

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
WEDNESDAY, MAY 28, 1980

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

On behalf of hon. members I would like to welcome to the House a delegation from the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary accompanied by the First Vice President of the Canadian Police Association and Executive Director of the Police Association of Nova Scotia, Mr. Joe Ross; the President of the Halifax Police Association and Director of the Police Association of Nova Scotia, Mr. Roy Landry; and the President of the Truro Police Association and First Vice President of the Police Association of Nova Scotia, Mr. Harold Thurrott.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: I would like to ask all members also to extend a warm welcome to thirty-eight grade five and special education students from Acreman Elementary School in Green's Harbour in the electoral district of Trinity-Bay de Verde along with their teachers, Mr. Edwin Penney, Mr. Edward Peddle and Mr. Denis Galway.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: And as well a group of twelve students and their teachers from Clarenville Integrated High School in the district of Clarenville. We trust they enjoy their stay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the House that the new asphalt storage and handling facility of Newfoundland Hardwoods Limited at Stephenville has now been completed and is ready for opening.

This new facility, new asphalt plant,

MR. BARRY: will allow the West Coast region of the Province to be served much more economically and efficiently than in the past.

The new facility is located on the Harmon Complex in Stephenville. The capital costs amounted to \$325,000 and there will be five new jobs created in the Stephenville area.

The first shipment of asphalt is expected to arrive by tanker on May 30, 1980. As soon as the tanker is unloaded the plant will be fully operational.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. STIRLING: Just a quick reaction, Mr. Speaker.

I think this is a noteworthy day. The Minister of Industrial Development (Mr. Barry) in the last year has announced the first five jobs created by his department, in one year of operation.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer). The minister seems to have completely demoralized the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary, and I have to give a little preamble, Mr. Speaker. The other day the hon. gentleman told the House that it was not unusual for people to transfer from one force to another and dragged in this red herring of members of the Newfoundland Constabulary holding down high-ranking jobs in the RCMP. Well, I would like to ask the minister if he knows of

MR. S. NEARY:

any other case in Newfoundland? I think the hon. gentleman was referring to recruits and people on active duty when he was talking about cutting across, going back and forth from one Force to the other. But does he know of one other example in this Province where an RCMP officer or a member of the Newfoundland Constabulary was in retirement, taken out of retirement and went to a senior post either in the RCMP or the Newfoundland Constabulary?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, this is the first time that a former member of the RCMP has been appointed Assistant Chief of Police. That is a question of fact. I have no hesitancy in relating that. When the hon. gentleman says 'taken out of retirement,' he was retired from the RCMP. He is approximately forty-three years old, so he was not home; he has been working for the past year in an executive capacity with the Department of Justice as Director of Emergency Measures. So certainly that is a question of fact. As I stated at the time, as the appointment shows it is the general practice that appointments are made from within the Force. It is, however, the prerogative of government to make appointments at the Chief and Assistant Chief level and there is no automatic exclusion or disqualification of a person competent and capable - and he is a Newfoundlander - because he happened also to have served in the RCMP. To accede to that request, to accept that principle, would be to erect an iron curtain, which I have no intention of doing.

MR. S. NEARY:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY:

The hon. gentleman has continued to drag in the red herring. Nobody is criticizing, Mr. Speaker, members of the RCMP going over to the Newfoundland Constabulary or members of the Newfoundland Constabulary taking senior positions in the RCMP providing they are in active duty, or they could be Newfoundland recruits,

MR. S. NEARY: but certainly not people who are retired, this is unheard of. And I submit that is a red herring the hon. gentleman is dragging in to try to defend his position. Let me ask the hon. gentleman, how did the name - and I have nothing against Mr. Coady, he is a Newfoundlander - how did the name of Mr. Coady get in contention in the first place? What did he do to gain preference over senior officers of the Newfoundland Constabulary? What qualifications did he have over and above senior members of the Newfoundland Constabulary? What courses did he have, for instance? What special qualifications did he have? How did his name get introduced into this matter in the first place when there were no ads carried in any newspapers or anything advertising for the job of Deputy Chief?

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

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: First to comment on the preamble, when the hon. gentleman says 'retired', I think one must be specific. He was retired from the RCMP, he was not a retired person. He was a person forty-three years old working full-time in the Department of Justice.

MR. S. NEARY: You are splitting hairs.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: The hon. gentleman says that is splitting hairs, but it is a pretty large and important hair, I would say. The gentleman was retired from the RCMP, he certainly was not retired. He has been working in a full-time job for the past year as Director of Emergency Measures.

Now, the hon. gentleman

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER:

says there were no advertisements for that so how did we know about the qualifications? First, I should say there that there have never been and there were no advertisements when the position of Chief became vacant and Chief Roche was appointed, or when the position of the other Assistant Chief became vacant and Assistant Chief Don Randell was appointed, so there is nothing unusual there.

The method of how the gentleman was selected was that the Chief of Police, Chief Roche, as I think he has informed members of the Brotherhood himself, made that recommendation to the department and I, as Minister of Justice, made the recommendation to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. And Chief Roche made that recommendation. The hon. gentleman says, "You know, why should it be this particular man? Does he have better qualifications than anybody else?" My answer to that is, as I said before, I am not comparing one person with another, I am not saying one person has better qualifications and another has less qualifications, it is not a question of comparison. It is a question that it is our policy for the development of the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary and to help it to prepare for the needs of the future-and police duty changes as well as other occupations change - that we are planning for new training programmes and recruitment procedures and, in our opinion and in the opinion of Chief Roche and in the opinion of the government, this particular person had a mix of experience and qualifications and service in Newfoundland and in various parts of Canada which well qualified him for the job and in our opinion he can do the job very well.

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

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

MR. S. NEARY: I find it very difficult, Mr. Speaker, to accept that answer. I know I have to accept the word of the minister but I find it very difficult to accept the fact -

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

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: The purpose of the Question Period is to ask questions, not to make speeches. If the hon. gentleman is dissatisfied with any answer he is getting there is a procedure that he can implement to voice his dissatisfaction.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) I have to apologize to the hon. House Leader, I really did not hear what the hon. member's preamble was, but I suggest to him that he keep it short and ask his question.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am asking the hon. gentleman out of all the people in Newfoundland, including members and senior officers in the Newfoundland Constabulary who had qualifications to take that job, how did Chief Roche lay on his hands on one particular individual? Did somebody bring this to his attention, did somebody send him a resume, did he know about it himself? How did he just lay on the hands on this one particular individual right out of a clear blue sky?

MR. L. THOMS: Did Coady apply for the job?

MR. S. NEARY: Did Mr. Coady apply for the job?

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

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Nobody applied because there were no applications invited, as indeed they were not, for the position of Chief and for the other position of Assistant Chief. I do think that it is unfortunate to call into account the judgement of Chief Roche. Chief Roche knew Mr. Coady; obviously as Director of EMO they would have had contact during at least the past year. So he certainly knew him,

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: he knew of people in the Force and he had the files of people in the Force. The hon. gentleman wants me to say that one person is better qualified than others or to say that others are not properly qualified, but the hon. gentleman is not going to say that because I do not believe that. We are not talking about comparisons. What I am saying is that at this particular time, for the particular tasks and the particular challenges of this particular time, it was the opinion of Chief Roche, it is the opinion of the government that the gentleman whose appointment I announced had the appropriate mix of qualifications, of experience, of past background, of variety of service that he had given in the other police force that made him a very capable person for this job at this particular time.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): I indicated a final supplementary the last time, the hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. L. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague.

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

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, first of all I only have one question left. I want to ask the hon. gentleman if it is true that the government had to sort of - the minister had to sort of cook the books, change the regulations in order to make this appointment? That is one part of my question. And the other part is that if I was a member of that Force I would be insulted. I would consider it and I would resent it-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh !

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: The minister is stating, Mr. Speaker, the minister is stating that he does not want to make comparisons, he is not going to get sucked into that, making comparisons. Well, the hon. gentleman has insulted the members of the Force because -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! Order, please! The hon. member is not asking a question. I think that is the purpose of Question Period. I ask him to direct his supplementary question.

MR. S. NEARY: Is it correct to say, Mr. Speaker, is it correct to say that there are any number, a number, x number of senior officials in the Newfoundland Constabulary who have the qualifications, more qualifications than the gentleman he appointed, or equal qualifications to the gentleman he appointed and if so, why was not consideration given to somebody within the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary?

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

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, it certainly was not my intention to insult members of the Constabulary, and I would think that some of them on reflection may well be insulted by the kinds of questions that the hon. gentleman might be asking.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I have absolutely no intention as long as I am Minister of Justice of surrendering my and the government's responsibility -

MR. S. NEARY: When you are wrong, admit you are wrong.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: - and obligation. Now, the hon. gentleman -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: It will be noted that the hon. gentleman is not interrupted when he is asking questions, but lacks the common courtesy -

MR. NEARY: Admit you are wrong.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: - the common courtesy to keep quiet during answers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: So the hon. gentleman certainly has a

May 28, 1980

Tape NO. 1863

EL - 3

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: right, but I have a right to expect a certain courtesy from the hon. gentleman. And the government has no intention of surrendering the responsibility or obligation for making these senior appointments. This is a responsibility and obligation the government has we do not intend to surrender it.

MR. NEARY: When you are wrong, you are wrong.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: This is the kind of society where it is the civil authority which makes these appointments. It is not the kind of authority where

MR. OTTENHEIMER: a police brotherhood makes the appointments of management within the police. This is a civil society, it is a society where the decisions are made by the civil authority who are accountable to the people, and that is a principle that we certainly intend to stand by.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. NEARY: It could only happen in Nazi Germany or behind the Iron Curtain.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!
The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. STIRLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker. In view of your ruling the other day I have a new question for the Minister of Justice. Given the fact that the government certainly has the authority to appoint, the government has now appointed, and the very presence here today indicates the feeling that the government has not acted in a way that people would have understood clearly. Now, in view of that -

MR. BARRY: Justice can be done.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Relax. Relax.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of comment -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!
If the hon. member has a question, I would direct him to put his question.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, the question for the Minister of Justice: In view of the fact that you have now appointed a deputy, and in my view, you have put him into an impossible situation where he has to try to deal with a situation similar to any other group of employees, if you like, where he has been put

MR. STIRLING: into a position by the poor handling by the government so that he will really have no other choice -

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: - but to resign.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member has a question?

