something there to bring to trial, and I assume that there is. If there is not we should know about it as soon as we can and if there is we should know about it as soon as we can. I know that the Department of Public Works and the people in the Department of Public Works are more anxious than anybody else to see this particular matter brought to a head. That it is imperative that as quickly as possible all these allegations of inequities, of improprieties, of wrongdoings be dealt with and settled. That if wrongdoing indeed has taken place, that if people are guilty, as I said last night, whether they are employees of government, whether they are elected officials, or whether they are private citizens outside the public service, or outside this House, if there are guilty people in this matter then they should be brought before the courts and the law should deal with them and if they are guilty then let the law take its course. It is equally important, Sir, that those people, the vast majority of the people in the department who do business with the department, who sit in this House, it is equally important to them that this matter be brought to a head so that this pall, this pallor,

May 2, 1978.

Tape No. 1727

AH-2

MR. DOODY: this cloud that hangs over all of us can be cleared and put to bed and we can get on with the business for which we were sent here, and that is the governing of this Province and the matters that relate to it.

Now, Sir, further than that on the judicial enquiry into the Scrivenor projects, into the Health Sciences Complex I cannot go at this time, as I have said the Mahoney enquiry is set up, the terms of reference are broad enough in scope I understand, to embrace all the matters referred to and presumably matters will be brought to the attention of the commission if there is a need felt for it.

Now, one of the items that was discussed during the estimates, and previous to the estimates, were the lists, the so-called lists from which the Department of Public Works have awarded the various maintenance tasks which resulted in the work orders and the problems with them, and some of these are matters which are under investigation. But to put the minds of people at ease, perhaps, with regard to this, the list that was in being in the department some years ago, and subsequent lists, have been replaced some time ago by what is now referred to as the index. And it is a huge black tome that is down on the Deputy Minister's credenza, down on his desk in which are listed the names of all the companies who are willing, who are anxious to do work for or contract for work with the Department of Public Works and Services. And this list has been compiled as a result of public advertising.

MR. W. DOODY: In September past all the major and indeed the minor newspapers in the Province were circulated with an advertisement signed by the then minister, Joseph G. Rousseau, Jr., to the effect that the Department of Public Works and Services is in the process of establishing a contractors' index from which firms and interested individuals will be requested to submit tenders or make proposals for work from the Department from time to time. Interested firms and individuals who would like to have their names placed on the index are requested to advise the Department of Public Works and Services of their interest and of the nature of the service which can be supplied. One, the information submitted should state clearly the name of the company or individual, contain a mailing address and telephone contact, the type of service normally supplied by the company or individual, the dollar range of the service normally supplied by the company or individual, the area of the Province in which the firm is prepared to work. The Department will request additional information from such companies and individuals to complete its files once the initial information has been received. It is intended by the Department to use the contractors' index for a period of one year once it is complete and to update it thereafter on a yearly basis. Interested parties should send their information to the Department of Public Works and Services, and so on. Joseph G. Rousseau, Jr., Minister. Now this -

AN HON. MEMBER: Pardon?

MR. W. DOODY: Joseph G. Rousseau, Jr., Minister.
That is my diction. I will have to work on that. I know it must be upsetting.

The procedure that is followed in the Department now is that for those items of less than \$1,000 three companies are contacted and asked if they are prepared, or capable,

MR. W. DOODY: or able in a given area of the Province if the work is in Stephenville, or if it is in St. Anthony, or in Lewisporte, or wherever, three companies who have supplied their names and the information which I listed are asked if they are able to do this particular work, and this is done on a rotating basis. The rotation is audited monthly by the DM to make sure that there is not an over-abundance of work going to an individual.

AN HON. MEMBER: You do not have a list, do you?

MR. W. DOODY: There is no list. There is this delightful index which any member is welcome to look at to make sure that there are the lists as such.

MR. WHITE: They were done away with?

MR. W. DOODY: Yes, I have been assured by the - One of the first questions that I asked when I went in there was if I could see the list, and I was informed that there was no list. And I did not pursue that matter. The -

MR. WHITE: Whelan is a good man. He is a good deputy.

MR. W. DOODY: That is right. And we have some good assistant deputies there too. It is a good operation now. So for items up to \$1,000 this system is in place. Between \$1,000 and \$12,000 tenders are invited from at least three companies. The Public Tenders Act calls for a \$15,000 limit. The officials in the Department felt the \$15,000 limit was too restrictive, they wanted a cushion in between so that they would not run into overruns, a bunch of \$14,999 bids which would put them in overrun situations, and then in awarding the overruns they would be in violation of the Public Tenders Act. So a \$12,000 limit is now in place. I think I had better adjourn the Committee. You can rise the Committee, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It now being 1800 hours I leave the Chair until 2000 hours.

4864

VOL. 3

NO. 47

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
8:00 - 11:00 P.M.
TUESDAY, MAY 2, 1978

The Committee resumed at 8:00 p.m.

Mr. Chairman in the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

1801-01.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. DOODY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SIMMONS: We have someone wanting to speak over there.

MR. DOODY: Pardon?

MR. SIMMONS: Some are more equal than others.

MR. DOODY: What is that?

MR. SIMMONS: Some are more equal than others.

MR. DOODY: Yes, that it true there is no question about that. I recognized that the day that I met the hon. gentleman.

MR. SIMMONS: The minister is more equal.

MR. DOODY: That is right! That is right!

The fallacy about all men being born equal is indeed a fallacy, it is not true.

As the Committee adjourned or rose for supper, Mr. Chairman, we were discussing some of the new innovations and new controls that were being put into place in the Department of Public Works and Services over the past year and we particularly brought to the attention of the Committee the index of people, firms, companies, suppliers who might be interested in obtaining some of the maintenance and emergency work of the department and I described in some detail how that process was arrived at and how the index was being built up area by area, service by service, trade by trade, company by company and had mentioned to the Committee that the index was available. It is in the Deputy Minister's office and we would welcome any input that hon. members of the House or other associates might have in bringing it to the attention of the public as being

MR. DOODY: the proper way to go about the acquiring of that kind of service for the department on behalf of government and its agencies in the \$1,000 or less area and in emergency situations.

The public notice that has been placed in all the newspapers in the Province, the major ones and the minor ones: I read into the record a copy of the advertisement and there is a copy available for the Table of the House if anybody so desires.

There is an area between the \$1,000 area and the Public Tender Act which specifies that all items over \$15,000 should be tendered. Now as I said earlier, Sir, the \$15,000 amount is no longer the guideline the department uses. The \$15,000 amount which is the public tender's floor, has been cut to \$12,000 by a decree of the Deputy Minister who feels that the , and I certainly agree with him, that the very letter of the law in this particular area would give rise to a problem of overruns for which there was no redress and so the rule of law in the department itself is that public tenders have to be advertised for all matters of business in excess of \$12,000. Not \$15,000, \$12,000. So the amount we are looking at then is that area in which we do have difficulty and which I still feel, and which the senior officials of the department feel, is still an area of concern and one that we have to look at very, very carefully and very, very closely and that is that area between the \$1,000 and the \$12,000.

The rule in the department right now is that tenders have to be invited for all areas, all items within that price range. I have a few examples here with me: A tender for retubing of York-Shipley hot water boiler in the district vocation school in Carbonear: Well, three companies were phoned, called - no, they were not, they were written - three companies were written and asked to

MR. DOODY:

submit a tender on that particular job. The department's estimate of cost was \$5,000. There were three bids came in by the three firms whose names are shown here and the lowest of the three obviously was awarded the tender.

There is another one here. The department's estimate in this particular case is \$5,000. The company that won the bid was \$4,294 and that one is pretty accurate. In the other one that I have here, the department's estimate of cost was \$5,500, the lowest estimate of bid on that one, which was for the Fisheries College here in St. John's to install four unit heaters in the basement of the main building, and the lowest bid that arrived by letter was \$2,675, and so the system appears, at least on the surface, to be working well. How it really does work, as was suggested by the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) will depend mainly on the attention that it is given and to the spirit of the act and the amount of reverence that is paid to what the act really means and the rules and regulations themselves, although as they sit there in place right now appear to me to be reasonably good, and there are some areas, some holes, some gaps, some cracks that still need to be filled and still need to be corrected but without the dedication to the act and to the spirit of the act of course these things are meaningless.

But I feel that we have a good team in place there now and it is building up into a much better team. I think that we know what it is all about and where we are going and what the message is. I think that, as we have explained already, that we are well prepared to look at the year ahead and the years ahead and I would hope, Sir, that the next Auditor General's report for the Department of Public Works and Services will have nothing more contentious in it than the Auditor General's reports on Finance

May 2, 1978

Tape No. 1730

WM - 3

MR. DOODY: and Treasury Board and so on during the past years when the major differences were matters of difference in philosophy on bookkeeping and accounting on general principles.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have to inform the hon. gentleman that his time has elapsed.

MR. DOODY: Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. KITCHEN: How could his time be elapsed?

On motion 1801-01 through 1810-03-03,
carried.

On motion Head XVIII all items without
amendment, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (DR. J. COLLINS): Order, please!

XX - CONSUMER AFFAIRS AND THE ENVIRONMENT

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and the Environment.

MR. MURPHY: Do you want to pass them all now? I know there is not much confidence in my department -

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I had the floor, I believe. I yielded to the minister on the understanding that he wanted to make an opening statement.

MR. MURPHY: I made it.

MR. SIMMONS: That was his opening statement? Well, Mr. Chairman, that is good. It is also the longest statement we have had from the minister in eight or nine weeks, but then again we do not get Florida radio.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (DR. COLLINS): Order, please!

To avoid confusion, the Chair had recognized the hon. minister, I am not sure if the hon. minister has finished his few remarks.

MR. WHITE: I just wondered if he is finished his speech?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs and the Environment.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman,

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MURPHY: I am very happy indeed to make a brief statement, some five or ten minutes, on my department's programmes for the year. I would like before I start, perhaps I am being a little old fashioned here, to revert to a very old custom. I have on my right here my Deputy Minister, Mr. Kinsman, who has done a tremendous job in this department since it was formed a couple of years ago. And I would like first of all to thank him and the other officials, and my ADM, Mr. Barter, and Mr. Downey for the job that they put into this department to make it a success, which I feel it has been. If the success of a department's programme is to be judged on the amount of

Mr. Murphy: money expended, our department would certainly not head the list. Fortunately, however, there are other criteria by which a department's effectiveness can be measured. My department's primary function is a regulatory one and when viewed from this perspective it assumes a major significance. The department administers over fifty pieces of legislation, several of these Acts being active on a daily basis.

To cite some examples: departmental legislation regulates activities such as consumer credit, collection agencies, direct selling, real estate trading, landlord-tenant regulations, co-operatives, waste disposal, pesticide control, pollution, water management and many, many others. It is true to say that the legislation and activities of my department directly or indirectly touch the lives of every Newfoundlander.

The old Department of Provincial Affairs and the Environment was renamed the Department of Consumer Affairs and the Environment by an Act of this Legislature in June 1976 and the department has become a very effective force and made great strides forward since that time. I would like to inform the hon. members of some of our money activities and describe the progress that has been made particularly during the past year. And at this juncture I would like to say that our estimates are made up in different sections under different headings, and perhaps it might be to the benefit of everybody concerned, particularly the general public, if we could go through these headings one by one instead of making very long speeches, then pushing everything through as has been the custom this past couple of years. I think it would be much better for the public to get the information out and also for the members to get information themselves.

MR. NEARY: We cannot get it from the present government.

MR. MURPHY: The past twelve months have been a period of growth and change for the Consumer Affairs Division of the Department of Consumer Affairs and the Environment. In January we extended our services to the downtown area of St. John's by the establishment of the Consumer Help Office at City Hall. This office is the second of its kind in Canada, and it is a joint venture of the Provincial/Municipal/Federal governments.

Mr. Murphy: The office, which is located in the Main Lobby of City Hall, is staffed on a rotating basis by personnel from both the Federal and Provincial Departments of Consumer Affairs. Through these facilities consumers may obtain assistance with consumer problems and receive information on consumer products and consumer legislation.