MR. STIRLING: Would the minister now indicate what steps he has taken to prevent this kind of confusion in the future so that you do not have this kind of problem of a complete breakdown in communications? What have you done about the future to prevent this from happening again?

MR. NEARY: No, do not let him off the hook.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, we do not expect to be appointing a Chief of Police or Assistant Chief of Police for quite a number of years. They are all relatively young people and barring ill health or barring an accident, we do not anticipate the need of making any such appointment. And certainly I do not think anybody has thought that if in ten or -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: The hon. gentleman still will not keep quiet. The hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) still will not keep quiet.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: The Great defender of law and order, and he does not have enough sense of order, he does not have enough -

MR. NEARY: At least I do not break the law.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Sorry.

MR. NEARY: At least I do not break
the law.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!
Obviously hon. gentlemen -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) like the hon.
gentleman.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!
Obviously hon. members to
my right ask questions in order to get answers. I submit
it is very difficult to get answers if continuous
interruptions are occurring. So I would ask hon. members
to give their answers in silence and give their questions
also in silence.

The hon. the Minister of
Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, we certainly
have not made any plans for an appointment in, you
know, however many number of years for a Chief of Police
or for an Assistant Chief of Police. As I have said
before and as the facts will show, the general practice
is appointment within the ranks. In one instance we
appointed an

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Assistant Chief of Police who was a Newfoundlander, who had served formerly with the RCMP, who was for the past year working with the Department of Justice in another capacity we appointed him as Assistant Chief. I do not see that it is matter that hon. members should take such exception to at all. And certainly nobody has made any plans for the appointment of Assistant Chiefs in what could be some years hence.

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

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

MR. L. STIRLING: Again, in view of the Speaker's ruling the other day, I do not want to return to the line of questioning and be ruled out of order. So I would ask a supplementary dealing specifically with this: Our police, we have taken a great deal of effort to make sure that they are proud of the job that they are doing and we are proud of them. Now put yourself in the position a new recruit who has been attracted to the police force, and he can, as in any other organization, see himself moving along providing he does the work and he gets it -

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

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I again say this is a Question Period, not the point to make a speech, least of all to give a sermon.

MR. E. ROBERTS: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, obviously it is the Question Period and all that my hon. friend for Bonavista North (Mr. Stirling) is doing, it may be offensive to my learned friend from St. John's East to be asked questions on a topic that he obviously would prefer to hear nothing more about, but all that my hon. friend for Bonavista North is doing, Sir, is posing a question. He is not making a speech. If he were to be allowed to give a sermon, Sir, I can think of no group of ladies and gentlemen who more deserve a sermon or more need a sermon than hon. gentlemen and ladies opposite. But, Sir, that is not the point of it either. All my hon. friend for Bonavista North is doing is asking a question and I submit he ought to be allowed to do it without being harassed by gentlemen opposite who are being touched in what obviously is a tender and very sore spot, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): With respect to the point of order, I bring to the attention of all hon. members Standing Order 31 (c) which says in part, "In putting any oral questions, no argument or opinion is to be offered nor any facts stated except so far as may be necessary to explain the same".

The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. L. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I am trying to put the question in the context of recruiting and showing a career path as we want to do throughout the whole Public Service. And the people in the Constabulary if you were a new man coming in or now at a rank along the way, what assurance would the minister give, having learned this current lesson, that he will recruit in a way and set out a career path in a way that people in the police force will know that providing they take the courses, providing they are diligent, providing they do all the

MR. L. STIRLING: training, that they will be in line to be considered, to even be considered, Mr. Speaker, before going outside the force? What assurance can the minister give that having learned this lesson, that in the future he is going to be able to set this out for the honourable career men in the police force?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

I believe the hon. member has asked his question.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, bearing in mind the government's policy for development of the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary, bearing in mind its commitment to that development and our view for the need for new and developed training procedures and recruitment procedures, then I would say that the appointment of a person who, working together with Chief Roche and Assistant Chief Randell, could make a very significant contribution to the development of that force, to the improvement of training and recruitment facilities, that the appointment of a person who could make a significant contribution to those goals would be, I would hope, welcome for the overall good of the force.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING:

A final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. STIRLING:

Do I understand from the Minister of Justice that bearing in mind the fact that the major problem we have here today is because he did not do exactly what he just set out, and that is advertise it, select from amongst the force, and find somebody from within the force before going outside the force, and that he has now set up a situation where the Deputy Chief, who would normally succeed, or you would expect that he would expect to succeed, has an impossible situation; Is the minister saying that even though he has learned all these lessons he is not prepared to do anything about the present situation and he is not prepared to guarantee that it will not happen again in the future?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, I am not really sure what the import of the question is but I think what it comes down to essentially is, am I prepared to change my mind or is the government prepared to change its mind with respect to the appointment of the Assistant Chief which I announced last week; at least that is what I understand to be the gist of the question. And as I said before, the government has no intention of surrendering its

MR. OTTENHEIMER: responsibility and obligation to make these appointments. The government has no intention to surrender that responsibility.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!
The hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, my question is also to the Minister of Justice, and I would suggest that the Minister of Justice is learning well from the Premier of this Province in that he is becoming just as arrogant, just as arrogant.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Dictatorial.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

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

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I welcome questions on this and other subjects. Hon. members will know, however, that I do not make personal references to them and I think Your Honour will see that offensive language -

MR. NEARY: Why do you not (inaudible)?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: - if the hon. gentleman from LaPoile will keep quiet.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: - that in my answers to them, they may agree or disagree with the answers, I do not make personal, offensive references to them, not that it particularly bothers me, and I think I can hold my own with the hon. gentleman from Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) -

MR. THOMS: Then why are you on your feet?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: - but I think that personal offensive language really has no place in this Legislature.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

May 28, 1980

Tape No. 1867

AH-1

MR. THOMS: Where is the point of order?

MR. NEARY: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): To the point of order. The hon. member
for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: It is really humorous, Mr. Speaker, to
hear hon. gentleman on the other side after they give members on this side
the flick, they get up then and try to portray an image of being holier
than thou. After giving me the flick, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer)
then gets up and says, "Oh, my hon. friend should not do this to me." It
is alright for them to do it to us but we cannot do it to them. And I
would submit, Your Honour, that there is no point of order. It is not even
a disagreement. It is just that the minister is very testy and sensitive
today because he knows he did wrong.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: With respect to the point of order, I
would rule that there is no point of order. The hon. minister has taken
an opportunity to defend accusations that were made perhaps towards him
but I would like to rule there is no point of order but a difference of
opinion between two hon. gentlemen.

If the hon. the member for Grand Bank (Mr.
Thoms) has a question, I would direct him to ask it.

MR. THOMS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question to
the minister is - and I believe that in this particular case the present
Chief of Police is being made a scapegoat in the whole matter, is being
used - and my question to the minister is what part the Assistant Deputy
Minister of Justice, Mr. Cyril Goodyear, an ex RCMP officer himself, had
to play in the appointment of Mr. Coady?

MR. NEARY: A good question.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, to suggest that Chief Roche
is anybody's scapegoat is to sorely underestimate the man, and I would

MR. OTTENHEIMER: say that they sorely underestimated him.

MR. THOMS: You are the one who used him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Chief Roche himself made the suggestion, made the recommendation. The hon. gentleman asked what role did Mr. Goodyear have to play and then he said that Mr. Goodyear also served in the RCMP. What a terrible thing for the man to have done, to have served in the RCMP! He also served in the Newfoundland Rangers for years, he also served as Chief Magistrate, Chief of the Provincial Bench, he is also a member of the Law Society. But what a terrible thing, he also served in the RCMP, You would not know but he served in the NKVD!

MR. THOMS: Now who is misinterpreting what I say.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: What did he have to do with it? He was the one who received the recommendation from the Chief, he was the one who received the recommendation from the Chief and passed it up the line. There is no great conspiracy that Mr. Goodyear, because he served in the RCMP, is out to put the RCMP everywhere at all. And I point out, I think it is most unfortunate that a man who cannot defend himself, who is a public servant, who also served in the Newfoundland Ranger Force -

MR. THOMS: Answer the question.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: - who also served as Chief of the Provincial Bench, that such a man is attacked in the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMS: A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order. The hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, there must be a love-in for the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) on the other side today. My point of order is this, that the minister is simply just not answering the

May 28, 1980

Tape No. 1867

AH-3

MR. THOMS:

question. He is giving us a eulogy on the Assistant Deputy Minister of Justice. I want an answer to the question of what part the Deputy Minister played in this appointment.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

I do not believe I need to hear any debate on that. There is no point of order. I quote Standing Order 31 (g): 'A member who is not satisfied with the response to an oral question may give notice that he intends to raise the subject-matter of the question at a later date.' So the hon. member is aware of that.

MR. L. THOMS:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Grand Bank.

MR. L. THOMS:

Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Justice (Mr. G. Ottenheimer) indicate to this House whether or not the appointment by senior personnel within our police force by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council is an exception to the rule across Canada?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, it is in the Constabulary Act, the appointment of the Chiefs and the Assistant Chiefs. I have not really checked the Constabulary Acts of the other provincial forces. I would have to either do that or have somebody do it. I know it is the procedure in this Province. I have not checked the Constabulary Acts on that point in other provinces. I will certainly have that done.

MR. L. THOMS:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Grand Bank, followed by the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. L. THOMS:

Mr. Speaker, as I said before, I think that appointments to the police force should be taken out of the realm of political appointments, and I would ask the minister once again, in view of the controversy that has arisen because of the method by which this particular appointment was made, whether or not he will consider an alternative method to making senior appointments in the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, with reference to the method in which this appointment was made, it is exactly the same way that the

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: appointment of Chief Roche was made, Chief Randall was made and all the Chiefs of Police for past decades or generations. So it is not a -

MR. L. THOMS: I am not asking that.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: It is not particularly unusual, it is the way it has always been done. I will certainly have a look at the Constabulary Acts in other provinces - I have not checked them - and see what their particular provisions are, but at the moment I am certainly acting within the Constabulary Act of this Province .

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

MR. L. THOMS: You cannot get an answer out of the man.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, my question also is to the Minister of Justice.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I have difficulty hearing the hon. member put his question.

MR. G. FLIGHT: My question to the Minister of Justice, Sir - and there is a very interesting side issue to this whole question, Mr. Speaker. A lot of people in the Province felt over the years that EMO has been downplayed much to their regret because they recognize it is a very important organization in this Province, and with the appointment of Mr. Coady with all the grand qualifications outlined by the minister, then they felt that EMO was again being elevated to the kind of organization it should be. One could make the case that Mr. Coady was inserted in the position -

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

MR. G. FLIGHT: - of Director of EMO while this position was waiting to become available.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker -

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

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: - there was not even a question so it is very difficult to reply to anything.

MR. G. FLIGHT: That is the preamble, Mr. Speaker.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Oh, that is what it was.

May 28, 1980

Tape 1968

EC - 3

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. G. FLIGHT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

A supplementary, the hon. the member

for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. G. FLIGHT:

Would the minister indicate to the

House now if he is aware of an individual with the qualifications of

Mr. Coady that was necessary to be Director of EMO, whom he is looking

at to

MR. G. FLIGHT: appoint to the position of Director of EMO now that Mr. Coady has gone, because there are some people in the Province who see the man appointed Director of EMO as important to the Province as the man appointed Assistant Chief of Police?

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

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the supplementary preamble, the position of EMO always has been and is one which will be done by public advertisements, so there will be public advertisements and no doubt those interested and with the qualifications will apply. I can not prejudge, I have no idea who will apply or who will be appointed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: It is an important post, certainly a very important post for co-ordination of the various services and forces and auxiliaries and units in case of some catastrophe -

MR. S. NEARY: (Inaudible) leadership (inaudible)

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: - or disaster or accident. Obviously, it is very important and advertisements will be made and the best qualified and suitable candidate will be appointed.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Let us clap for Mr. Coady, boys.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. E. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: One final supplementary, the hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. E. HISCOCK: My question is to the Minister of Justice, and we have seen in this House arrogance displayed at various times by this government but nothing like we witnessed today.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! If the hon. member has a question, he has ten seconds.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. E. HISCOCK: The question I would like to ask the Minister of Justice - the appointments are of a civil nature and is not the act of this government and the minister - will the minister take into consideration

MR. E. HISCOCK: in the future that any senior position of the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary be taken upon advisement and the Brotherhood informed or at least consulted with appointments in the future?

MR. S. NEARY: He would not want that.

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

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, we are certainly not, you know, anticipating an appointment at that level. The hon. gentleman said about appointments within the ranks. As I said, the entire procedure, if you go back through appointments for the past number of years, in the past number of months, the appointments have been within the ranks. This is one specific instance in order to meet one specific set of circumstances, and that is the development of the Force, the new recruiting and training methods and their overall development and upon the advise of the Chief and government's own decision to accept that advise, this particular person was appointed. It would not be appropriate, certainly, to have the consent of the Brotherhood in order to appoint a Chief or Assistant Chief. I mean, that would be relinquishing or surrendering that obligation which now rests with the government, with the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. And to say that a condition for the appointment of a Chief or an Assistant Chief must be the concurrence of the Brotherhood, would be to surrender that authority, which the government is not in a position to do.

MR. E. HISCOCK: Final supplementary.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of privilege, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my understanding on the rules of the House is that you have to raise a point of privilege as soon as the information is brought to your attention that the privileges of the House have been breached, is that correct?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member may continue.

May 28, 1980

Tape No. 1869

SD - 3

MR. S. NEARY: Well, I am not laying any charges against the Minister of Justice (Mr. G. Ottenheimer) at this particular moment, Mr. Speaker, but I do want to say this, that if it is borne out in the course of events that the

MR. S. NEARY:

minister withheld information or misled the House during the Oral Question Period on this matter of the appointment of an Assistant Deputy Chief of Police, if that happened then I would submit the hon. gentleman is in breach of privilege of this House. And it happened -

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - in this way, Mr. Speaker. I want to tell Your Honor how I think it happened. I am told from a very reliable source that Mr. Coady has asked to have his application withdrawn.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Now that may or may not be true, Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I believe I have heard enough from the hon. member. I do not think that this constitutes a case of breach of privilege, certainly not a prima facie case. So I would rule without having to hear anything further that there is no breach of privilege.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of privilege, the hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: The hon. gentleman put forward the position, if I misled the House. Now, I am using point of privilege as a matter of explanation, I am not pressing for a prima facie. I am using it as the authorities show as a point of explanation. I think that it is most unfortunate that the hon. gentleman should bring this in. I certainly did not mislead the House, I certainly did not tell untruths and for the honorable-or lie, in other words, we may as well call it, or lie to the House. I certainly did not do that and I think veiled allegation that I so did must be, I would hope, embarrassment to many of the hon. gentleman's colleagues.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! With respect to the point of privilege, I would rule also that there is no prima facie case in this matter but the hon. minister has taken the opportunity to clarify remarks that were attributed to him by other hon. members.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

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

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I want to respond to a question that was asked me by the hon. member for LaPoile yesterday.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

DR. J. COLLINS: He asked me would I inform the House whether or not the government has taken the major step, the big decision of allowing beer to be placed in cans.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

DR. J. COLLINS: Can I get the attention of the hon. member for LaPoile(S. Neary)? I am answering a question.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. member is answering a question.

DR. J. COLLINS: Allowing beer to be placed in cans, allowing tinned beer into the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. J. COLLINS: I have to tell the hon. member that I have since checked and the President of the Liquor Corporation reminded me that beer in cans has been for sale in this Province for some considerable time. It is mainly beer imported from foreign countries, but there has been tinned beer for sale in this Province for years.

MR. NEARY: I am talking about local beer.

DR. J. COLLINS: Well, you did not say local beer.

MR. NEARY: Do not be so stupid (inaudible).

How am I going to (inaudible).

DR. J. COLLINS: In regard to a sub voce supplementary that I just heard from the hon. member, there has been an approach to the Liquor Corporation by one of the local breweries to can beer within this Province. There has been an approach to the corporation and the corporation, of course, has given the permission to have such beer listed because, of course, the precedent is already set. I might just mention also at this point - the hon. member brought up the issue of possible pollution. I think the way he expressed it was 'What will be done to protect the environment against these cans being flung out of the windows of cars and left along the roadside and in parks' and so on and so forth. I have to tell him in the House that the corporation has advised the local brewer in question to consult with the Department of Consumer Affairs and Environment on this very issue.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): This being Wednesday, as agreed, I understand we will continue with the concurrence debates. Forty-five minutes I believe, remaining on the Resource Estimates Committee Report, then followed by the Social Estimates Committee Report. For the benefit of the hon. members, the Social Estimates Committee Report will cover the Departments of Social Services, Consumer Affairs, Justice, Health and Education. At the conclusion of the forty-five minutes, a motion will be put on the Resource Estimates Committee and I also understand that His Honor may be arriving sometime shortly, at four o'clock or so, so we may have to rise briefly. The hon. the member for Trinity-Bay de Verte.

MR. F. ROWE: Yesterday I managed to drag out of the Minister of Fisheries (J. Morgan) a very significant statement which in his absence I hope the Premier will pursue today and that is that essentially the

MR. F. ROWE: government has decided at this point in time, for various reasons, to scrap the idea of the superport in Harbour Grace. Now what I would like to hear from the Premier today, if the Premier is listening, Mr. Speaker, what I would like to hear from the Premier today, in the absence of the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), whom I assume will not be here -

AN HON. MEMBER: That does not make any difference.

MR. F. ROWE: Well, Mr. Speaker, could anybody opposite indicate, is the Minister of Fisheries going to be absent for the remainder of the day?

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

MR. MARSHALL: The Minister of Fisheries is out on pressing business, I would like to inform the hon. member.

MR. F. ROWE: Well, that is fine.

MR. MARSHALL: But members of the ministry can answer any questions he wishes to pose.

MR. F. ROWE: That is fine. That is fine.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what I would like for the Premier to indicate to the House today is the status of the five year programme, the five year fisheries programme announced a couple of years ago by the previous Minister of Fisheries, which was to cost in the order of \$500 million, \$250 million from the private sector, \$250 million from the government sources, either provincial and/or the federal government. What I would like to know from the Premier, Sir, is whether the government has abandoned that original programme brought in by Mr. Walter Carter approximately two years ago, called Fisheries Strategies Into The '80s. We now know that the superport, or the primary landing and redistribution port, that concept, costing in the order of \$61 million, has been scrapped. However, it did cost this administration in excess of \$600,000 for the Kellogg study and other provincial departmental studies to have that study produced, which came up essentially with the strategies for the fisheries for the next five years into the eighties. What I would like to have from the Premier is a straightforward indication as to the status of the fisheries programme as outlined in that particular brochure put out by the department and by the minister of the day.

MR. F. ROWE: Another thing that I would like for somebody on the other side, Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Fisheries, to indicate is this whole business of salt fish and the marketing of salt fish in the Province, And I am reading a letter here addressed to a certain person whom I will not name at the present time, I will only be too happy to indicate it to the Premier privately, but it is from Maritime Fish Products Incorporated of New York, and they have indicated, Mr. Speaker, that their "business in salt fish has been growing steadily over the years," and I am quoting from the letter. And they buy, or "We buy," as stated in the letter, "approximately 8 million pounds of finished product in salt fish a year." The letter goes on to indicate that "almost all of our salt fish still comes from Canada, but unfortunately none from Newfoundland. We last purchased salt fish from Newfoundland in 1974 and since that time we have never been offered supplies or in any way been contacted by anyone associated with the Saltfish Corporation. Fortunately we have managed to establish alternative sources of supply in Nova Scotia and Quebec. It is, however, very regrettable that we are no longer able to do business with a reputable packer in Newfoundland."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the reason why I quote from this letter is that apparently since 1974 at least we are losing, or have lost, through one buyer anyway, a potential market of 8 million pounds of salt fish to a potential buyer outside this Province. I was wondering if somebody on the other side could indicate to the House to what extent this type of thing is going on. This was just brought to my attention there yesterday and if it is just one firm,

MR. F.B. ROWE:

or if this is an isolated case it may not be looked upon to be that serious. However, 8 million pounds of salt fish is 8 million pounds of salt fish that has been bought by this outfit, this Maritime Fish Products Incorporated in New York, is being bought from Nova Scotia and Quebec now when it was being bought from the Province of Newfoundland prior to 1974. And the last thing that we need in this Province is the loss of markets for salt fish and I hope that this is not too extreme.

The other matter, Mr. Speaker, that relates to, I suppose the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie), is the matter of the blueberry industry in this Province. I was wondering, and probably the best way here is to read a letter that has come to my attention from Jasper Wyman and Sons of Maine, and it is addressed to whom it may concern and it is a copy which is difficult to read, Mr. Speaker, but I will read the letter and probably that is the best way to put the question to the minister concerned.