During the past year our division in consultation with the Department of Education developed a consumer education pilot project for presentation to the high school students in the Province. The response to this programme has been most enthusiastic and it is presented by the Consumer Affairs staff upon request from high school teachers, and I would like to pass this information out to any member who would like at any time to have our people visit their own areas for any particular purpose such as this.

In these classroom sessions, audio-visual aids in the form of exciting, provocative films are shown and are followed by discussions on the work of the department, consumer rights and responsibilities, and the legislation administered by this department to ensure these rights are protected and consumers' responsibilities clearly understood. To date this programme has been presented in high schools, collegiates and Memorial University Extension Service classes. At the request of community and services groups the

MR. A. MURPHY:

programme has been enlarged and presented to women's institutes, Beta Sigma Phi, consumer groups, Business and Professional Women, clubs, cadets, church groups, rural development and pre-marriage courses. The consumer consultant and consumer affairs staff have travelled widely throughout Newfoundland and Labrador in an effort to inform thousands of consumers of their rights in the marketplace, and to assist them by the use of films and lectures in making wise decisions in that marketplace which daily increases in complexity.

Regional offices: because of the high demand placed upon the department's regional offices which were established during 1976, stenographic staff were hired for the Grand Falls and Corner Brook offices. These regional offices provide the consumers in Central and Western Newfoundland the same services that are available through the department offices in St. John's. I might add here, Mr. Chairman, that we received requests from various other areas of the Province to create offices but unfortunately due to a lack of funds we have not been able to do that, but I might say that in the past few months we have assisted groups in Western Labrador and Happy Valley - Goose Bay who are very anxious to get some consumer activities going and we have made them a small grant of \$500 which will provide office space for them in one of the government buildings and also provide a telephone and a direct connection to St. John's. We hope to extend that service perhaps to the Baie Verte Peninsula, to the Stephenville area, to the Marystown area and the Green Bay area and we will have someone travelling around in regular -

MR. FLIGHT: Any chance of including Buchans?

MR. A. MURPHY: - weekly or so on and so forth that will meet with groups and I think will be very educational for these groups. The impact of the consumer education project and the department's expansion to City Hall and the Central and Western regions has been reflected in a tremendous increase in the number of complaints and inquiries received during the past year. The Consumer Affairs staff in the three regions have meditated complaints and provided information to 8,000 consumers

MR. A. MURPHY: We think that is quite a tremendous amount of inquiries.

I might add here that we do not accept collect calls in my department from anybody because the bills would be enormous. Everybody phoning our department pays for their own phone calls. And I would just like to put that on record that anybody who has a complaint and if they want to contact either Corner Brook, Grand Falls we do not receive collect calls only in two instances and that is Labrador West and Happy Valley - Goose Bay where we have installed our sort of regional offices there.

The types of complaints mediated ranged from home repairs to food prices. An increase in consumer awareness has been indicated by the escalation in the number of inquiries received by the division for information regarding flooring care, wood burning stoves, television sets, new and used cars, electric blankets covered the whole spectrum of consumer goods. The most recent addition to our consumer service facilities is a consumer information resource center. This center is equipped to supply consumers with research information to assist them in buying a new or used car. It contains information on product ratings and testing of appliances, carpet, upholstered furniture etc. This center houses all available consumer publications which should prove to be of great benefit to consumers and assist them in better utilizing their hard earned dollars. In other words, it is a kind of circulating library where we try to keep people up-to-date. If there is anything in particular any member or any of his people would want, feel free to give us a shout and we will supply them with what is available.

The ongoing monitoring of food and household commodities continued during 1977 with a major survey undertaken by the department at the request of the Commission of Inquiry into Newfoundland transportation. All major areas of the Province were monitored for comparison with mainland prices. This information has been transmitted to the Commission and should prove most valuable when assessing the impact of transportation costs on the price of food in Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. A. MURPHY:

The introduction of the federal insulation grants and the emphasis on energy conservation prompted the division to monitor prices of insulation materials in order to prohibit any undue escalation in costs because of the high demand for insulation materials.

I may say on many of these things that we do in conjunction with Mines and Energy or any other department, we work side by side with all the ministers and we try to make it a co-operative venture both federal and provincial.

During 1977 members of the division staff visited rural communities in Newfoundland and Labrador to mediate customer complaints, address community groups and to ascertain the need of consumers living in areas remote from centers of supply. And I think everybody will appreciate

MR. MURPHY: that in the cities of St. John's and Corner Brook where we have the new supermarkets we sort of control ourselves, but in the smaller places it is that much more difficult to try to keep prices down.

The sites chosen were Grand Falls, Gander, Stephenville, Port aux Basques, Corner Brook, Marystown, Bay Roberts and St. John's. To familiarize consumers with the work of the department and the services that we offer an advertising campaign was undertaken during 1977. Our ad was the wishbone. It was designed for insertion in the two daily newspapers. It simply said, "Wish you could call someone for help? You could call us at - ," and we had the three numbers in the Province in this. The ad appealed to young and old and the response has been most overwhelming.

For distribution to consumers in Newfoundland and Labrador, the Consumer Affairs Division researched, developed and printed eight brochures on such topics as buying a new car, complaint procedures, deals on wheels etc. A consumer alert button was also designed which proved to be most popular and has been widely distributed.

At the conclusion of our second year of operations as a fully fledged Department of Consumer Affairs and Environment, the Consumer Affairs Division has a much broader mandate and is now supplying to consumers in this Province the services that were so long overdue.

Another department that we are responsible for, or a division if you like, is the Registry of Co-ops. It is something that I am very keen on myself, that I would like to see a full-fledged co-op division particularly in the rural parts of the area. I think it would be a tremendous boost and to give you some idea of the value of co-ops that are presently being carried on in the Province, the total volume of business conducted by Newfoundland co-ops increased by ten per cent, to over \$55 million

MR. MURPHY: last year. These are the co-op stores in the Province.

MR. STRACHAN: Retail co-ops.

MR. MURPHY: Retail, yes.

MR. STRACHAN: Not producer co-ops.

MR. MURPHY: Unfortunately. I think it is something that we should have but we will get around to it eventually.

The following is an indication of the volume of business, financial and otherwise, of the active co-op societies for the 1977 reporting year: The total number of members is 28,709, and the assets amount to \$28,718,584, that was twenty-nine per cent increase over last year. Sales were \$42,582,886; loans \$12,315,796; all increased nine per cent to ten per cent.

Newfoundland's fifty-six active societies employed 450 full time and 310 part time staff. Two new co-ops were incorporated during the year, Greenspond Smoke House Producers Co-op and the Credit Union Council of Newfoundland.

Our Co-op Registry continued to examine the corporate and capital structures of co-ops as well as the efficiency of operations. This Registry provides information, statistics and research for the benefit of co-ops generally and assists in the supervision and development housing co-ops in particular.

Landlord Tenant Relations was another very, very important division of our department. During the year 1977 there were a total of 422 applications for hearings before the five residential tenancies board. And of that total 351 came before the boards for hearings and our building inspector carried out a total of 925 inspections of properties. I may say that we have only one inspector. We would like to have one or two more but we just have not the funds to employ them.

There was a considerable increase in the applications from the Western part of the Province and this can be directly attributed

MR. MURPHY: to the establishment of the regional office of the department being opened there in the Fall of 1976. Another step forward for the Landlord Tenant Relations Division was the legislation passed bringing rented mobile homes and the land rented in mobile home parks under the jurisdiction of this division. Formerly they could do nothing whatever about it but now they have some control to walk in there and look at what is happening.

Metric conversion; I am sure everybody in the House is very anxious to know about metric conversion. I wish I knew something about it. But there is a lot of work being done on it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Foot by foot.

MR. MURPHY: Foot by foot? No, the foot is out.

We worked on the Highway Traffic Act, The Department of Transportation and Communications Act, The Public Utilities Act, The Family Homes Expropriation Act, and The Gasoline Tax Act. As you know, we were one of the first in Canada to get into the highways, the changing of signs and this type of thing, and as a consequence I think, as far as safety is concerned, the original sixty mile speed limit was cut to ninety kilometers, which is now fifty-five miles per hour and I think that is in conjunction with what is happening in the States.

AN HON. MEMBER: I thought that was ninety miles an hour.

MR. MURPHY: A lot of people think it. Yes. But I might say it is kilometers.

MR. MURPHY: There is a lot more work to be done I think. One of the big jobs would be in the Department of Mines and Energy where all the planning and all the maps and everything will have to be changed-yards, rods, acres, whatever - into metric language.

The other important part of our department, Mr. Chairman, is the Department of Environment. And though, as I said earlier, we were just a small department where there are a lot more things that we would like to have done, we did a fair job, I think, in having some effect on environmental division activity.

Significant advances were made in the area of water resource management and waste disposal site construction, pollution complaint investigation and industrial pollution monitoring during 1977. In recognition of the need for more and better technical information on water resources, the Environment Division acquired two additional hydrology technicians in 1977 and expanded its data gathering activity to cover ground and surface water bodies across the Province. Though of a long-term nature, the benefits of having such data are considerable, for the proper engineering design of bridges, culverts, storm sewers and other water control structures is dependent upon having reliable information on storm water levels and run-off conditions over an extended time period.

Co-incidental with the above, additional stream gauging stations were negotiated with the federal government bringing the Provincial total to sixty-one stations being monitored for high and low water levels in 1977.

The Department of Consumer Affairs and Environment provides for the protection of public drinking water supplies. This is legal protection in the sense of describing the water shed area in the Newfoundland Gazette and thereby allowing the water supplies' owner,

MR. MURPHY: normally a municipality or water supply committee, to restrict certain activities in the watershed which could result in contamination of the water supply. That could, in many cases, involve swimming and perhaps boating and many other pasttimes. We try to, if we can, not bar all recreation. We feel that certain forms of recreation, it might be fishing, might be allowed and we would not want to bar the people from it.

Application for watershed protection must be made to the minister and may or may not be approved depending on the scope of development, pressure or the nature of other activity in the area. As I say, a lot of it would be the actual recreation areas that we talk about.

In negotiation with federal officials we were successful in obtaining the agreement of the atmospheric environment service to expand the presently inadequate climatological station network by an additional thirty precipitation stations. Data from these stations will be correlated with stream flow measurement from nearby river basins and used in designing local water structures.

Something that we are introducing in the House this session and we hope to get through is a well drilling act. As a prelude to intended legislation regulating well drilling in the Province, meetings were held with all well drilling firms and their co-operation requested in supplying the division with pertinent technical data. To date pump yield, information on rock formation etc. on some 3,500 drilled wells have been supplied. This will be used in mapping ground water resource areas and eventually reducing the number and cost of dry wells. In other words, we hope to have this information on any part of the Province where someone is contemplating

MR. MURPHY: digging a well. We hope to say, Look, this may not be the suitable place; because of information we have, perhaps you should dug over here in these deep waters. So I think that will be a tremendous help.

MRS. MCISSAC: Would the minister permit a question?

MR. MURPHY: Yes.

MRS. MCISSAC: Will that replace the Water Services Division or the wells that are being provided by the Water Services Division in Municipal Affairs or is that a completely separate programme?

MR. MURPHY: I would say we would work in conjunction with Municipal Affairs. On the whole thing, I think, we would work alongside Municipal Affairs.

MRS. MCISSAC: Back to back.

MR. DOODY: That is right, back to back.

MR. MURPHY: In this case too, my Deputy Minister informs me, all well drillers will have to get a licence as to their capability. I have two minutes? Yes, well, all right, I am just about clued up on the thing. I just want to give an overview but if anybody wants to ask any questions, of course, we would love to have them.

Perhaps this one thing under the waste disposal site construction programme: The division has financed the construction of ten new waste disposal sites for unincorporated areas in Newfoundland and Labrador over the past twelve months. This activity represents an expenditure of some \$130,000 plus an extensive involvement of environmental officers and time in providing technical administrative advice to waste disposal committees in the selection and operation of environmentally suitable sites.