'To who it may concern:

Concerning Newfoundland wild blueberry production, we find that due to soft and old berries caused by early picking and holding the berries up for several days before delivery and processing causes a very high shrink, a blueberry with a character problem and, therefore, it is not conducive to normal grade standards required for the trade.

'If we are to continue purchasing and using wild blueberries from Newfoundland, we must have berries that are fresh and processed within twenty-four to forty-eight hours of picking.' And then they go on to other kinds of processing and they state,

MR. F.B. ROWE: 'We believe that this could be accomplished very easily by the industry as a whole'.

Now, Mr. Speaker, since this is, I would assume, one of the few industries that can be derived in a sort of a non-cultured or non-cultivated or in a wild sense here in the Province, we have certainly much in the way of wild blueberry lands in this Province and, obviously, there will be a cultivation of them, but this is certainly an indication from the Eastern Seaboard of the United States that our blueberries, for some reason or other in this particular case, do not reach the standard required by this particular company in Maine and, obviously, there is a loss of markets in this particular case.

So in closing, since I do not have much time left, Mr. Speaker, I would like the Premier to indicate the exact status of the five year fisheries strategy that was announced by Mr. Walter Carter since we got the indication yesterday that the superport has been scrapped and, also, if he could indicate the loss of markets for the salt fish in this Province as indicated in another letter that I brought to the attention of the House. And probably the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development could indicate what if any, what is the degree of seriousness through the loss of marketing blueberries because of the grade and quality of the blueberries in this Province.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am only too pleased to respond to some of the comments made by the hon. the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. F.B. Rowe) on the whole question of fisheries in the

PREMIER PECKFORD: Province and particularly as it relates to the distribution port in Harbour Grace.

Now, talking about fish, the hon. member is bringing up a real red herring when he talks about the central port in Harbour Grace because what has overtaken the whole question of a superport or a redistribution centre for codfish and other fish species in the Province is the present situation

PREMIER PECKFORD: as it relates to the Northern cod, and unless and until there is some determination by the federal authorities on how they are going to proceed with the access to the Northern cod, it will impact directly upon the viability or lack thereof of the superport concept, and more importantly, the whole re-distribution aspect of that superport. So that is where the thing lies. Back two or three years ago under the former administration there was a proposal put forward, a direction taken as it related to the re-distribution of fish that could be brought into a central port at Harbour Grace. That pre-supposed—and one of the assumptions underlying that report, underlying that strategy was that there was some fish to have access to, if I may be so bold grammatically to use a sentence ending in a preposition. So the question is one of as to whether there is going to be access to additional fish. Now that whole question of additional fish comes down to the question of the Northern cod stock because that is the primary now there are some other secondary species that could be brought into Harbour Grace as well, but the primary stock would be the Northern cod stock and until we have a determination by the federal authorities - this is why, obviously, DREE has not moved, DREE could not get an answer out of Federal Fisheries and Oceans and they were switching it back and forth for a couple of years there. Because the whole idea of Harbour Grace was not only, obviously, for an inshore fishery but was to have access to the gradually growing Northern cod stock which would be of such a consequence over the next four or five years by the time the superport was built, that you would have a legitimate surplus offshore which would have to be caught. And then, if that legitimate surplus which would be, obviously, then because of its

PREMIER PECKFORD: legitimacy over and above what was needed for the inshore fishery, then that offshore effort could be used to bring that legitimate surplus ashore to Harbour Grace and allow for its distribution in the North-eastern area of the Island to the plants that now exist that are now only working three or four months of the year.

But the operative and the salient point of the strategy was that there was additional fish in the resource. Now with the offshore effort being the way it is right now they are not altogether sure whether, in fact, there is going to be one. That strategy was developed, as the hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. Rowe) said, a couple of years. There has been somewhat of a change to that strategy, obviously. That was done by a previous administration, not by this one, so that therefore one has to look at what we have said as it relates to the Northern cod stock. And we are committed to a policy whereby the inshore fishery must be totally and absolutely protected.

Now until we are assured, and I know from whence I speak, that the inshore fishery will not be impaired or negatively affected, then we do not want to see any offshore effort, Newfoundland or otherwise, on the Northern cod stock. And when we would rather see for the next three or four years the Northern cod stock left alone, and while it is being left alone offshore that there will be intensive, extensive studies done on that stock to see whether, in fact, there is a legitimate surplus. Because what is now classified,

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, as a surplus, is not known in fact, is not known in science, is not known biologically. And I refer the hon. the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe) to a number of studies that have been done over the years which are very inconclusive on this whole question of the Northern cod stock and whether there are sufficient quantities there over and above what would naturally flow to the inshore. As a matter of fact, there are those around who are far more qualified in the fishery than I, who have said to me in the last two or three weeks that the reason why the whales are near the shore and all the rest of it is because there is not the amount of fish outside to keep them where they normally would be. And there is other evidence to suggest that. So what we are saying as a Province, which we have said in a number of documents that have been produced, the Northern cod seminar in Corner Brook last year where we produced documents which indicated our emphasis upon the inshore fishery. Because if you do not - and I challenge the hon. member to tell me where he stands on this - if you do not do that you are challenging the population distribution and the present arrangement of communities around this Island in the long-term. That is what you are doing. You are challenging whether Fogo should continue to exist, you are challenging whether St. Brendan's should continue to exist and so on. So our emphasis is on the inshore fishery. If and when it can be demonstrated scientifically and factually that there is no more, then fine and dandy, we will look at a legitimate surplus and then we think the central port concept is a very wise kind of approach to the distribution of fish to a number of fish plants around the Province to allow them to extend their season and to reduce unemployment in Eastern and Northeastern Newfoundland. So that is the approach we are taking.

Pursuant to that approach, and to add substance to it scientifically and otherwise, we are engaged in a fairly extensive study right now on the Northern cod stock, scientifically and historically. And we will be producing a document on that to indicate that the position we have taken is a very reasonable and sensible one

PREMIER PECKFORD: to take. So the superport idea as it relates to the catching and bringing to shore and the distributing of the Northern cod stock and other species out of a central port like Harbour Grace is a sound idea, but it cannot precede factual information, scientific information which demonstrates that in fact there is a surplus to the inshore effort which would allow for the distribution of this additional surplus. I do not think the hon. member knows, nor do I, nor does any hon. member in this House know, that there is at this point in time sufficient surplus offshore which will not be negated, which will not hurt or inhibit the ongoing inshore fishery at its present level and even for it to improve somewhat over what it is right now.

That is the great challenge, to be able to say definitively and categorically that there is right now more fish than is necessary for a vibrant inshore fishery, so that therefore you can bring that extra fish in and have the so-called central port as a viable option for the whole fishing industry on the East and Northeast coasts of the Island and in the Province generally. That is the great question, and there is no - as I said - scientific information to show that. We have to prove that. It is a good idea. To be corny and to be punny, it is a super idea as long as you have the resource. We do not know to this point in time that we really do have the resource to the extent that would make possible the viability of that concept and unless and until we know that, then it is foolhardy to move ahead today and yesterday towards massive investments in that field. You would be putting the cart before the horse. Let us know what we have and then on the basis of that, develop a strategy in line with it which would include, if in fact we had the fish, that kind of redistribution port, and a logical place for it to be would be in Harbour Grace.

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS:

Mr. Speaker, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor has arrived.

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): Admit His Honour the
Lieutenant-Governor.

May it please Your
Honour, the General Assembly of the Province has at
its present session passed certain bills to which,
in the name of and on behalf of the General Assembly,
I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

A bill, "An Act To
Provide For Natural Areas In The Province To Be Set
Aside For The Benefit, Education And Enjoyment Of
Present And Future Generations In The Province."
(Bill No. 12).

A bill, "An Act To
Protect The Environment Of The Province By Providing
For Environmental Assessment." (Bill No. 13).

A bill, "An Act
Respecting The Establishment Of A Newfoundland And
Labrador Arts Council". (Bill No.16).

A bill, "An Act To
Adopt A Flag For The Province". (Bill No. 44).

A bill, "An Act To
Amend The Workers' Compensation Act". (Bill No.46).

HON. GORDON A. WINTER(Lieutenant-Governor): In
Her Majesty's name, I assent to these bills.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for
Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, let the
record show that the Premier has now made a complete
reversal on the whole fisheries policy of the
administration of which he, himself, was a part when
it was announced, a complete reversal.

The hon. the Premier said
this afternoon, Sir - I could hardly believe my ears,
he was practically saying exactly the same thing that we

MR. F.B. ROWE: said when this whole superport and this five year fisheries programme was first announced in living colour over in the Holiday Inn. And it is a sad commentary, Mr. Speaker, when we have \$661,000 worth of prematurity. I would suggest that the government should have done the studies on the availability of cod stocks or any other kind of stocks before they started announcing \$500 million programmes, fisheries programmes for this Province and \$61 million superports. I would submit it would have been far better if the studies had to have been done pertaining to the stocks and the status of the stocks and the state of the stocks of the various species of fish in this Province before they got up and spent \$661,000 to make a grandiose premature statement just before an election campaign.

 But let the record show, Sir, that the Premier of this Province, who was a part of that original administration - he can try to put as much distance between himself and the Moores administration if he wishes, but the hon. the Premier and many ministers on the opposite side were

MR. F. ROWE: members of that administration which must have had Cabinet approval to announce that \$500 million fisheries programme for this Province. And the prematurity of it cost the people of this Province, the taxpayers of this Province \$661,000. And at that time, Mr. Speaker, we raised many questions, many questions relating to the concept of a superport and the whole concept of the direction of the fisheries at that time and we were called everything under the sun for simply asking questions about it. I can remember the hon. Minister of Fisheries at the time questioning whether I was a true Newfoundlander or not and saying such foolish things as 'Senator Rowe would be ashamed to see his son asking these type of questions in the House of Assembly' on that particular day. Now we see a complete 360 degree about turn on the part of the Premier who is now Premier but was a senior Cabinet minister of the administration of that day. So, Sir, I submit that the Opposition of the day and of today, of that day and of today, were right in raising legitimate and sensible questions relating to that whole concept and I am happy to hear that the government has come to its senses. I am saddened to learn that it cost in excess of \$600,000 for the studies to be done and I would further like the Premier or somebody to indicate to this House when questions were being raised last year with respect to the superport, Mr. Speaker, the answer coming back from the opposite side was that site preparation was ongoing and acquisition of land was ongoing at that time. Now, Mr. Speaker, do we have to call for an investigation to find out whether there was in fact acquisition of land, whether in fact there was site preparation? And if land was acquired, by whom and for what purposes? And if site preparation was ongoing, by whom and for what purposes? Was it related to, in fact, the fisheries or was it related to the oil industry in this Province? I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, whether in fact there was land acquisition, whether there was site preparation. Within the Department of Fisheries the obvious answer is no, because under the appropriate heading in the Department of Fisheries estimates there was \$100,000 estimated for last

MR.F.ROWE: year, there was zero dollars spent.
So I do not know whether it was spent under any other department of government. But, Sir, I simply rise to establish the record that there has been a complete about face on the part of this administration unfortunately at a cost of in excess of some \$600,000 and there are still questions to be raised with respect to the direction of the fishery and also the acquisition of land and site preparation out in Harbour Grace.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry and regret very much that the hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr.F.Rowe) forgot about an election that happened last June in which his party was defeated and this party was victorious and that as a result of that there have been certain policy decisions taken by this administration which might not necessarily coincide with the policy decisions made by a former administration and that he will have to talk to the former Minister of Fisheries, that he will have to talk to the former Premier and express his consternation and his frustration with the way in which he perceived those policies to be directed. It is just too bad, and I say to the hon. member for Trinity Bay de Verde, the political reality of the situation is that last June his party proceeded to put before the Newfoundland people a certain platform and this party on this side put forward a certain platform and unfortunately they were unsuccessful and fortunately we were successful and we have therefore since last June articulated a fisheries policy and I am glad to see that the hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde has followed in in line with this administration's policy on the fisheries. I am very, very happy that he supports our present position on the fisheries. I am very happy that the hon. member and the people on the other side support our position on offshore ownership and control of the mineral resources on the Continental Shelf. I am very happy that the party on the opposite side support the whole question of transmission of electricity through Labrador so that

May 28, 1980

Tape No. 1876

AH-3

PREMIER PECKFORD: we can get on with the job of
trying to improve the life and the economic well being of our people.
And I am sure as we announce new policies, creative,

PREMIER PECKFORD: imaginative policies on this side. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, it is very interesting to note that this day, this very day we have passed in this hon. House a number of reform pieces of legislation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: A very significant and historic day in our history -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - that I hope the press will note, an Environmental Assessment Act for the first time in our history. You know, "An Act To Preserve Certain Parts Of The Province For Ecological And Wildlife Purposes," for an Arts Council that was never ever established before. You know, for a brand new distinctive flag, and in that line, Mr. Speaker -

MR. F. ROWE: A point of order.

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

A point of order, the hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: The hon. Premier now is entering debate on the Arts Council and the flag. Now what the flag and the Arts Council have to do with resource development in this Province is beyond my comprehension and I would simply ask that in the ten minutes at his disposal he be relevant to the point at issue.

MR. F. ROWE: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: To that point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde does not understand that I am talking about reform, and that I am talking about reform as it relates to fishery policy, reform as it relates to arts policy, reform as it relates to environmental policy, reform as it relates to almost everything in this Province, Mr. Speaker, and it is in that vein that I was talking about the fisheries policy of this Province. It is a reform policy, one that, I am happy to say, that the hon. member supports.

MR. JAMIESON:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

To the point of order?

MR. JAMIESON:

No, no. No, Mr. Speaker.

Oh, you have to rule on the point of order.

All right.

MR. SPEAKER:

I would rule there is no point of order but merely a difference of opinion between two hon. gentleman.

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. You know, I am very, very happy to have the hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde on my side. He is a strong advocate of resource management policy in the Province, and now that I have the member for Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe) on my side I cannot go wrong. I cannot go wrong now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I am on the safest ground any politician in this Province could ever be on because now when I have the member for Trinity-Bay de Verde on my side on fishery policy we are safe, we are secure forever more as it relates to the way we are going to prosecute the fishery, the way we are going to process our products, the way we are going to develop -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Prostitute the fishery?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

- the way we are going to develop a super-port or distribution port, no question. So I really thank the hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde for allowing me this opportunity to put on the record once again, really no need to but the hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde has allowed me to, and it is a great opportunity that this whole business of fisheries policy, the whole business of making sure that you have the facts before you move, making sure that the inshore fishery, that the people of Musgrave Harbour and Dotting Cove in the member for Fogo's (Mr. Tulk) district, that the people of Barr'd Islands, that the people of Island Harbour, that the people of St. Mary's-The Capes district, that Branch are safeguarded, that that is what we want to do first, that we want to make sure that the inshore fishery is protected, and after that

PREMIER PECKFORD: has been protected, and that scientifically there might be a legitimate surplus, at that point in time then we are looking at being able to exercise our technological flexibility to put on an offshore effort which will then supplement the fish processing facilities in Fogo, in Joe Batts Arm, in Seldom, in St. Anthony, in Croque, in Conche, even in Southeast Crouse. I mean you might even get a processing plant there going, in Englee. It is just a fantastic thing, and to think, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - on the day that we passed all this reform legislation, that consistent with that reform, that the hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde would get up and support the government in such a stupendous way that he did, I think it is just fantastic. And once again we were unanimous on the Sergeant at Arms yesterday and now today we are unanimous on the fishery. The support that the Opposition has given this government is overwhelming and I do not know - you know, sooner or later there is going to be more people cross the House to this side, there is no question about it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, I gave notice to the Minister of Lands and Forests, but I suspect he has not had an opportunity to get the answer. He may be looking for it now. It is a very straightforward question. Perhaps the Minister of Industry can answer it for me: Some time ago there were more than reports, but there were reports as well as some work done on what I might describe as a mini-pulp mill concept in four or five locations around the Province, where certain kinds of wood would be simply advanced to the pulp stage. They would be relatively small but they would provide a sizeable amount of employment and a certain amount of wood cutting and the like. I ask it

MR. D. JAMIESON:

particularly because I became aware of it through the likelihood of one such operation, if the plan worked out, being located in the Come by Chance area and I wonder if the Minister of Industrial Development (Mr. L. Barry) has heard about this plan or whether it is something that has any reality or any practicality to it. Could he answer that?

MR. SPEAKER: (Butt) The hon. the Minister of Industrial Development.

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I understand the Department of Forestry has looked at this concept. There have been reports - maybe I will let the minister, now that he is here, go into more detail - the concept has been explored - I will let the minister determine the extent.

MR. C. POWER: (inaudible) is here.

MR. L. BARRY: The mini-pulp mills.

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

MR. D. JAMIESON: I doubt if the minister wants me to repeat it. I have mentioned the fact that I had an understanding that there were explorations under way about these, what I call mini pulp mills which would export relatively small amounts of pulp but there were about four or five locations around the Island or perhaps in Labrador as well, where these might have been practical.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Lands and Forests.

MR. C. POWER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, my understanding of that situation was that several years ago there were feasibility reports begun and carried to a certain stage to check on the economic viability of having export operations in actually four given locations in the Province. The thing was never carried through to its ultimate climax, if you want, partly because the linerboard mill in Stephenville, I understand, sort of took away a large supply of wood. In particular on the East coast, in the Come by Chance area, there was one of these areas being considered to take into account all of the wood East of the Bonavista Peninsula, taking all of that wood and channelling it out through Come by Chance. What happened was that there was a great deal of difficulty then with the paper companies which had a lot of very solid guaranteed

MR. C. POWER: rights of timber in those areas and were not willing at that stage to give up their rights in those given areas especially with the Labrador Linerboard Mill coming on it sort of got lost in the Labrador Linerboard Mill shuffle. Now, in the last several months we have been doing a lot of feasibility reports on the Bonavista Peninsula, the Great Northern Peninsula and Happy Valley- Goose Bay to see if we can get involved in small pulping operations. That being deemed to be viable in the Bonavista area, we are now looking at the possibility of a wood export operation that primarily debarks wood, chips it and further processes it to the point that it does not go out as pulp but goes out as a fairly processed product.

And as I say, we had a delegation in Europe, there are some Europeans coming here at the end of next week, and there will be some persons going from Newfoundland to, particularly Norway and Sweden and Spain, where there is a demand for this type of wood chips in the very short future.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, first I want to answer hon. the Premier; the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that the people in Harbour Grace district have been had, they have been taken by the government.

MR. G. WARREN:: By this government.

MR. S. NEARY: By this government and the hon. gentleman can not brush it off again as he has been doing now for the last year by saying, 'That was a previous administration'. The hon. gentleman was a senior minister in that administration who did not resign because of ill-conceived concepts like the superport in Harbour Grace. The hon. gentleman did not resign over it. The hon. gentleman took the attitude, here is his attitude, Mr. Speaker, and he says this all of the time about various serious other matters that happened when he was a member of the Cabinet, a senior minister in the Moores' administration, he says, 'Well, I did not resign because I thought I would stay in the Cabinet for the good of Newfoundland'. Well, was it for the good of Newfoundland or was

MR. S. NEARY: it for his own good he stayed in the Cabinet?

MR. G. WARREN: It was neither one of them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. S. NEARY: For the good of Newfoundland he stayed in the Cabinet. When Moores was up to his skulduggery, his ill-conceived concepts and his sllieveeneries and his crookedness he did not resign because he said, "I want to stay in the Cabinet because it is good for Newfoundland". It was not good for the hon. gentleman. I would submit, Your Honour, the reason the hon. gentleman did not resign was because he thought it was good for himself and not good for Newfoundland. And you can not take these serious matters involving substantial expenditures of taxpayers' money, investigating the possibility of a superport for Harbour Grace, and then going through an election and getting the member for Harbour Grace (Mr. H. Young) elected, and only by the skin of this teeth I might say, elected on the premise that Harbour Grace is going to boom.

MR. G. WARREN: Never again, never again.

MR. S. NEARY: She is going to get a superport. And now the government has done a double flip, they have turned themselves inside out, they have reversed themselves,

MR. S. NEARY: they have cancelled the superport for Harbour Grace. It is cancelled, Mr. Speaker. And the reason the hon. gentleman gave for cancelling it, by the way, is not the real reason, because the concept was not conceived on the Northern cod stock. That is another big red herring, a big red whale that the hon. gentleman is dragging into this matter. The fact of the matter is, Sir, the people of Harbour Grace have been taken, they have been conned. They have been conned by the Tory propaganda, by the Tory strategy now for eight years in this Province. The people of Harbour Grace were duped and conned by Mr. Moores and they were conned by the present Premier and his henchmen. It is a shame! It is a crying shame! Now we are told there is going to be no superport in Harbour Grace. Well, the hon. the member for Harbour Grace (Mr. H. Young) who went around and campaigned on the fact that there was going to be a superport should now resign and put his seat on the line, put his political future to the people of Harbour Grace who thought they were getting a superport.