While I am on this I would like to express a very sincere word of thanks to the some 1,000 Newfoundlanders for serving voluntarily on these waste

May 2, 1978, Tape 1734, Page 4 -- apb

MR. MURPHY: disposal sites in unincorporated areas. We give them a little seed money to pick the site and prepare it; after that the committee takes over

MR. MURPHY:

they collect the waste disposal fee and they do an excellent job. So, if you wish, we may begin my estimates.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, Consumer Affairs and Environment represent a lot of things as we would see by going down through the heads. But I stand here tonight to have a few words to say relative to the last couple of things mentioned in the preamble to the head in the minister's department, and that is environmental investigations and industrial pollution.

There is no doubt, Mr. Chairman, other people on this side will speak regarding Consumer Affairs and they will have an opportunity to do that later, but I want to address myself to the issues involving environmental investigations and industrial pollution.

The minister, Mr. Chairman, in his remarks tonight I thought very quickly skipped over what I consider to be probably one of the most important branches in the minister's department and that is the Head 2009, Environmental Management and Control. There was very little said about that in the minister's remarks. And probably rightly so, Mr. Chairman, since there is only a little over \$3 million in the minister's department. But I would submit to this Committee that we have facing us in this Province today one of the most crucial tests that could ever face a province when it comes to industrial hazard and industrial occupations.

The minister's department, Mr. Chairman, no matter what will happen under consolidation of legislation, no matter what may happen after occupational health and safety laws are brought into effect through this House of Assembly, no matter

MR. RIDEOUT: what may happen by putting the whole umbrella of occupational health and safety under one branch of government, no matter what may happen in that regard we would still have supposedly on paper a Department of Environment. And I would submit, Mr. Chairman, that that Department of Environment and that minister, whoever he may be, will have many, many years into the future, and probably forever as far as we can see down the road, will have a very large degree of responsibility when it comes to implementing regulation and legislation regarding, as the minister's own preamble says, environmental investigation and industrial pollution.

I happen to represent a district, Mr. Chairman, where industrial pollution is probably more topical, I am not saying more severe or more important but more topical today than it is anywhere else in this Province. And the minister's department should be involved up to the neck in that particular situation. And I have seen nothing, Mr. Chairman, over the past two or three years to convince me that the minister's department is at all even elementarily concerned about what is happening with industrial pollution on the Baie Verte Peninsula.

Oh, yes! They sit back and wait, Mr. Chairman, for a report from the Federal Department of Environment, but we know, the minister knows and I hope that this Committee knows, that the federal government is only responsible, Mr. Chairman, for the implementation of regulations under the Clean Air and Soil regulations and that is to say the control of dust emitted into the atmosphere, into the ambient air I think is the technical term.

The minister's department, I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, if it has not it should, the minister's department should have a great deal to say about industrial pollution.

MR. RIDEOUT: on the Baie Verte Peninsula, or about industrial pollution in Long Harbour, or about industrial pollution in Labrador City, or about industrial pollution wherever it might occur in this Province. In fact, as I pointed out in my opening remarks, it is one of the obligations that this department has assumed under its own preamble to heads of this department.

MR. RIDEOUT: And I have seen, I have seen very little leadership, I have seen very little evidence, in fact I have seen very little of anything, Mr. Chairman, that convinces me that the Department of Environment - I am deliberately leaving out the first part of the name of that department - I have seen very little that convinces me that the Department of Environment, of which the member for St. John's Centre (Mr. Murphy) is the minister, has shown any leadership whatsoever when it comes to controls of industrial pollution and occupational pollution in this Province. And I would say, Mr. Chairman, that that is to the shame of the minister and to the shame of the department which he heads.

I have only to go back to the Selikoff Report, for example. I do not know if the minister has even yet seen the Selikoff Report.

MR. MURPHY: I have not received one yet.

MR. RIDEOUT: Well, the minister should not be concerned about having received one, because his colleague, the Minister of Labour and Manpower, representing the government, attended a meeting with Dr. Selikoff and the unions and the company, and was presented with a copy. And it is my understanding that that minister carried out his responsibility and took that document to Cabinet. So the minister should be very well aware of what is in the Selikoff Report when it comes to industrial pollution on the Baie Verte Peninsula.

Well, let me refer to it in a respect that I feel has a lot to do with the minister's department. Section two in the report, Mr. Chairman, deals with environmental considerations. Now I would believe that environmental considerations should fall under the auspices of the Minister of Environment for Newfoundland. I think that would be a reasonable assumption. I would feel that the minister should be one of the leaders in bringing under control this industrial

MR. RIDEOUT: pollution that exists on the Baie Verte Peninsula.

MR. SIMMONS: He should be the mover.

MR. RIDEOUT: You would think the minister would be a leader, that is exactly what I said, in cohesion with his other colleagues who are obviously involved, or should be involved in this type of programme.

But let me refer to section two of the Selikoff Report, when he talks about environmental considerations. Selikoff says, "A limited programme of environmental sampling was undertaken by Dr. William J. Nicholson," the man whom the present Minister of Tourism ridiculed so much in this House last year when I brought up his name for bringing out the counts on the roads, "Dr. William J. Nicholson and his colleagues at the time of our survey of mine and mill workers. Nevertheless," he says, "it was clear that significant environmental asbestos hazards exist." Significant environmental asbestos hazards exist, now I hope the minister retains that sentence. It says, "Against a background of knowledge that ambient air levels in the United States urban areas generally range from .5 to 10 nanograms per cubic meter, measurements of 760; 360; 240 to 580; and 14,000 were found on the Baie Verte Pensinsula," where you find generally ranging in the US from .5 to 10 nanograms per cubic meter of air.

Did the minister, once this went before Cabinet, after his colleague received the information, the report on behalf of the government, did the minister then call in his environmental people and say, "For Heavens sake get down to Baie Verte and see what is going on down there." Has the minister done that yet? You know you would think he would in view of the significance of this particular report.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Chairman, I have to say in all honesty, and very candidly, that what I have seen over the last couple of years coming from the minister when we talk about occupational health and safety in this House, when we talk about industrial pollution or environmental pollution, the first thing that comes back from the minister is what did we do years ago? People were being polluted with coal dust and people were being polluted with this and they are still living, But I would say, Mr. Chairman, people were being polluted in St. Lawrence and the price has been paid. And there is nobody, there is nobody who can stand in this House, or stand anywhere in this Province,

MR. RIDEOUT: or stand anywhere in this country and say that asbestos dust is not a hazard. It has been proven beyond doubt, it should not be a part of the argument anymore, it has been proven. Dr. Selikoff's name was hauled over the coals in this House a couple of years ago when my colleague from the Straits of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) and myself were fighting with the government to get a few thousand dollars to support his investigations in Baie Verte, his name was hauled over the coals as being a scientific bluff, but he has the credentials, Mr. Chairman.

And we had a very reputable organization in the United States only two or three days ago give out very pertinent information with regard to asbestos pollution in that country. It was through the media only two or three days ago, I think I have a copy of it down in the office. So the argument about asbestos dust being hazardous to health is no longer an argument, it no longer holds water, so what are we holding back for? Why are we holding back?

The minister's department has not been to Baie Verte and showed a real presence. No way have they been in there. We talk about asbestos fibres in the drinking water in Baie Verte and other communities on the Baie Verte Peninsula, and what reaction do you get, Mr. Chairman? "The water has been running over the same rocks for centuries and nobody has died yet." Well, Mr. Chairman, they die all the time on the Baie Verte Peninsula the same as anywhere else in Newfoundland. Whether they die from asbestosis or mesothelioma, I do not know. Nobody else, I would submit to this Committee, knows because nobody bothered to find out before.

Now when are we going to do it? This has all come to light in the past eight or ten

MR. RIDEOUT: years, but we have yet, even though it has come to light in the last eight or ten years, we have yet to see very precious little action on behalf of government in this vital field.

Now, I have said in this House, Mr. Chairman, speaking in the Mines and Energy estimates, "Do we want corpses on the table before we start some action? Is that what it takes?" Oh, you will talk about getting emotional! Well I would submit it is an emotional subject. If we want corpses on the table, well that is fine, we will wait another ten years and we may have them. But that is not what we should be waiting for. The minister's department should be in there.

There is, Mr. Chairman, all kinds of technical knowledge available about the dangers of asbestos dust. It has been available for years. It did not come out in Baie Verte until the union began to make it their business eight or ten years ago to do so. But now it is open, we all know about it, the technology is available, the experimental ability is available for the minister's people to go down there and start testing the water supplies. The solutions are available as far as water supplies go with regard to the filtering of water systems and so on. That is all available, but have we seen any action? No, Mr. Chairman, we have not.

Now, your cannot slough this off on the federal government because they have given Advocate Mines until the end of 1979 to improve the environmental situation or they are going to be in trouble with the federal government. And do not let anybody, I say to the minister, to all ministers, do not let anybody kid you with this foolishness about threats to close down or anything of that nature.

MR. RIDEOUT: The asbestos operations in Ontario two or three years ago - two or three years ago the asbestos operation in Ontario when they were told they had to have tolerance levels of two fibres per c.c. threw their arms up in frustration. "We cannot do it, we will have to close down." The government said, "Close down." But they brought in those regulations, Mr. Chairman, and they are living within them today. So do not let anybody kid you about this foolishness about closedowns. If there is money to be made there they are not going to close down, so do not kid ourselves with that.

And the Minister of Mines and Energy says -

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Chairman, a point of privilege.

MR. CHAIRMAN(Young): A point of privilege.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member. Since I made the statement in the House today I have found out that whilst a ticket at the airport was paid for by Mr. Charlie Silver for some people, Mr. Randy Simms was not one of those. I withdraw the suggestion that he was and apologize to him in the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN(Young): The hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: What was I going to say before the Premier interrupted me? Yes, Mr. Chairman, I was talking about the fact of not allowing ourselves to be hoodwinked by those people who say -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! Order, please! Order, please!

MR. RIDEOUT: I was talking about, Mr. Chairman -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) gone now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I have recognized the hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay and I ask all the other hon. members to remain silent.

MR. RIDEOUT: - about not allowing ourselves to be hoodwinked by those big companies, Mr. Chairman, who say they cannot afford to come within the -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. RIDEOUT: - guidelines of the legislation because we will force them to close down. That is a pile of foolishness. It did not happen in Ontario. It is not going to happen in Baie Verte as long as there is money to be made there and there is money to be made and the company's balance sheets have been showing that over the past number of years.

Yes, I remember, what I was saying about the Minister of Mines and Energy, The Minister of Mines and Energy very proudly says that the recommended levels in this Province are 5cc's and that Advocate is well below these and that they are down to 2.5 and 2.4 and so on. That very well may be so, but notice what the minister says, 'recommended! What is the legislated level in Ontario? It is not recommended to be 5. It is legislated by regulation appended to the act, as far as my information goes, to be 2 cc's.

MR. PECKFORD: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order has been made.

MR. PECKFORD: I do not know if the hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay understands or not, but we are regulating the levels of asbestos dust at Baie Verte to be a certain level -

MR. SIMMONS: That is not a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. PECKFORD: - and it has the same power as legislation.

MR. SIMMONS: - that is a speech.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Chairman, that is as much a point of order now as -

MR. CHAIRMAN: I feel it is just more or less a point of explanation.

MR. RIDEOUT: The minister is a good debater so there is no point of order to that.

Mr. Chairman, the minister sent a telegram to the concerned wives in Baie Verte on Saturday, which when read over the PA system said, "The recommended level in this Province is 5, but we find that the average level of Advocate Mines is 2.4." Now is the minister going to deny that?

MR. PECKFORD: No, I never denied that when I got up. I just wanted to make it clear to you that we have the power under regulation to close the mine down if the level -

MR. RIDEOUT: That is a bunch of foolishness.

MR. PECKFORD: No, it is not a point of foolishness.