Mr. Speaker, the superport concept, so we were told in this House - and the hon. gentleman did not resign from the Cabinet when we were told, because he said, 'Oh, no, I have to stay here; I have to stay in the Cabinet for the sake of Newfoundland,' not for the sake of his own political hide or the hide of his Party, not for that. Newfoundlanders first.

AN HON. MEMBER: He did not have the guts to do that.

MR. S. NEARY: No, he did not have the courage.

We had an experiment in this Province, hon. members will remember. Several foreign ships brought in their fish to Harbour Grace and to, Marystown I believe it was, frozen fish put ashore in Harbour Grace and in Marystown or down on the Burin Peninsula. I am not sure if it was Burin and Marystown or just Marystown.

The whole idea behind the superport concept was to process foreign caught fish in Newfoundland waters within the 200 mile limit. That was the original idea, that was the concept behind the superport. Instead of having to take the fish all the way

MR. S. NEARY: back to Europe it would be processed - joint ventures, I think it was called - processed here in Newfoundland, or semi-processed in Newfoundland. We were opposed to joint ventures, Mr. Speaker, because we claimed the fish should be put ashore, processed by Newfoundland, plants owned by Newfoundlanders and not by foreigners or owned jointly by Newfoundlanders and foreigners. Now that was the whole purpose behind the superport concept. The Northern cod stock thing only came up a few weeks ago when the hon. gentleman now decides to use it as an excuse for cancelling the superport. Well, I would submit, Mr. Speaker, all those people who bought land, these speculators, people in high places who went over and bought up the waterfront and bought all the land in Harbour Grace, are not going to be very pleased with the hon. member.

MR. H. YOUNG: (Inaudible) fish.

MR. S. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, there were a number of people who bought land in Harbour Grace. They are not going to be very pleased now with the administration. But I tell you who is not going to be pleased. The people who are going to be more displeased with the administration are going to be the ordinary people of Harbour Grace district -

MR. D. HANCOCK: Hear, hear! Not only in Harbour Grace district.

MR. S. NEARY: - the people who were conned by the hon. gentleman and the Premier of this Province, the people who were fooled into thinking that there was going to be a superport in Harbour Grace and that the district of Harbour Grace would boom. The fact of the matter is, Sir, that the whole project was ill-conceived from the beginning. It was a figment of somebody's imagination. It has cost the taxpayers plenty. I would like to know - I wish the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. J. Morgan) were here. Perhaps the Premier can send out now and get us the figures of how much money has been spent so far in developing the superport in Harbour Grace that has now been cancelled. The superport now is just as dead as some of the ~~stiffs~~ that the hon. gentleman has put into the ground in the last three or four years. It is just as dead as that.

MR. S. NEARY: is just as dead as the people the hon. gentleman had on the cold slabs in his morgue. Just as dead as that.

MR. YOUNG: Just as dead as you were on Bell Island. I did not run away from Harbour Grace like you ran away from Bell Island.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I challenge the hon. gentleman now. I challenge him now to do the honourable thing, the honourable and decent thing, Resign his seat and go back to the people of Harbour Grace.

MR. YOUNG: What did you not (inaudible) vote (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I challenge the hon. gentleman, if he is as honourable and decent as he thinks he is and if he thinks he has the support in Harbour Grace district that he thinks he has, then I would submit, Sir, that the hon. thing for him to do and I throw this challenge out to the hon. gentleman.

MR. YOUNG: (inaudible) the next election.

MR. NEARY: Oh, the next election. Oh yes, he is going to stay here now, he is going to follow the Premier's example now. He is going to stay there for the good of the Harbour Grace District not for the good of his own political scalp, his own political hide,-

MR. YOUNG: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: -that is not worth very much at this moment and when the word goes out to Harbour Grace today that the Premier announced the cancellation of the superport in Harbour Grace I would say the telephone, the hon. gentleman's telephone will not stop tonight, and it will not be for customers, for the lack of customers.

MR. YOUNG: Not anymore. Not anymore a university professor (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that -

MR. WARREN: He is gone. He is gone the next time.

MR. NEARY: - this is typical, typical of what has been happening to the promises made by the Tory Party when they were campaigning then to become the administration of this Province, the government of this Province.

MR. WARREN: Look at the Minister of Education.

MR. NEARY: That is typical, typical, and the hon. Premier yesterday proved how paranoid he is after getting about being reminded of these things. How paranoid. Holy Moses, Holy God - Holy God, Holy Moses. Why I have seen better down opposite Bowring Park.- better performances than that. The hon. gentleman obviously has become paranoid. The hon. gentleman is going to have to sit there and take it day in and day out and he is going to be reminded whether he likes it or not.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Sit down and stop embarrassing Newfoundlanders.

MR. WARREN: Oh, listen to him.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please! Before recognizing the next hon. member I would like to point out that the time on the Resource Estimates Committee will end at 4:29. The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Thank you very much. I thought all the time had been expired. I would like to respond to the hon. member for LaPoile (S. Neary) besides commenting from my seat which was irregular to the rules of the House to say that his ongoing oratory continues to embarrass many of the people of this Province. But, let me just say that in my comments on the distribution port and the superport, we in no way

PREMIER PECKFORD: cancelled the concept of a port in that area or in Harbour Grace. What we are saying is, and we are glad that there is some support on the other side, obviously the support is from the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (F. Rowe) and is not shared by the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). Obviously the member for LaPoile in his comments now, has cast some confusion on the position of the Liberal Opposition as it relates to the Northern Cod controversy. Is the hon. the member for LaPoile saying that he is against the inshore fishery? Is the hon. the member for LaPoile saying that he does not care about the inshore fishery? Because he happens to be the member for LaPoile which therefore is not dependent upon the Northern cod, he is no longer concerned with the fishery of Harbour Grace. He is no longer concerned with the fishery of Fogo. He is no longer concerned with the fishery of St. Anthony. He is only concerned with his own selfish interests and those have to do with the Gulf fishery as it relates to the district of LaPoile.

And I find that unfortunate that on the one hand the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde very, very honourably came out in full support of the government's position on the business of the Northern cod and on the inshore fishery and yet one of his own colleagues would get up -

MR. F. ROWE: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - just after him and completely contradict that kind of position.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): A point of order, the hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, the Premier is obviously just twisting words here. I stand by what I have said.

PREMIER PECKFORD: (Inaudible) 'Fred'.

MR. F. ROWE: The hon. member for LaPoile (S. Neary) got up and showed the government -

PREMIER PECKFORD: That is not a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. F. ROWE: - for what they are and that is making these grandiose election promises before an election and not keeping them after the election and that is the point that he was making.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. F. ROWE: It has nothing to do - we are in total agreement with the inshore fishery and whatever the Premier can say -

PREMIER PECKFORD: That is not a point of order.

MR. F. ROWE: Will the Premier sit down, Mr. Speaker.

PREMIER PECKFORD: That is not a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROWE: - he can continue on to say -

AN HON. MEMBER: Sit down. Go home out of it.

MR. ROWE: The hon Premier can say it as long as he wants to, there is no wedge, there is no difference of opinion -

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, it is.

MR. ROWE: - between the hon. member for LaPoile (S. Neary) or any member of the caucus and myself on that particular issue. We were talking about two different subjects. One was a broken promise and one was fisheries policy-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh !

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

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please! The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I cannot

help it if the Liberal Opposition are crying, are cry-babies because now they cannot find this administration wanting on fisheries policy, that they are talking about history, they are talking about a former administration.

I cannot help that, they can cry away. Cry, cry, cry!

All I say is that today in this hon. House the hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. Rowe) said one thing on the fishery and the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) said another.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

Order, please!

The time has expired.

And I would rule there is no point of order but the hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde took an opportunity to clarify remarks attributed to him.

The motion is that this House concur with the report of the Resource Estimates Committee. All those in favour 'aye', contrary 'nay', carried.

Moving right along to Social Services Estimates Committee; Social Services, Consumer Affairs and Environment, Justice, Health and Education.

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. G. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I am just wondering if the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment (Mrs. Newhook) will be back this evening because what I am going to say in the next five or six minutes will be of concern for the environment of this Province.

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, back in December this government appointed a public inquiry made up of Mr. Clarence Powell, Mr. Hudson Davis and the Rev. Francis Buckle to have public meetings in Labrador to check out the viability of the Kitts-Michelin uranium deposit. Now, that public hearing was held in the month of December. I have not got in front of me now the stipulations set down for the inquiry but they were to report back to the minister within a given period. And subsequently the minister, within thirty days upon receipt of that public inquiry, she was going to release it to the public and to the House of Assembly. The hon. minister received that document from the Chairman of the Powell Inquiry on April 10th. and today it is May 27th., it is forty-seven days later and it is still not released to the public.

Mr. Speaker, I have a lot of serious questions to ask that hon. minister but as the House Leader said, if the hon. minister is not in her place we have capable ministers over there to answer the questions. I hope now, when I am finished, that the hon. Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) or the Minister of - here we go, I know it is going to get answered - the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) is going to answer it. Okay, fine.

What is the reason that the public of Newfoundland and Labrador do not have access to that public report? Is that public report such a confidential report that the public of Newfoundland is not supposed to see it? Did the public of Newfoundland have to give information at the public inquiry?

Mr. Speaker, I bet I could give some of my own personal feelings why it is not before them. Because number one; the report says, 'No development', that is number one, that is the first reason. And this government is trying to con itself,

MR. G. WARREN: they are trying to make up some ways and means of getting Mr. Powell and Mr. Hudson and the Rev. Francis Buckle to change their minds. They have already gone back to them and asked for clarification on recommendations. Do you mean to tell me that Mr. Clarence Powell have not got enough ideas, enough common sense to give recommendations to this government, that they have to waste the time and energy and the anticipation of the people of this Province in not letting them know what is in this report? This report is saying no, that is why. This report is saying, 'No development', and the government have not got the gall to get up and stand up and say, 'Look, we are going to have no development on the Kitts-Michelin uranium deposit' - Okay? - but what are we going to do for Happy Valley/Goose Bay who depend on it for 200 or 300 jobs? Now, we have a large section of Labrador which has to depend on Happy Valley/Goose Bay and this government does not have any contingent plans whatsoever for any kind of industrial development for that particular area. And the only thing they are relying on is for this mine inside of Makkovik and Postville to go ahead. So the Powell

MR. G. WARREN:

Commission is saying no to it.

I will stipulate now - I understand, I could be corrected tomorrow when the minister gives her report. She has been saying for the last three or four weeks, 'tomorrow', 'tomorrow', 'tomorrow'. I do not know when 'tomorrow' will come. But I would say there are conditions laid out. I would say from this report there are conditions laid out that no development but 'BRINEX - you go back to the drawing board.' You go back and prove, Look, we have an Environmental Assessment Bill passed in this House of Assembly a few days ago; now, we have criteria to meet in this Environment Bill, but you have not met those criteria, you have not proved to us that this mine will be environmentally safe. Meanwhile, on the other hand, BRINEX is sitting back. Because we all know the market for uranium is very, very soft at the present time. So with the procrastination of this government and the public inquiry being so long - and the minister knows, well, we are talking about six months since the report started until the minister received it, and probably it could be several days yet before we receive it.

I am concerned for the people in Happy Valley - Goose Bay. By this project not going ahead, and not getting 200 or 300 jobs that were pretty well guaranteed by ministers of this House - if BRINEX goes ahead there will be 200 or 300 jobs. By saying no to this project the government does not have any continuing plans whatsoever for any other kind of development in Happy Valley - Goose Bay.

Mr. Speaker, the minister in her budget has allotted \$144,000 for abandoned vehicle disposal. Now, I do not disagree with this whatsoever but I am sure there must be ways and means for this administration - well, maybe; I just thought about something, maybe the minister is waiting to play politics, and the Cabinet itself is waiting to play politics. Are we waiting to have our Cabinet meeting down in Happy Valley - Goose Bay when we are going to make a few grand announcements about some development and also at the same time delay this process of the BRINEX report until after we have our Cabinet meeting? I will be surprised to see how this Cabinet will stand up with the twenty-seven briefs, maybe more, maybe less. We will use the figure

MR. G. WARREN: twenty-seven - there may be more, but many, many briefs that will be presented to the Cabinet when they arrive in Goose Bay. And they are from people who are concerned about the lack of this government with respect to industrial development and job creation in Labrador.

I would like to ask the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. J. Dinn) how many jobs - not in the past six months, the past seven years - have this government created in Labrador? I believe you can count on your fingers and toes the number of jobs that this government have created in Labrador. Well, I can tell the hon. minister how many jobs have been lost in Labrador because of this government. There have been many hundreds of jobs lost in Labrador because of the lack of attitude and lack of interest that this government are showing towards Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, I have some concerns, concerns that have been expressed by all people, that in Industrial Development, in Consumer Affairs, in Education, in Health, any department you name, you look at any department whatsoever - that there is a lack of attitude of this government towards Labrador and Labrador's future.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, in literature there is an individual created by Cervantes called Don Quixote, who went through life tilting at windmills.

MR. BARRY:

Now, at least Don Quixote had real windmills to tilt at. We see the individual, the member opposite, Mr. Speaker, attempting to tilt at windmills but first he has to build some straw windmills to tilt at. First he has to try and, Mr. Speaker, misquote the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment (Mrs Newhook) and to try and give the picture of the minister refusing to release a report when I sat here in this very House, as did other members, Mr. Speaker, yesterday, and heard the minister say that the report would be released within a couple of days, publicly released within a couple of days. Mr. Speaker, there were certain members opposite in government who sat on reports for so long that they had small reports. There are reports, Mr. Speaker, that are still down in the dungeons of this building that we have not been able to find, that never saw the light of day. They have never seen the light of day, Mr. Speaker, and now we get the hon. gentleman opposite getting up and saying, because a minister is saying that we are going to release a report in a couple of days—he has to create the straw windmill because she does not jump at the instant the member says, "Let us have the report." Well, Mr. Speaker, we have a government here, we have a government that believes in openness, we have a government that believes in the release of information, Mr. Speaker, and there has been a commitment, Mr. Speaker, that this Kitts-Michelin Report will be made public within a few days and, Mr. Speaker, it will be. So I think that that is one straw windmill that never started spinning. It did not stand up long enough for the hon. member to tilt at it to knock it down. He could not get it to stand up, Mr. Speaker, so that is his first point. He goes on then to create another straw windmill which is that somehow the report of the Powell Commission is going to decide the future of the project. The mandate of the commission is to report upon the public reaction of the residents of Labrador with respect to the project and then there will be a decision made by government, by Cabinet as to what the next step is, whether it is an out and out refusal, whether it is an approval, whether it is a qualified

MR. BARRY: approval, whether it is a qualified refusal, there will be a decision made by Cabinet.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the other point, I think, is a matter of the philosophical difference in approach between members on this side of the House and members opposite, is that the hon. member opposite is trying to create this myth that it is government who creates jobs, that it is government who plucks jobs out of the air. Mr. Speaker, the people of this Province elected this government -

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. BARRY: - because they accepted this government's philosophy that it is the free enterprise system, it is the free enterprise system, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: (Baird) Order, please! The minister has the right to be heard in silence.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, oh it smarts, it smarts, Mr. Speaker, when you begin to point out the flaws, the weak logic, the flawed philosophy that hon. members opposite engage in. Mr. Speaker, it is the private citizens of this Province, the free enterprisers, the entrepreneurs who will create jobs, It is government's responsibility to create the proper environment to permit the free enterprise system to do what it does best, i.e. to create jobs. And, Mr. Speaker, we have a commitment on the part of this government to create the environment, to create the environment that will permit the free enterprise system to see the free enterprise system create at least 40,000 jobs over the next five years.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, if you look at the employment statistics that are coming out over this past Winter you will see that we are well ahead of our schedule. We are well ahead of our schedule, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Why do you not raise your arms like the other fellow up there?

MR. DINN: Thirteen thousand last month.

MR. BARRY: How many?

MR. DINN: Thirteen thousand last month.

MR. BARRY: Thirteen thousand increase in employment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, this government is taking a rational, responsible approach to creating the proper business environment, the proper environment with respect to the protection of the environment, if that makes sense, and, Mr. Speaker, we will see jobs created in this Province because this government believes in the ability of our citizens.

This government, Mr. Speaker, believes that we have people in this Province who have the entrepreneurship, who have the willingness to take a risk, who have the ingenuity to see how to make a dollar and to earn a good living and to create employment for their fellow Newfoundlanders, Mr. Speaker. And that is the responsibility that this government accepts, not the responsibility of make work projects which was all we ever saw when members on the other side, to the misfortune of this Province, formed part of the government of the Province.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, we will set the proper environment for job creation and whether it be, Mr. Speaker, at five jobs a day, or whether it will be at 13,000 - was it last month? - these jobs will be created -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER(Baird): Order, please!

MR. BARRY: - but they will be created by a rational, reasoned, orderly approach to development and not by the helter skelter politics, the helter skelter madcap schemes that we saw hon. members opposite support when they were in government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, no wonder they call him the school boy debater. As a matter of fact, I attended a debate very recently involving eleven and twelve year old boys and I must say most of them, if not all, were much better at debating than the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMS: Much better.

Suddenly a promise -

MR. BARRY: (inaudible) let us have (inaudible).

MR. THOMS: If you close your mouth long enough you might.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, we heard that this government is not now going to create the 40,500 jobs. No, that was another big Tory conservative lie that was presented to this Province in June of this year. Now the jobs are going to come by without any work, without anything being done by this government. And there has

MR. THOMS: been nothing done, Mr. Speaker, by this government since June 18, absolutely nothing! All we have heard about is the oil and gas, the confrontation with Ottawa, the confrontation in the fisheries, the confrontation with Nova Scotia, the confrontation between Newfoundlanders, but I heard very little from the Premier of this Province -

MR. BARRY: Would I be permitted to ask a question?

MR. NEARY: No, No.

MR. THOMS: No, of course not.

I have heard nothing from the Premier of this Province about the 40,500 jobs that were going to be created until the Minister of -

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER(Baird): Order, please! A point of order. The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY: The hon. member is sweeping me up with his oratory here. I am going to have to leave for a few minutes but I am not sure if I can - it was the only way I could break the trance of his oratory, to rise on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. member have a point of order?

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, if I could get to the point of order. I wonder if the hon. member would not misinterpret the remarks either of myself or of the Premier that are made and are in Hansard. If he is going to quote us quote us properly. But in closing I just wonder if -

MR. HANCOCK: Mr. Speaker, there is no point of order.

MR. BARRY: If I could finish. I just wonder if the hon. member opposite could explain how the decision just confirmed by Mr. Rompkey to scrap

MR. BARRY: the synchrolift for
St. John's, how he sees that creating jobs on the
part of the federal government?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order,
The hon. the member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I was
just going to suggest that if the Minister of Mines
and Energy (Mr. Barry) wants to know what Mr. Rompkey's
philosophy is on the synchrolift, I talked with Mr.
Rompkey as early as this morning and no decision had
been made on the synchrolift. Why does he not ask
Mr. Rompkey or is he not talking to Ottawa these
days, again?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

To the point of order.

There is no point of order, but a difference of opinion
between two hon. members.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird)

The hon. the member for Grand Bank.

MR. L. THOMS:

Mr. Speaker, now that the schoolboy debater has left maybe I can get the Minister of Justice(G. Ottenheimer) in and have a few words about that particular department.It certainly did not take the Minister of Justice of this Province very long to become as arrogant as the Premier of this Province and probably as much so the Minister of Mines and Energy. It is a job sometimes to know which one is more irrational when he gets up flinging the arms, the Minister of Mines and Energy(L. Barry) or the Premier of this Province.

Well, Mr. Speaker, speaking about the administration of justice in this Province, you know, it is passing strange. I have been asking the Minister of Justice, who has a tendency,

to hide his head in the sand on matters relating to the administration of justice in this Province.

MR. WARREN:

Now !