MR. RIDEOUT: It is a bunch of foolishness.

MR. PECKFORD: So you do not want to hear the truth. So I cannot help that. I mean you will just have to just -

MR. RIDEOUT: I am all for hearing the truth, Mr. Chairman, but the point still remains, that the recommended level in this Province is 5 cc's, and the legislated level in Ontario is 2. And then they get out from under the umbrella by saying that the average level at Advocate Mines is 2.4 or 2.5. So it is. Nobody argues with that. But neither will you find too many people with their heads screwed on right to argue that it is not up to 6 and 7 and 8 and even up to 12 in some parts of that plant.

Now if we are going to call a spade a spade let us call it that and lay it on the table and never mind hiding behind averages or hiding behind recommended levels or anything else.

MR. PECKFORD: I am not hiding -

MR. RIDEOUT: I am not saying the minister is hiding. I am not saying that.

MR. PECKFORD: That is what you are implying.

MR. RIDEOUT: Well if cap fit, cap wear, that is all I can say to the minister.

MR. PECKFORD: It does not fit, therefore I do not wear it.

MR. RIDEOUT: Now, Mr. Chairman, as I have said, there are other departments in this government that have a great deal of responsibility when it comes to environmental control, occupational health and safety and so on. But as I said in the beginning, the minister's department will, as far as I am concerned, have a tremendous role to play in that area far into the future whether we have consolidation or not. And I cannot see any evidence whatsoever, with a skimpy little budget of 2009 of something like the car wrecks and the whole works it only comes up to \$950,000. So with a budget of that nature the minister I hope, I hope the minister will tell me what leadership he is going to take in what he says his responsibilities are, environmental investigation and industrial pollution. We have seen no evidence, Sir, I would submit whatsoever on the Baie Verte Peninsula. We have seen the Federal Department of the Environment down there. The minister's department has made us aware of what the federal department found down there, but we have seen no direct leadership, or no evidence whatsoever of leadership from the Provincial Department of Environment, forget the Consumer Affairs part.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Placentia.

MR. W. PATTERSON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words on the minister's estimates. I represent a district that I suppose is much the same as the hon. member for Baie Verte. We have been suffering up there with a pollution problem since 1966. The pollution there was caused by the effluent from the

Mr. Patterson: ERCO plant. We are well of that happened there. The plant was designed as a freeway where the effluent went out in the bay. There was no consideration or no thought given when that plant was being built, to what effect it would have on that particular area. Now there was certainly no need for any studies to be made, any surveys to be made because all they had to do was look at the plant in Dunville, Ontario where the cattle died and vegetation was destroyed. And so in Placentia Bay after a year of operation there that plant pumped out the raw effluent into the bay and the herring died, fish died, all kinds of marine life was destroyed. So after great pressure by government the corrections were made and settling ponds were built around the plant, and now the effluent flows into the ponds and it is somewhat diluted and then it goes out into the ocean.

Having settled that problem there, then they had a problem with the stacks, the emission from the stacks. Now not only is the immediate area harmed by the fumes from that plant there, but for miles and miles around vegetation has been destroyed moose have been found with swollen joints, and rabbits, contain thousands and thousands per cent of fluoride more than would be normally acceptable. So efforts are being made now to try and correct that. But we are very lucky with the operation of that refinery at Come By Chance that we did not have a major spill up there. We had very close calls there, several near misses with the huge tankers going up and down the bay without pilots, phosphorous ships criss-crossing the bay -

MR. ROBERTS: Were there actually, if the hon. member will permit, were there actually near misses? That is the first I heard of that.

MR. PATTERSON: Yes. Oh, yes. I could supply you with papers showing you on graphs the closeness of the ships.

MR. ROBERTS: I take the hon. gentleman's words.

MR. PATTERSON: Because you had the big supertankers going up there, going in and out, and when these two ships come together

Mr. Patterson: the wake from the bow would have a tendency to shove the stern in.

MR. ROBERTS: That is the phenomenon when two ships pass close to one another they are drawn together by a sort of magnetic attraction.

MR. PATTERSON: That is right. The bow is shoved off and the sterns came together. So there was no precautions taken against that. The Atlantic Piloting Act did not act as it should have acted there, and ships were allowed to run without pilots up and down that bay. Now these supertankers are certainly a menace to the oceans of the world. I have an article here which states that these ships should be banned and smaller ones used. This article says, "When the Come By Chance Oil Refinery reopens it will be served as before by oil bearing supertankers. If the Bell Island mines become a crude storage depot, supertankers will bring the oil there too, and with them the danger of major oil spills. Therefore the advice of oceans authority Jacques Costeau is vitally important to the fishing Province of Newfoundland." And he says here, "We should forbid the supertankers and multiply the smaller tankers", he said in an interview in Paris. 'I would to have three smaller oil spills than one big one.' He was critical of the French Government's handling of the spill on the French Coast March 17, which fouled one of France's most productive fishing grounds as well as a region popular with tourists."

So these are things that, in our mad rush for industrial development, we have to be most very careful about. Now a plant thousands and thousands of miles away, a plant in New York has been known to pollute parts of Sweden and destroy vegetation up there. It says here, "Sulphur dioxide pollution is caused mainly by power stations burning coal and oil. Britain's policy of dispersing airborne pollution by means of high-stacked chimneys has in fact relieved pressures on the local environment, but it has also led to the export of pollution to other countries, including

May 2, 1978

Tape 1739 (Night)

PK - 3

Mr. Patterson: Scandinavia. A report published by a group of Scandinavian scientists claims that the acid rains have caused dissemination of fish in 2,300 lakes in Norway and Sweden, and that forests and crops are also in danger. "

MR. PATTERSON: "This report follows another study published in July by Europe's Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, ascertaining that Europe was a recipient of sulphur dioxide pollution emitted by industry in North America and that Britain was the worst offender of the European polluters." So, Mr. Chairman, I think that a concerted effort must be made by all nations of the world if we are to survive on this planet. Not only must we concentrate on industries that are in our own Province or in Canada, but there will have to be strict regulations on the movements of oil with tankers and also with other industries.

Now with regard to developing oil on the Grand Banks, that may or may not be good. That could spell the end of Newfoundland. We could destroy one industry for the sake of another one. And they have had blowouts in Norway and they also had a huge blowout some years ago down in California. "'Oil and water do not mix,' proclaimed the sign at the marina, and nowhere was the fact of elementary science more painfully evident last week than in the normally serene Pacific Coast community of pleasant white stucco houses and red tile roofs of Santa Barbara, California. The trouble all started two weeks ago with a Union Oil Company drilling operation six miles off the coast of Santa Barbara, an affluent town of 73,000 some ninety miles up the coast from Los Angeles. The drillers had reached down 3,500 feet under the ocean floor when they decided to withdraw their drill pipe to replace its worn bit. This unexpectedly uncorked a pressurized pool of oil and allowed the black goo to boil up through the drill shaft into a vertical fissure and out through a 200 mile deep ocean floor, rising the ocean surface below and it turned into a horrible, uncontainable mess."

MR. PATTERSON: Now, Mr. Chairman, just imagine what would happen on the Grand Banks, the richest fishing grounds in the world, if we were to get an oil spill. If we were to get an oil spill on the Hamilton Banks or anywhere up the coast of Greenland, I do not think for a minute - and I am not an authority on this - but I do not think we have the technology today to take oil from the coast of Labrador. I have some experience with that part of the world, the Northern waters, and I have seen icebergs twice as big as Confederation Building; they just come growling and tumbling off the glaciers off the coast of Iceland and Greenland and they move down to Newfoundland and melt in the warm waters. So I do not think we should be too crazy about drilling off Newfoundland. I do not think we should be too enthusiastic about industry coming in here unless we make darn sure that we have strict regulations governing these companies, as up at Baie Verte.

MR. FLIGHT: You are with us. Come on over!

MR. PATTERSON: Well, I am sure the hon. members opposite are concerned about pollution as well as I am. Up in Buchans they had problems there, and I am sure up at Baie Verte they have a very serious problem, and I am sure we have very serious problems in Placentia district. So I am sure all the hon. gentlemen over there are very sensitive to that as well as I am. I am not knocking industry, I am not knocking ERCO Industries, I am not knocking the oil companies, but I do not see why we should trade off one industry for another. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Young) The hon. the member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I have some points I want to put to the minister. I doubt if I will be

MR. PATTERSON: speaking for twenty minutes, the allocated time, but there are several concerns that I have that I want to hear the minister address himself to when he stands up to rebut any arguments or points that were raised.

The minister is aware that he sponsored or instituted, got into being, an investigation into the insurance companies in this Province in the last year. It was supposed to have been a wide ranging investigation of various aspects of insurance. I want to hear the minister tell the House whether or not he has the report of that investigation, that study into all aspects of insurance, why it is - the mobile homes, I understand, were included. The rate of insurance charged to mobile homes was far in excess of the rates charged to domestic although they had the same fire fighting facilities, although they were built to Canadian Underwriters' specifications. The mobile home owners of this Province were in effect being ripped off. And the minister was told that on many occasions

MR. FLIGHT:

and he agreed that that would be one of the terms of references of the insurance companies.

The mobile home owners in this Province, Mr. Chairman, are still wondering what the situation is. They have seen no changes in their insurance rates. We do not know what the recommendation of the minister's enquiry was and I want to hear the minister explain that particular position to the House.

Mr. Chairman, it would not be fair to accuse the minister of having any responsibility for the fact that there are thousands of automobiles in Newfoundland today, driving on the Trans-Canada with no insurance. However, consumer protection, is consumer protection. If I buy automobile insurance, liability insurance, then I have a right to believe that the Department of Consumer Affairs will protect me to the point that they will make sure that every other consumer in this Province also has automobile insurance. But the fact is, Mr. Chairman, that there are thousands of automobiles travelling our highways today with no insurance. There are so many ways to get out of it. And the previous Minister of Transportation was - I could say too stupid, because I remember him standing up in this House and refusing to take advantage of the one way that would guarantee that nobody would drive in this Province without liability and that is simply to put the onus on the insurance company to say that if you are going to sell insurance in this Province then you have got the responsibility of notifying the Registrar of Motor Vehicles when any individual cancels insurance or refuses to renew. And I have since seen editorials in this Province suggesting that that is the way out and there is no other way out. The previous Minister of Transportation -

MR. MORGAN:

They can change over from day to day.

MR. FLIGHT: Then it is up to the insurance companies to keep the ministry advised on a day-to-day basis. The consumers of this Province are entitled to that kind of protection. And so I would say, Mr. Chairman, I believe it is the responsibility of the Minister of Transportation to protect the consumer on the Trans-Canada Highway. However, if he is going to shirk that responsibility then it falls within the scope of the Minister of Consumer Affairs in his role as protecting the consumer. So that is enough said.

Mr. Chairman, I want to talk about pollution. I was amazed, absolutely and totally amazed - it would have been three or four months ago-when I heard on the radio, myself, the Minister of Environment making a press release. I wondered for a minute if he was an employee of one of the major industrial companies in this Province. And he was standing up and saying that one of the major rivers in this Province - we know the Exploits River, if not totally polluted is highly contaminated and in danger of total pollution below Grand Falls. No question about it at all, Mr. Chairman. But the minister made a statement to the effect that he could understand the company concerned for polluting the river the most. As a result of a debate here two weeks ago when the Minister of Forestry tried to stereotype me as a person who had something against Price (Nfld.), I am leery of mentioning the name but, Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the Minister of Consumer Affairs, can he tell this House how many million gallons per day of pollutant that Price (Nfld.) is putting into the Exploits River? How many million gallons per day?

I recall, and the Minister of Fisheries should listen to this, I recall sometime four or five years ago - it was forgotten apparently, I can get the Grand Falls Advertiser, because that is where I remember reading it - a full page spread

MR. FLIGHT: that indicated that the salmon fishery in Notre Dame Bay was in jeopardy and there was some thought, and I am not sure if this was Provincial Fisheries or Federal Fisheries, there was some thought of closing down, putting a complete and total freeze on the salmon fishery in Notre Dame Bay for ten years, closing down the commercial and sports fishery of the Exploits River, cleaning up the Exploits River, because it is a fact, Mr. Chairman, that the salmon fishery in Notre Dame Bay depends by and large, almost totally, on the Exploits River, on the salmon going back in that river, spawning and going out. It carried the greatest salmon run in this Province. And it is a fact quite possibly that the Exploits River is the basis of the salmon fishery in Notre Dame Bay.

Now whatever happened to that study and that report. The work was done, Mr. Chairman, and if I have to I will produce it for the press or for the House if I am brought up on this issue later on; I will produce the story and the basis of it and the reasons for it for the House. What amazes me is that the Exploits River goes on being polluted. Now we had one situation since this administration have

Mr. Flight:

been in power, we have one situation where they are talking about shutting down the commercial salmon fishery in Notre Dame Bay, cleaning up the Exploits River so as to guarantee ten years down the road that there will be a viable salmon fishery in the bay. And the basis of their concern was, number one, the inability of the Exploits River to maintain the salmon runs. And that minister in a press release stood up and excused Price (Nfld.) for not implementing the kind of pollution control that has been recommended by the federal government by various agencies!

Mr. Chairman, now I accept the fact that it is very possible that Price (Nfld.) could not be expected to implement overnight the kind of pollution control that would be required to have a pollution free river tomorrow, but I do not accept under any circumstances that a minister of this Crown would stand up and let Price (Nfld.) fight their own battles. Let them tell the people of Newfoundland why it is they cannot afford to clean up the Exploits River. I do not see a minister of the Crown standing up and saying it for them! And I will live with the pollution in the Exploits River for the next twenty years if I have to live with it because Price (Nfld.) or whoever is operating that mill cannot afford it.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is federal.

MR. FLIGHT: Well if it is federal the minister should not have had opened his mouth. Let the Minister of the Environment, let Romeo LeBlanc tell the people of Newfoundland.

AN HON. MEMBER: The former hon. Premier -

MR. FLIGHT: Is it federal, Mr. Chairman, that the greatest river -

MR. MURPHY: Would you mind telling me what the minister is supposed to have said?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: Yes, Sir. The minister said, Sir, that it was not reasonable to believe that Price (Nfld.) could end the

Mr. Flight: pollution going into the Exploits River. The minister said it in that context. The minister made a statement with regards to the pollution in the Exploits River, and the basis of the statement was saying that he could not blame Price (Nfld.), or Price (Nfld.) could not be expected to institute all the pollution control that will be necessary to clean up the river. And he may be right. Well, all I am saying is that Price (Nfld.) do not need that kind of support from the government. They are very well, they have got a Public Relations Department like you would not believe to convince the people of Newfoundland that they cannot afford to stop polluting the Exploits River, They can convince the people of Newfoundland; we do not need any member of the Opposition or a minister of the Crown to -

MR. HICKEY: Would the hon. gentleman permit a question?

MR. FLIGHT: Sure I will permit a question.

MR. HICKEY: How many of his constituents are employed by that corporation?

MR. FLIGHT: I would say to you, Sir, that at least 40 per cent of my constituents are employed with Price (Nfld.) and 39 per cent would stand behind me in the remarks that I have made this past five minutes.

MR. HICKEY: Very unusual people.

MR. FLIGHT: At least a per cent. The majority would stand behind me.

MR. HICKEY: I would not bet on it.

MR. FLIGHT: Not one of my constituents would demand that Price (Nfld.) would attempt to clean up the Exploits River if it meant that kind of expenditure would jeopardize their operation, but what they are not convinced, and what the ministry has not convinced the people in Central Newfoundland and my constituents of is that Price have indeed made any effort to clean up the pollution they have put into the river. Have I answered the minister?

Mr. Flight: So, Mr. Chairman, there is pollution going on in this Province, and some of the greatest perpetrators of pollution in this Province are the corporations, and we have the major river in Newfoundland polluted. Now whether we go along with the fact that it is polluted and watch the pollution go for the next eight or ten years, or whether we decide to ask Price (Nfld.)—and not only Price (Nfld.), the major towns. The member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan), what has he done, what has the member for Grand Falls done to help the Town of Grand Falls stop pouring raw sewage into the Exploits Rive, 15,000 people?

MR. CALLAN: He has resigned from the Cabinet.

MR. FLIGHT: What has the member for Bishop's Falls, the member for Exploits (Dr. Twomey), the very honourable member for Grand Falls for that matter, what has he done to assist the Town of Bishop's Falls to put a sewerage treatment plant? They are dumping their raw sewage into the Exploits River, And we want the Exploits River to maintain a salmon run! You know, let us stop beating around the bush and let us admit either one thing or the other, that we are prepared to see the Exploits polluted and wipe out the fishery, the salmon fishery— and that is only one aspect I am using, the salmon fishery or we are going to stop the pollution. And if we are going to stop the pollution, we are going to tell Price (Nfld.), the Town of Grand Falls, the Town of Bishop's Falls, and all the other towns all out through the area, like we should have told ASARCO twenty-five years ago, that they are going to stop polluting. We cannot have it two ways. Simple. And the question, of course, that I would like to hear the minister tell the House, because as Minister of the

MR. G. FLIGHT:

Environment he should know, is how many millions of gallons of pollutant, highly toxic pollutant, are going into that Exploits River per day? That is enough said on that, Mr. Chairman.

Now the other question I have to ask the minister: We are going into a spray programme, budworm spray in this Province. We are going to use the chemical matacil. I want to ask the minister, and he can take as long as he likes as far as I am concerned, to tell this House as to just what extent his department was involved in monitoring the experimental spray programme in Newfoundland this year? The experimental spray programme, just to what extent what his department was involved. I know they hired a couple of university students. I also know they have allowed the people doing the spray programme to wash out their containers in a river that runs through Stephenville and for a day or two that river was red! There were some very serious questions raised on the West Coast as to whether or not the act that I suggested did indeed happen, but I know it did happen. Now if the Department of Forestry and Agriculture - we are going to go into a massive spray programme now and I presume that the Department of Consumer Affairs and Environment is going to take the responsibility of monitoring that spray programme, of protecting the environment. If we are going to have that kind of an approach then we could be in trouble. That happened, Mr. Chairman, and I am surprised that there was not a public outcry, but there was not a public outcry. But the equipment used by the spray people was washed - you know, the concentrated chemicals were washed right in a brook. And I do not care if that brook ever carried a trout, I do not care if it ever carried a salmon, or anybody ever drank it, it should not have happened. And that is the type of a thing that is causing so much opposition to the spray programme in Newfoundland, because they are afraid of our inability to monitor and they are afraid of what will happen once the spray programme starts. The Minister of Forestry is there. He may not have heard that.

MR. MURPHY: I am not sure I did either, you know.

MR. FLIGHT: Well, that is the reason for these, Estimates,

MR. G. FLIGHT:

Mr. Chairman, to advise the minister on things he

do not know.

Now let me ask the minister this: Since matacil has been - and this is a fact. This is not the anti-spray protesters or anything else, this is a fact. Matacil was only registered for commercial use - not today, not to this point registered for commercial use in the United States. It has been only been registered for experimental purposes. There has been all sorts of criticisms about matacil, about the fact we know nothing about it. We knew something about the DDT and the other chemicals available to us and I am sure had we gone with one of them that there would have been just as much opposition. But the people who are opposing the spray programme now have a real argument: they are accusing the provincial government of using a chemical of which they know nothing. They know nothing about the possible reactions or the possible affects on non-target - you know, on anything but the budworm. Nothing about its affects on the insect life of the Province, nothing about its affects on the fish life of the Province.

Now where is the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment - and I realize of course the minister has been away for a month. I do not mean to be critical of that. But I suggest that the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment was the one spokesman for this Province, or someone so designated by him would have been the one spokesman for this Province who would have answered some of the criticisms that we have been listening to and heard over this past two, three, four months. And if I am wrong then of course I will be - somebody will jump and say, But I have not heard one utterance from the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment or anyone designated by him to defend the government's decision to use the chemical matacil. Not one! And the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment is the only minister in this - the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture has no business talking about matacil. He has only got to tell us what will happen as far as the budworm is concerned with the forest resource, the timber itself, the trees. But in as far as what the spray programme is going to do to our environment, it is the Minister of Consumer

MR. G. FLIGHT: Affairs and Environment, And the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment to this point in time, and again I want to say very honestly, very sincerely if the minister and the rest of the House will accept it knowing that the minister has been out of the Province up until today, I am not trying to cast - I am saying though that the minister should have designated, the people of Newfoundland had a right to believe that if there was any - if there were some fears in the minds of people in Newfoundland about chemical masecil, then they had a right to expect that minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment would have been the one that would have set their hearts at ease and their fears at rest. Not one word!

Mr. Flight:

if the minister knows anything about Matacil. I want to know what experimentation they have done. I want to know if the Minister of the Environment has instructed his people to check out and find out if the things that have been said about Matacil are right. Is Matacil only registered in the United States for experimental purposes? Is it a fact that Matacil is not allowed to be used in the United States but it is being sold in Canada by the very people who refuse to use it in the United States? Are we the guinea pigs? The accusations are there. I am afraid of it. Even the people who support the spray programme because they value our forests are afraid of the end product, the by-product. And certainly should we not expect, should not the Province expect the Minister of the Environment to stand up and assure us that this is all hogwash, that there is no fear in the United States of Matacil, that we will not be ripped off by a company who is manufacturing Matacil in the United States?

Is it not funny, Mr. Chairman, that the chemical Matacil is not used for commercial purposes in the United States, not allowed to be used? EPA, the Environmental Protection Agency, have not approved, all the various departments have not approved Matacil for use in the United States. But they have approved its manufacture in the U.S. to sell it to Canadians and to sell it to Newfoundlanders. So we use it. So what are we?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Guinea pigs.

MR. FLIGHT: And I will tell you, two years down the road if Matacil works, then we can say we are the people whom it was tested on. If it does not work, we will have been the guinea pigs. And I want to hear the Minister of the Environment, whose total and absolute responsibility is to assure the people of Newfoundland that the chemical that we have chosen is the safest and all this stuff that we are hearing that frightens us to death is nonsense.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the member for Grand Falls.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, maybe I could sum up my remarks very quickly by saying if the hon. member so wishes he could send out his remarks to the Central Newfoundland area, to the Grand Falls media.

MR. FLIGHT: I will.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: He is going to do that, is he?

MR. FLIGHT: I am (Inaudible).

MR. LUNDRIGAN: All right, tomorrow. I have just checked with the House Leader, I understand that Hansards are taped now and compiled for the evening session as well.

MR. FLIGHT: You bring yours outside.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: For the evening session as well.

MR. FLIGHT: Your speech the other day, you did it yourself. You took it outside and had it printed, the whole speech.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Yes. Okay.

Now I just want to ask the member is he willing on tomorrow when Hansard comes out to clip the remarks that he made in the House this evening and send them out to The Advertiser, CKCM, CBC, and the Q system in Grand Falls? He is going to do that?

MR. FLIGHT: What about the hon. member?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: As a matter of fact, if he does not I will just tell him that I am going to be very interested in his public relations, because that is exactly what I am going to do tomorrow, clip it out. I always believed, Your Honour, that a little knowledge is a dangerous thing, and I can see it here this evening in glowing colour from the remarks of the hon. member. I did not intend to say anything, I intended to listen to and learn from the member for Baie Verte (Mr. Rideout) who spoke with a great deal of feeling and compassion for his people, a feeling that I think is shared by every member of the Legislature; my colleague from Placentia Bay (Mr. Pattesson), from the Placentia area who spoke about the pollution problems, and the continuing problems in his area that have captivated the attention of the people of Newfoundland, and are still there. And I could quite understand it. I listened to the minister tell about one of the finest departments in the government,

Mr. Lundrigan: the one that was non-existent a very few years ago, Consumer Affairs, that has emerged and the Environment which is one of the strongest arms of the government today, sometimes in some areas it may be a little too strong because we have to try to balance our concerns. In one area we have got to be all out and aggressively in favour of everything that can be done where there is a health hazard. In some other areas we have to weigh the thing out in terms of some of the history of the situation, some of the economics of the situation, so that we do not over-do it.

And I just want to tell the member a little something that he might not be aware of when he gets up and exposes the Price (Nfld.) Company as one of the villains in the system: About six months ago as a result of federal legislation which is considered by some jurisdictions to be ultra vires, outside the constitutional power of the federal government - and he is talking about a federal jurisdiction, he is talking about the Federal Department of the Environment, nothing to do with the Provincial Department of the Environment - sent out a schedule on

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

pollution abatement that had to be met by the Price (Nfld.) Company and by the Bowaters Company over in Corner Brook. And only for the aggressiveness of the provincial Department of the Environment, with the person who is now sitting to the right of the hon. minister and two or three of his competent staff that he has with him, we today would have been looking at the impending shut-down of Bowaters and Price (Nfld.) Limited in this Province. And the minister, under the direction of the Cabinet, called together some of his colleagues - I was one of them at the time involved in Cabinet - and we looked at the schedule. And the experts, some of whom had direct contact with the traditional employment with the companies in question, went out and they did an assessment of the two companies - the one I am going to refer to is Price (Nfld.) - and these environmental experts concluded that the Price (Nfld.) system is one of the cleanest mills, in terms of its interaction with the river and interaction with the environment, in the whole of Canada. They have spent millions of dollars - I cannot describe the amounts right off the top of my head today - in pollution control because of impending control systems that were being forced on them to a large extent in Canada. They were one of the most progressive mills in the whole of Canada in cleaning up their act. They are looked on today as the leading mill in the world in the way they are producing and the type of system they have, one of the reasons why they are not taking that much downtime and one of the reasons why there is such a bright future in that particular area.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Now we looked at all this and we did the assessment and came back and we picked up this schedule which was sent out of Ottawa. When it arrived in Newfoundland it became one of the hottest issues in the government at the time it came down from Ottawa.

The schedule which was laid out - first of all, we thought it was outside their authority to impose the schedule on us when the schedule was laid out. It was a very closely guarded, internal matter. And I can now say it because it has been largely rectified because of the position the Province took, it would have definitely closed Bowaters. I can safely say publicly now it would have closed Bowaters and the chances of Price (Nfld.) Limited going very much longer into the future would have been very, very slim, very slim indeed. It was so serious a matter that three or four months ago at a federal/provincial conference on these matters, I raised the question at the national level with the other ministers across the country and expressed our concern. And the member might recall that when the Prime Minister made his statement to the nation after the Prime Minister's Conference, which was a follow-up to the conference of all the various ministers, one of the statements which was unanimously agreed to by the premiers and the ministers across the country was that in certain areas, particularly this one, we have to go really easy or we close down a lot of our finer mills in Canada.

And the member stands up in his place and talks about the villain, Price (Nfld.) - clean up your act, dump them out -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

May 2, 1978

Tape 1745 (Night)

EC - 3

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: That, Mr. Chairman, is the heights of -

MR. FLIGHT: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please!

When the Chair calls order, I expect members on each side of the Committee to take their places immediately.

A point of order has been raised.

MR. FLIGHT: I am prepared if I have to to shut down the Committee and have the tapes presented. At no point in my discourse, in my twenty minutes, did I refer to Price as the villain, I simply stated a statement of fact. And I doubt very much if the hon. the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan), who accused me, Mr. Chairman, of suggesting that Price (Newfoundland) Limited was a villain, is aware - he alluded in his earlier remarks that a little knowledge is the worst thing a man can have. I doubt, Mr. Chairman, if the member can quote the figures I asked for here tonight. I simply made a statement of fact that insofar as the pollution of the Exploits River is concerned, Price (Nfld.) Limited tonight is the greatest contributor to that pollution. I did not call them villains, I did not say they should not be doing it. I am saying that if we have to accept the fact that the Exploits River is polluted, then Price (Nfld.) Limited is the villain. And I ask the member to say in this House the numbers of gallons of pollutant per day that is going in as a result of the Price operation. And, Mr. Chairman, I want that member to withdraw. I am as concerned about Price (Nfld.) operation, I am as totally aware of the contribution that Price (Nfld.) has made and I would

MR. FLIGHT: go as far as that hon. member would go to defend and protect Price (Nfld.) in this Province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT: And I want a total and absolute withdrawal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! On a point of order debate is not permitted, nor can it be. On this point of order I think it is clear that we are dealing with matters of interpretation there, what one member felt he indicated by his remarks, what another hon. member understood by those remarks. I do not think it is in the area that the Chair can judge on.

The hon. member for Grand Falls.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. FLIGHT: A point of privilege, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of privilege has come up.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I have to have your concurrence, Sir, in this matter. The hon. member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) well knows, and I admit to the House, that Price (Nfld.) is the biggest employer in the district that I represent. And if the word were to go out, if there were a misconception to go out, or if that member were allowed to mislead this House and advise the people of Central Newfoundland tomorrow, which he has the ability to do, that I referred to Price (Nfld.) or accused them of being villains, then Mr. Chairman, that could have far-ranging effects. Now if it were true I would live with it. If I accused Price (Nfld.) of being a villain, then I would be prepared to go publicly and live with it and defend it and stand or fall with it. But the fact is, Sir, that I believe as a member of this House that I am entitled to have anything that is said of me, either in the House or out, to be honest and true, and I did not and I would not accuse Price (Nfld.) of being villains. And I demand that that member withdraw the accusation that I accused Price (Nfld.) of being villains. I did not.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. PECKFORD: To that point of privilege, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. PECKFORD: To that point of privilege, Mr. Chairman, there is no point of privilege. It is obviously a difference of opinion between two hon. gentlemen here who disagree over certain statements made and certain interpretations put on those statements and so on. There is no point of privilege. At the very least there might be a point of order but I even doubt, Mr. Chairman, whether that is true. So it is just a difference of opinion and has no relevance at all to any kind of privilege, personal or from the House point of view.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I did not realize you were going to rule on the original point of order but now we are on the point of privilege. Now the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan), Sir, claimed that the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) called Price villains, and that is a very serious word, Sir, I would submit to Your Honour the citation in Beauchesne, Section 155, where it says, "It will be useful to give examples here of expressions which are unparliamentary and call for prompt interference, These may be classified as follows; " Number two, Sir, "The misrepresentation of the language of another and the accusation of misrepresentation."

Now, I would submit humbly, Sir, that what the hon. member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) did in quoting or misquoting the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) in using the word villain is misrepresentation of the language of the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) and I think, Sir, therefore that the member for Grand Falls should withdraw the remark without qualification.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: On that question of privilege, Your Honour.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Grand Falls.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I have been here in the House the last couple of months listening to a flurry of verbage coming across the House which has accused members on this side of the House of every living thing under the sun. I have stood up in my place today and I have placed my interpretation on the fact that the member has placed the Price (Nfld.) Company in a particular light with respect to pollution. And I am very concerned. I did not intend to get into this debate and that is what I have said. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is what I stand by and what I have said is precisely the communication that I received from the hon. member and if the hides are so thin on the other side on these issues that they cannot take this kind of presentation then they should not make the comments they make.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! A point of privilege has been raised.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please!

I would like to again bring to the attention of hon. members that the task of the Chair is immeasurably worsened if, in attempting to give rulings for the benefit of the whole Committee, the Chair does not have an opportunity to get these points across as clearly as possible.

In considering the point of privilege, the first point I think one should dispose of is that I do not understand that the ruling made on the point of order is being queried by bringing up the point of privilege. There is a mechanism available for questioning or appealing

Mr. Chairman:

a ruling, and that the only method of so doing that can be recognized by the Chair is the method laid down in our Standing Orders. That method was not followed so I therefore look upon the point of privilege as not one that is questioning that ruling, and, of course, that would be impossible for me to accept it in that light.

So I would interpret the point of privilege as indicating that the hon. member to my right his concerns that the hon. member to my left should not tomorrow represent his views in a way that he would feel would do him wrong or be to his detriment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now the word 'villain' was used. Perhaps one could dispose of that point first which was raised by another hon. member to my right in quoting from Beauchesne. I think my memory serves me correctly that in that particular context it was 'villain' as it applied to an hon. member of the House or of the Committee, and it therefore is not barred from applying such a term throughout the debate in regard to other persons or organizations or other entities. And I do not believe that word 'villain' in the context that we are talking of now was applied to an hon. member.

So I do not therefore feel that I have a point of privilege to rule, because the question that is brought up is a hypothetical one, that is, will the hon. member to my left on tomorrow do such and such. This is hypothetical. It is clearly something that the Chair cannot rule on.

I would just mention in listening to remarks made I think it is quite clear - I am going back to my original ruling on the point of order - I think it is quite clear that it is interpretation that is involved here; one member is interpreting remarks as adding up to something, another member is objecting to that member adding those remarks up to mean something. And perhaps one could point out that presumably Hansard will tell the true facts, and that each hon.

Mr. Chairman: member will be able to point to Hansard, when it is available, as to what he actually did say, and this should justify his views in the public eye.

The hon. member for Grand Falls.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, I just want to say, Your Honour, that I am quite prepared to let the record speak for itself on tomorrow, and I do not have any intention of doing anything to embellish the remarks of the hon. member because they speak for themselves and they will be in Hansard tomorrow, and I presume right on out to the district so that people can debate the issue in Grand Falls, and we will see if 399 of the 400 or 39 per cent of the 40 per cent, whatever the hon. member said, agree with his remarks; If they do so I will be surprised.

Your Honour, I brought up the issue about federal environmental control legislation, which is the legislation that three or four months ago came nigh closing down two major industries in our Province today, or the major industry represented by Bowaters and Price (Nfld.). At the same time, Mr. Chairman, that legislation provided a major threat for the two companies in question. Apparently in Labrador, to my knowledge, and other members can speak on this, there has been a tremendous concern on the part of the companies in Labrador about the tailings and the imposition of the federal legislation. And I raise the question because I believe we should be looking at legislation. I am not sure that the federal government should have the control, without consultation, even though in the Act there was written consultation would precede any decision, to my knowledge, and I ask the minister, to my knowledge, there was no consultation when the original schedule was drawn up regarding the two mills in question. I believe there was almost a threat on the part of this jurisdiction, this government saying that if you try to impose yourself we will question you on the basis of whether you were not ultra vires or whether you are not outside of the constitution which was the reason, I believe -

MR. PECKFORD: There is some infringement upon the minister's authority.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: - on Provincial jurisdiction, which was the reason I believe that the federal government backed away from their original schedule which would have closed down the two mills in the Province. And I indicate this because the same threat exists with respect to the mining industry in Labrador. And I think this is a fairly serious matter, so I go overboard in the direction of supporting

MR. LUNDRIGAN: members who have environmental questions that infringe on health matters, and matters that are very, very injurious to the inhabitants of a particular region, but I think in some areas and in some cases we have to balance our approach in a reasonable manner. It is no good to come out tomorrow morning and say to Price (Nfld.), "You have got to clean up every bit of effluent which is going to have some deleterious effect," I believe that is the word they use in the Legislation, "deleterious effect on the water" because obviously in order to do that you would have to close down the mill. It is physically impossible, it is financially impossible and the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight), whom I should not be as rough with, is quite aware of that and is quite, quite aware of it. He is an environmentalist and I admire him for it. He is an outdoor man. I am a little bit of that myself. Sometimes I have been accused of being too much of an outdoor man, some of my company and some of my behaviour. But in any event he has got to balance out that kind of reasonable concerned attitude with the facts of the matter and that is that that industry is too precious for us to be irresponsible in any comments we might make-and I do not suggest the member's comments were irresponsible.

Now I want to get around to one last comment before I finish. This is something that is very close to the heart of the minister, very close to my heart as well, and that is the business of the co-ops. Under his department there is a section here referred to as the Co-op Registry. I understand he has got in his department - I do not understand, I know - one of the finest co-op men in the Province, a dedicated man who has dedicated his lifetime to the co-ops. Now the co-ops have been a sort of an economic force that have come and gone in many regions. In our Province they were originally sort of producer co-ops in

MR. LUNDRIGAN: orientation. Recently they were the Consumers co-ops. Many of them have been in trouble. And in today's Newfoundland there is emerging a form of co-op, through the Rural Development Association, because that is really effectively what it is, where the regional development associations can become incorporated and can take over the control of an industry, own an industry, build the industry, have the industry funded, like the Greenspond smoke house as an example, and effectively sort of re-enforce the private system that we have in this Province. And the minister has done a lot of work on this, and some weeks ago when I was still actively involved in Cabinet, I was working with him in trying to find ways and means to try to enhance the co-op movement in our Province today. I believe this is one of the finest challenges and I hope that he can tell us a little something in his few remaining minutes as to whether there has been any progress, whether there is any plan to try to bring this matter to some kind of a head. I understand that the co-op people have just met, if the minister had been here he would have been an invited guest, it was the weekend past in Gander and he is a friend of all of the co-op people. And I would like for him to touch on this because I do know that members of his staff working with Rural Development have done a lot of work on it. I think it is a matter of significance and it should be talked about in the House some time during the session.

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

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Chairman, just a few comments to the minister in regard to some of the environmental questions in Labrador.

I think in some ways as the years progress, I think the Department of Environment will probably become one of the more important departments and also one of the departments which will

MR. STRACHAN: have more and more of the problems, more of the dilemmas of government. I was wondering first of all whether the minister could tell us whether his department has any involvement at all in the environmental question surrounding oil and gas development or whether that is totally within the Department of Mines and Energy and the related groups and agencies?

I am very interested in these kind of questions because, as I have stated before here often in the House, there are some very serious environmental implications involved in oil and gas development. The member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) there has mentioned the question of carrying oil, and possibly LNG, the liquified natural gas, in tankers, and raised the question of possibly getting legislation. And I wonder if the minister and his department are prepared to give some leads on this, whether they are prepared now to make some kind of legislation or at least if they state it as a federal matter, although I think the Province should take this in their hands and force this issue of whether they can reduce the size of vessels, for instance, which are travelling through Newfoundland waters, through the fisheries waters, especially vessels carrying LNG, going to ports maybe outside of Newfoundland, over in New Brunswick or Nova Scotia, because there are serious environmental implications.

The other question concerning Labrador is that in Labrador there is a very emotional issue always surrounding environmental questions.

MR. STRACHAN: People generally do not have a middle position on it. They are often for it or against it and there are some basic questions recognized here because obviously in many ways when people have jobs, when people are working, when a country is affluent, then generally environmental questions as such rise to the forefront. In frontier countries or countries which are developing, generally environmental questions are pushed to the background because the idea is to develop and to try to create jobs. And obviously, similarly as unemployment increases in a province or in any land at all, environmental issues are pushed behind and as they become more affluent then people will start discussing this more seriously.

I think that in very many cases there is never this balanced position taken in which we balance the one against the other because of course one of the worst indignities that can be inflicted on man is if a man wants to work and he cannot find work, and obviously the environmentalists often do not see this point and will push and try to stop for instance industries purely on environmental issues without realizing that there has to be some sacrifice somewhere, especially as their expectations rise. Now I say this because it is a very serious situation in Labrador and I think if anyone goes to any meetings in Labrador one is always thrust into confrontation situations on this question. There is no middle ground on it. Always one has to take stances and one is accused if one is pro-development, one is accused of not concerning themselves with environment, or if one is a pure environmentalist one is therefore accused of not supporting development in job creation. And it is people's aspirations in Labrador, and especially the part which I represent, the Labrador Coast, where we have people who are essentially, as the member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) would call them, pastoral people, people who culturally are not involved or have not been involved historically in any kind of industrial development, the question even raises a greater

MR. STRACHAN: dilemma. Because as their expectations rise, and as they wish televisions, as they wish jobs to get the money to acquire the material possession of the world, as they request airstrips, wharves, the more and more comforts of the world, they also have to realize at the same time that in doing so they will often be wiping out the very thing that they wish to retain, that is a very much a pastoral culture. And there is a very difficult balance here, and people in Labrador, most especially the community I live in, the community of Nain which is eighty per cent Inuit, there is a very serious situation of trying to balance out what you retain in life, or what you want to retain and what in many ways you wish to throw away in order to get the benefits or the material benefits you require. And as I say it becomes a very philosophical and often a very heated argument and exchange in which people have very fixed positions and fixed attitudes.

A similar situation arises with BRINEX and the uranium tailings in which people in many cases are now objecting or see very serious objections, although now people are seeing that they need development to a certain extent in order to gain funds and revenue for the Province and for the developments. But at the same time they have some very serious and very valid objections because they feel that such industry will cause severe hazards or will contaminate large parts of the country, and of course as people start travelling more and more around the world to Elliott Lake and so on their fears are compounded because they see situations which have gotten out of control.

I say to the minister on this, and I do not want to go on much longer with this kind of dissertation, but I say to the minister on this that I think it is about time that the

MR. STRACHAN: Department of Environment, it is a very small budget under environmental management and control, and I think it is about time that they realized that they have to grab hold in this Province of some of the serious implications of environment in trying to balance them out and also to educate people that if they aspire in some ways to material benefits they desire, they must also realize there are certain sacrifices to be made at the same time. But I think this is very difficult to tell people. If I say this at a meeting on the Labrador Coast I know for instance that many people will jump down me because they feel that they can maintain this cultural way of life without having to sacrifice anything. And that is impossible. You cannot do that because in effect one has to change; regardless, one has to move down the road. What they are assessing in many cases is they want to be involved in that change and

MR. STRACHAN: this has occurred, for instance, in the Michelin - Kitts Pond area and they want to be involved in these changes but I say the department has not, in my estimation, grabbed hold of this real problem in Labrador and elsewhere in the Province and educated people in the changes which are going to take place and laid out to them exactly what sacrifices they will have to make. If they do not want to make these sacrifices then realize that in many cases their expectations or hopes will not be realized for a more materialistic way of life. I think that has to be laid out very clearly to people because I think that in many cases what is happening, in some situations, is a promised Utopia is being laid out to people down the road where they can have many materialistic benefits. They cannot have all the benefits of the modern society and world without realizing that somewhere along the line they also have to make sacrifices and I think that very clearly has to be made.

I know that many environmentalists will object to my statements; I realize full well that many people who are on the other extreme, purely capitalistic oriented, for instance, will object to my statements, but there must be somewhere along the line a middle ground, or some ground on which we can meet where the decisions are made and people made to realize that they have to give up some things in order to get these things and also will have to accept the environmental impact, the environmental damage incorporated into it.

I think it is incumbent upon the minister and his department to bulldoze ahead on some of these things. I think decision have to be made by this department and I think that many of the decision to be made will be very difficult ones to make more and more difficult because they are costly in the field of dilemma, of ideology,

Mr. Strachan: and of attacking people's ideas and I think it is a serious situation. So I hope that the minister will take this in mind that there should be real consideration for people's feelings, for how they feel about the environment. It is not an issue which can be tackled in many cases coolly and calmly because people do not feel about it in that kind of terms. We will have to expect some of these reactions from them, understand them, and also encourage some of these reactions as well because they are real, valid questions which are being raised as we move down the road. But at the same time I do not want to indicate that environmentalists are all nuts, nor, which is often regarded, environmentalists and people who are really concerned about it in many cases as just being pure nutty, their position is not valid. Their positions in many cases are valid, extremely valid. At the same time I think environmentalists have to understand as well that in order to become acceptable and credible— not acceptable, but more credible, they will have to lose some of their wilder Utopian ideas of pastoral living because basically many people do not want that way of life, and therefore there has to be this middle ground.

I wonder if the minister could indicate to us whether they do intend to take some of the issues, for instance, involved with oil and gas, some of the issues involved with uranium, some of the developments which people are very seriously concerned about, and rightly concerned about, and whether there can be any educational programme and whether we can discuss these things in a more rational fashion rather than some of the discussions we have had of late.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (MR. YOUNG): The hon. member for Port de Grave.

MR. E. DAWE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct my remarks to the hon. minister with reference in particular to the subhead, Environmental Management and Control. I am sure that the hon. minister is quite aware of the very serious problem we have had this past three years in Conception Bay Centre with regard to waste or garbage disposal. And if I heard correctly today through the media, it is my understanding that the minister and his officials are considering a new proposition this

Mr. Dawe: . . . year with regard to waste disposal for Newfoundland, and I refer to the open trench or pit type disposal unit.

As I understand it from the media today, the minister and his officials had visited the Mainland and they are convinced that this is the answer to waste disposal in Newfoundland and that they intend to make one pilot project for this coming season.

MR. DAWE:

My remark to the minister is to make an appeal on behalf of Conception Bay Center. The minister mentioned that there is consideration to have this unit erected at Corner Brook, St. John's, the Burin Peninsula or Conception Bay Center. And when I say, Mr. Chairman, Conception Bay Centre, I am referring to the communities of Upper Island Cove, Tilton, Spaniard's Bay, Bay Roberts, North River, Clarke's Beach, South River, Cupids and Brigus. These are communities within municipal jurisdictions. We have the communities of Butlerville, Bareneed, Mackinsons and Georgetown that are outside municipal jurisdictions, and my judgement is these combined communities make a total population of 15,000 people.

We have had a serious problem over these last three years. The communities which I have mentioned have had to truck their garbage as far as Waitbourne, a distance of twenty-five miles. And any member can readily realize the excessive cost to the various councils to have to truck this garbage this excessive distance. And my appeal to the minister is if there is going to be one pilot project installed this year there is no more need in this Province today than in Conception Bay Center. The minister is quite aware of it, his officials are quite aware of it, and the councils fully realize the interest the minister has taken these past two or three years to try to solve this problem. And I say to the minister, if I can be any help to him, I will be prepared to convene a meeting of all these councils to decide a site - the biggest problem is to decide a site - decide a suitable site for this new installation.

The minister and his officials probably would have information that I do not have, probably could point out Corner Brook is in more need, the Burin Peninsula is in more need or St. John's is in more need. I cannot make that judgement, Mr. Chairman, but I can say that we are in dire need of a suitable, reliable and central location for a waste disposal unit in that part of Conception Bay, and I cannot think of any more pressing need within this Province. I cannot think that any of these communities that you would mention today would be in more need than our part of Conception Bay Center.

MR. DAWE: The need is there, you are quite familiar with it, and, as I say, I would be quite willing to convene a meeting of all the councils involved to assist your officials to decide on a suitable site. And I am sure if you and your officials would decide to make this pilot project to be located in our part of Conception Bay, you would relieve a most pressing social need. It has been a very cantankerous problem these last three years and the most cantankerous thing of this nature is the location of a proper site. People do not want a garbage disposal unit next to their community because it deteriorates, detracts from the impression you get from a community when a waste disposal unit is nearby. But I would make this strong appeal to the minister that on behalf of 15,000 people in Conception Bay Center - I do not know of any other part of Newfoundland where the desire

MR. DAWE: and the need is more, and I can assure him that it would be most welcome news when you reach your decision if you could make the decision to erect this waste disposal unit, this pilot project, this trench or pit type incinerator for our part of Conception Bay. It is most needed, and if it is not provided you and your officials will be antagonized. The councils are at their wits end. They cannot find a suitable solution. They have to truck their garbage now twenty-five miles at excessive cost to the councils involved and they cannot maintain this garbage collection unless some special grant from the Department of Municipal Affairs to relieve these communities of this most important need. And I say to the minister, and I appeal to the minister, and his officials, to give most serious consideration to erecting this first pilot project in our part of Conception Bay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs and the Environment.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, my time is a kind of short and I would like to try to answer some of the questions because the purpose of course of the exercise is to have questions answered. Perhaps I will deal with the hon. member for Port de Grave (Mr. Dawe) first because it is fresh in my mind.

MR. NEARY: The Sarasota Kid.

MR. MURPHY: 'Steve', do not be so obnoxious, please. Try to be decent for once in your life. With reference to my statement today on pit incinerators -

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman made a fool of himself down in Sarasota.

AN HON. MEMBER: That did not make a fool of him.

MR. NEARY: He did not improve any.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I feel that the hon. minister will have some difficulty in answering the questions if he is being interrupted, and he asked to be heard in silence.

MR. MURPHY: There will be a circus in town next week and you will get a job as a clown.

MR. NEARY: Two months in Sarasota (inaudible).

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, if I may, I will deal with the last gentleman's request first. Just to say that as far as pit incinerators are concerned it is an ambition of ours to try to do -

MR. NEARY: What about car wrecks?

MR. MURPHY: - away with all waste disposal sites as they are set up today. We realize that this Province is not the best for soil coverage, soil is scarce in many places and as I said on CBC tonight in an interview, we have had five, I think, active requests for this type for a pilot project. We have a few dollars in our budget this year for that. We have to decide with areas that they are prepared - of course there will be a shared benefit. It will not be all municipalities. There will be non-registered groups within that and the gentleman referred to Conception Bay Centre. We have had several meetings with the group, in Bay Roberts particularly, with Mr. Mercer and the rest of the group, and the idea was from Cupids to Victoria actually, a population of some 30,000 people with a sophisticated system and we would do away with ten or twelve of these eyesores and nuisances that are waste disposal sites.

We have also got the city of St. John's very much interested. I think Robin Hood Bay is past its labour and it is time to do something with that there. And I think the city are hoping that there would be one in the West End of the city.

The Burin Peninsula, we met in Marystown with a group of people there two months ago, discussed the same thing, and also the Corner Brook area. We did visit the Mainland and saw some of these in operation and we think it is the answer to it. But it is like everything else, the monies may not be available to do all that we would like to do.

Now just to get back to a few items that we want to talk about, I certainly wish I had the support in Cabinet,

MR. MURPHY: with the Minister of Finance, that I had in this House tonight; my budget I think would be a little bit larger than it is at the present moment.

MR. DOODY: It was not the same -

MR. MURPHY: As a matter of fact, not disclosing Cabinet secrets, but I did suggest possibly that forget it altogether and I will run a sweepstake and raise enough money to do my projects in my department.

MR. NEARY: You used to run the bingo game when you were down (inaudible).

MR. MURPHY: I made a good job of it for the baseball league, raised \$225,000, never got one cent of it. And as far as the hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) is concerned, I do not know why he got so excited about 'we did nothing.' You know, I do not mind people saying we could have done a lot more. We have had at least three meetings,

Mr. Murphy: Mr. Power, our engineer, with the Town Council. And we did put into effect the watering down of the tailings from the mill; I think that is one of the first things. We are concerned principally, well as he said himself, the ambient air which is surrounding it I think within the mill comes with Mines and Energy. We work very closely with the Department of Health.

The hon. gentleman said starting off I skipped it over. You know, if I wanted to go into what I have here there would be no time for anybody to speak on it, so I was only allowed twenty minutes and I have a full page here on the Baie Verte question if the hon. member wants it, but I do not want to delay the House. He is welcome at any time to come down and I can put it on the record with him just how far we have gone with it. As a matter of fact, and I will just give him some kind of little inkling here now of it. Asbestos: Advocate is in the midst of a programme which began in mid-1976 to control the emission of dust both from the process and the waste trailings pile. Briefly, bag house air filters have been installed for the primary crushing, the secondary recrushing, and the dryer operations. Before the strike the completion was set for July, August 1978. The use of water to control tailings dust is showing increasing improvement. This is an ongoing project which will be refined in time. Besides in plant monitoring, a monitoring site for ambient air has been established near the dock facilities. The results of sampling along with a report giving the environmental control project status are submitted to our department on a quarterly basis.

MR. SIMMONS: Table it!

MR. MURPHY: Would you like to have a crack at it? I would certainly like -

AN HON. MEMBER: No, thank you.

MR. MURPHY: The asbestos levels in the ambient air relatively close to the plant and the tailings pilings are usually very low. That is the amazing thing. The air around the plant is much lower than in many places further away. While very

Mr. Murphy: difficult to get a true indication of ambient asbestos levels in an area, two short surveys were done in Baie Verte in 1975 and 1976, Although the results were variable the average levels were below what is considered a safe level, 0.045 fibres per cubic centimeters of air. That is what we found there. It was not possible to assess the contributions to the levels by Advocate. However, it is fair to say that whatever Advocate's contribution was, it will be decreased upon project completion. With completion of the above projects Advocate will be in compliance with Environment Canada's asbestos regulations which require compliance by December 1978. This will mean that Advocate will be using the best controls which are currently available.

It can be explained that the Environment Canada regulations under their Clean Air Act restrict asbestos fibre concentrations from stacks to two fibres per cubic centimeter. I think the hon. gentleman made that statement himself. Stack analysis have not been possible because unfiltered air samples containing the asbestos fibre have a tendency to immediately plug sample lines.

We were discussing the thing. We had a meeting, we had several meetings in the past few weeks about this but until these improvements are put in the mill, what the heck is the sense of us doing any monitoring when we know that it is only a waste of time, that as soon as this is completed we feel that there will be tremendous improvement in the actual conditions. We sympathize. I mean, do not let anybody feel that we ministers or departments, whether it is Mines and Energy, you know, are out to kill people with asbestos. I brought back an editorial, I do not know if I gave it to the minister today, that was in a Florida newspaper about the same thing. They are very much concerned with it. Only now are they becoming alarmed, although the effect is not felt for some twenty-five or thirty years, I think, you know. But it is present, you know; let us not fool ourselves. And I would like to have \$50 million to employ ten or fifteen Brian Powers to go around to Baie Verte,

Mr. Murphy: The hon. gentleman for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) talks about Long Harbour. I would have liked to see the hon. gentlemen on the other side in this hon. House when this plant was introduced to Long Harbour—when was it, eight or ten years ago?—and all the fears that were expressed at that time. But I will say this and I would like to put it on the record, that the co-operation we are getting from Long Harbour—and I think my deputy minister, he cannot speak but I know he is listening—has been 100 per cent co-operation right through.

We had this great scare about the deformed rabbits and everything else. We set up a committee of which the Minister of Health I think is Chairman at the present time, we worked very closely together. Instead of three or four departments going off in different directions I think we are going the right way. And the Minister of Mines and Energy has got certain obligations as has the Minister of Health as have we. So if we can get all of our officials working together I believe, and we know that environment is an in thing these times, I remember a short time ago someone was talking about the environment and the

MR. MURPHY: present Minister of Transportation says, 'Yes, there is a cure to it - close down every factory in the country. Close them down! You will have no environmental problems, no smoke from smokestacks or anything else.' So I would like to assure the member - and again I have asked every member of this House, invited them to come to my department if they have any problems and chat with any of the technical people down there, because there is a lot of technical information that goes into this as in any of the departments, particularly Mines and Energy. And the equipment, the monitoring stuff, is almost outside our reach. But the federal government have been acting very closely with us and they have agreed to supply a lot of this technical stuff that we have. Actually, the deputy minister was just telling me that one of our boys is leaving very shortly to attend a high level conference on this and I think again this is in consultation with - to count the fibres, you know, and these things are so minute that you would need to put them under a magnifying glass to see them.

With reference to the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight), I was astounded tonight when we were informed that they washed out their pails or their buckets or something else in a river in Stephenville after spraying. I asked my hon. colleague, and it is the first time that that was brought to the attention of me or of the minister. I think every member of this House must accept some responsibility for what is happening in the Province. We are elected for certain things, to protect the people and the Province, and we do not just come in here to sit down and look beautiful or try to raise criticisms about this, that or the other thing. I think we all have duties to perform. And I would like a submission with the names of the people who did that, and I am sure that the hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture and myself will go all out to -

MR. FLIGHT: It came up before in the forestry estimates.

MR. MURPHY: Did it? Well, I just was not there. I was away on very serious business. I was doing some research in another province.

As far as my defending Price (Nfld.), you know, it kind of worries me. I attended a meeting in Edmonton last Fall. And Mr. LeBlanc was minister at the time, and they talked about this great pollution of all these paper mills and they said there are fifty paper mills. and according to the tone of the meeting, my deputy minister can confirm, these would be closed almost within a month.

MR. FLIGHT: What?

MR. MURPHY: And I stood up and I said, 'Mr. Minister, you can talk about fifty mills if you like. There might be fifteen or twenty in Quebec and in Ontario, but in Newfoundland one-third practically of our working population get their living from two mills.' So again - and I will just balance this with what the hon. the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) said - we have to balance one thing with the other. And the only statement I made with reference to Price - and I was very happy that the hon. the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) put in the clear just what position we were placed in, and I, as the minister, with information that I was not entitled to disclose, actually, from Mr. Marchand, the minister, about certain things that have been undertaken. And it has not been established that there was one fish killed, not one fish killed in the Exploits River due to pollution. And still the hon. member says, 'The greatest contributor to pollution is the Price (Nfld.) Company.' What is pollution, gentlemen? They are talking about sewerage treatment plants. How many millions of gallons have flowed into this harbour of St. John's for the past hundred years? And everybody wants a sophisticated sewerage treatment plant.

AS HON. MEMBER: Your time is almost up.

MR. MURPHY: What do I have? - half a minute? And I would just like to say -

MR. FLIGHT: What about Lacaille?

MR. MURPHY:

Who?

MR. FLIGHT:

What about Natarail?

MR. MURPHY:

Never met the fellow.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. MURPHY:

I am sorry, 'Graham'. I was not being smart. But all these things have been monitored by our experts and I can only go by them. I am not like some of the people that talk in this House, I am not an expert on any of these things. I can tell you all about car wrecks and all the rest of it because I am very familiar with that.

I would like to thank, in closing, everybody who has had contact with our department, and again, I invite the members any time they want to come down to talk about any technical matters - I do not have them, but my officials will. And I would like to thank again the media and the Information Services who did such a tremendous job for our department this year, because as we see by the estimates, it is not money that we had to spend, but we gave out information and education. That is all we could do. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

On motion 2001-01 through 2009-05, carried.

On motion Head XX without amendment, carried.

On motion that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Chairman of Committees.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report having passed estimates of expenditure under the following headings, XVIII - Public Works and Services, XX - Consumer Affairs and Environment, all items without amendment, and made further progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received and adopted.

On motion Committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: This brings to an end the estimates and as the hour seems to be rather late, I move that the remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred and that this House on its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, at -

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. gentleman tell us the order of business now on Thursday when we -

MR. HICKMAN: Yes, as soon as I finish, if I finish.

MR. NEARY: And I might say the House is rising now with the co-operation of the Opposition.

MR. HICKMAN: I commend the Opposition for -

MR. PECKFORD: For staying in their seats.

MR. HICKMAN: Do I have to start all over again?

I move that the remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred and that this House on its rising do

MR. HICKMAN: adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, at three o'clock, and that this House do now adjourn. I anticipate that the order of business, Mr. Speaker, on Thursday will be we will start off with the legislation and go through whatever legislation is up and then hopefully get into the Budget Speech.

MR. NEARY: How about the Throne Speech?

MR. HICKMAN: And when we get into the Budget debate, and when the Budget debate is over we go into the Finance bills and then the other legislation is up and when that is over we will go into the Address in Reply. By that time it should be close to Christmas and well anyway -

MR. PECKFORD: Merry Christmas.

MR. HICKMAN: Toronto has got a very good hockey team, I am told.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved this House adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday at 3:00 P.M., those in favour "Aye", contrary "Nay", carried.

This House is adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, 3:00 P.M.