MR. L. THOMS:

You know, I have asked him several times now since the House was - I think I probably asked this question back as far as August of this year. Mr. Speaker, you know, if I were to go into a room and I saw two white-coated gentlemen, one on either side of the Premier of this Province or the President of Council, I would immediately form a certain judgement about what was wrong with the Premier of this Province or the President of the Council (W. Marshall). I would immediately form a judgement as to what was wrong.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible)

MR. THOMS:

When you walk into a courtroom in this Province, Mr. Speaker, when you walk into a courtroom, as I did only two or three days ago, and when you see the judge, when you see the prisoner sitting in a prisoner's box - a prisoner's box is what locally is known as a dock-with two uniformed police officers, one on either side,

MR. THOMS: apart , Mr. Speaker, from the inconveniences that it causes a lawyer who has to move from his seat up front to go back and speak to the prisoner -

MR. HANCOCK: And the money that is being wasted by the (Inaudible) and all.

MR. THOMS: -Mr. Speaker, it makes a farce of the presumption of innocence that is so vitally important to our common law system in the free world. A man is innocent until proven guilty. You go down to our Supreme Court today - I think the trial is still on - walk into that court and see the prisoner sitting in between two uniformed RCMP officers of this Province, and the first thing you are going to think is that the man is guilty, when it should be just the other way around. A man is innocent until proven guilty.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice (G. Ottenheimer) says, oh, we are negotiating. There are no negotiations necessary to correct - you, know, the United States is at least a hundred years ahead of us on this matter, at least a hundred years.

MR. JAMIESON: Some other Provinces (inaudible)

MR. L. THOMS: They are at least a hundred years ahead of us. It does not take any great deal of doing to rip out the prisoner's box and to let the accused person sit with his lawyer where he should be sitting. We do not need - the Minister of Justice said he expects to have it done within the next couple of months. You do not need two months. All you need are two carpenters and a little bit of carpet to put down where you took out the prisoner's box. I know the wheels of justice grind slow by Mr. Speaker, but with the present Minister of Justice they certainly do grind exceedingly slow.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice has been presented recently with a brief from the Canadian Bar Association. They had that as their first recommendation - their first recommendation.

May 28, 1980

Tape No. 1885

EL - 3

MR. L. THOMS:

A second one they had was that

the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary be expanded to include
Labrador.

MR. NEARY:

You would not know but that it was

original.

MR. THOMS: That is right. You would not know but it was original, you would not know but it is original. Now, I disagree with the Canadian Bar Association when they say put them there to show everybody that we own Labrador. Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not need the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary or the Royal Canadian Mounted Police or anybody to confirm to me that Labrador is a part of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. But I would like to see the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary not only in Labrador, I would like to see them in Gander, Grand Falls, Corner Brook, and all over this Province.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of things that should - I might add, Mr. Speaker, there is one recommendation where I have no problem in agreeing with the Canadian Bar Association, and that is to amend the Conveyancing Act. That is something that should be done and it should be done immediately, because too many people in this Province today are having their homes sold out from under them and injustices and inequities do occur. Mr. Speaker, if I hold a mortgage on a house anywhere in this Province today, I can proceed under, I believe it is, Section 5 of the Conveyancing Act, have the property sold, convey the property to myself, turn around and make a huge profit, make a huge profit on the sale of that house, and I do not have to account to the original owners, and that is an injustice. I think the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) will agree that that lends itself to certain inequities. That is the sort of thing, Mr. Speaker, that can be done immediately. It does not have to wait, it does not have to wait.

My ten minutes are up, Mr. Speaker.

I am sure I will have other opportunities to speak in this debate before it is over.

MR. SPEAKER: (Baird)

The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, to comment briefly on matters raised by the hon. gentleman. The first matter he is referring to; of course, hon. members of the House were aware of his views and, indeed, mine on that matter from a Question and Answer a few days ago,

MR. OTTENHEIMER: and that is with respect to the accused being accompanied by police in court. As I explained, that practice has stopped with respect to the accused appearing on arraignment, and we are discussing with the judiciary to have the practice stopped in other instances as well.

The hon. gentleman referred to the brief of the Newfoundland Branch of the Canadian Bar Association, which was submitted to the government yesterday with a copy to the hon. gentleman, I think, the hon. the House Leader as well. First, let me say that we welcome, you know, receiving this brief and briefs from the Newfoundland Branch of the Canadian Bar Association, and I think it is a practice, certainly, to be commended and, hopefully, to be continued because the more input and suggestions and ideas which come forward from quarters interested in the area of legal reform and related subjects, certainly the better.

With respect to the hon. gentleman's suggestion of amendments to the Conveyancing Act, I think there was a brief question and answer or some brief discussion of that when the estimates of the department were being considered and that it is a matter -

MR. THOMS: It is a terribly unfair provision, it/really is. Would you not agree?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: - on which the department intends to move. I do not think they were specifically the matters with respect to justice that the hon. gentleman referred to. What we do intend to do, of course, is to go through the brief carefully with a response to the Newfoundland Branch of the Canadian Bar. A number of the matters which they refer to, of course, there are policy decisions identical, you know, with their recommendation. With respect to recommendation, 'Refrain from using police prosecutors'; we hope to achieve within about a three-year period, where all prosecutions can be by regular prosecutors legally trained, lawyer prosecutors. Certainly, the first emphasis there would be indictable offences, and we hope to reach that goal,

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: you know, within the next two to three year period. I think, and it is only fair to say, that, you know, one could not give a guarantee that there would never be a prosecution by other than a lawyer prosecutor, I understand that happens in even the wealthiest provinces, Ontario and others, at times in isolated areas or depending on the nature of the charge. So I just want to make that point.

Another suggestion or recommendation they make is about the hiring of provincial court judges being confined to legally trained applicants and that, in fact, is our policy. We do that and one exception made and one only and made conscientiously and made in terms of policy so it is not an exception to our policy, I suppose, it is a refinement of the policy; our policy is that only legally trained persons will be appointed to the provincial court with the addendum that in the case of a native Labradorian - we were hoping to be able to appoint, a qualified native Labradorian which, in fact, we have done in the person of Mr. Igooliorte. Obviously, we are very pleased about that, the first native born Labradorian to be appointed to the provincial Bench and that certainly is very worthwhile and we are pleased that happened.

A number of the matters here I would not wish to, until sufficient thought and that is given to make an immediate kind of reply. No doubt a lot of thought went into the brief and it is our hope that an equal amount of thought, obviously, will go into the reply. But I think I have commented on the matters with respect to Justice mentioned by the hon. gentleman, I just wanted to make the overall point that certainly we welcome this brief and indeed other briefs from the Newfoundland Branch of the Canadian Bar Association and other groups, individuals, etc. who have an interest in the various matters of legal reform and related areas.

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

MR. L. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Minister of Justice (Mr. G. Ottenheimer) and I hope things do move just a little more quickly than they have been in the past. I would

MR. L. THOMS: like to, if I may, pose - if the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) would let me have the attention of the Minister of Justice (Mr. G. Ottenheimer)-

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Go ahead, I am listening.

MR. L. THOMS: You are listening, okay. You know, there is no legal maxim that justice delayed is justice denied. The Canadian Bar Association has brought out the point that in District Courts in St. John's at the present time that cases will not be heard for at least two years. Now, they are saying that cases are not heard for two years which means to say that the case then has to be heard and then an adjudication made so that you could be, from the time of issuing a writ and having all of the documentation filed in connection therewith you could be as long as three years before getting a judgement. And, also, they refer to the appeals from the Supreme Court where there is a great deal of time before judgements are handed down. And as I say, justice delayed - and this is the deterrent. The problem here is that this is a real deterrent in this Province today, the time lag from the time an action is started until it is finished because of our lack of facilities, lack of judges, etc. And I was wondering if the Minister of Justice could tell us whether or not this has been considered, I am sure it has been, and give us some indication of what we plan to do about it?

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

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, on those specific elements, yes, we are planning and this, hopefully, will be done next week. There is such a thing as an Attorney General's Act which usually makes, you know, amendments to specific areas and one there will be - it is recommended in the brief as well, and this is something that we had intended to do for some time, whereby the District Court may send to the Provincial Court matters referred to them but which could come within the jurisdiction of the Provincial Court involving costs not in excess of \$1,000. So, that will obviously have a certain effect. It will not solve all the problems, I do not suppose anything will, but everything helps to so do.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: And with respect to the backlog of matters in the Supreme Court going to appeal; there is a certain backlog there. As a matter of fact, it is quantified but I forget the number of pages or man-hours that it is now. And there after discussion with the court officials, we have decided to advertise for proposals from professional people who will come in for that period of weeks or months or whatever it is to get that backlog, which goes back some time, to get that caught up with and then it is their feeling that things will be able to stay current when this backlog is caught up. So there will be advertisements asking for proposals from, I am not sure what they are called, like overtime or manpower, you know, they are groups who specifically take on a specific assignment of typing and transcribing, that type of thing and we do plan to do that.

I think, also, that the former matter that I mentioned with respect to District Court, being able to send to the Provincial Court these certain matters will help out there. It is hoped as well that the creation of a judicial district for Labrador will obviously, in my opinion, be a forward move and it will certainly help in that direction.

MR. L. THOMS: It will be another factor which I think will help in that direction. And, of course, one of the real importances there is having in that important part of our Province an actual district court and judge, a person who will be based in Happy Valley - Goose Bay area. I think these are the specific matters the hon. gentleman referred to.

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

MR. G. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wish to put my five cents worth in. First I would like to say that the correspondence I had with the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) I thank him for, however, I am concerned -

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: What was that?

MR. G. WARREN: The correspondence concerning - I will speak about it now as I go along - the correspondence in connection with the cells in Happy Valley - Goose Bay. The cells in Happy Valley - Goose Bay are overcrowded and really it is unhealthy to a certain degree. However, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Justice a question concerning what rationale would be behind having a correctional center in Clarenville? I believe that is the next proposal, I think it is Clarenville or Grand Falls, is it not?

MR. G. FLIGHT: Windsor.

MR. G. WARREN: In Windsor, over and above having one in Labrador? Now, the reason I say this, Mr. Speaker, is that in Labrador we have a native population where under the present circumstances anyone who is proven guilty has to come to St. John's or Salmonier Line, to a practically unknown environment, and the language barrier is very very difficult. And we find that the inmates are very very unhappy. They go back and they are only back for a short period of time when some of them are back in the same rut again because they are not in their own environment. They probably could get proper training in Happy Valley - Goose Bay if there was a correctional center there. Now, Mr.

MR. G. WARREN: Speaker, I am going to jump to the Department of Education. I notice that the Minister of Education is -

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Just for continuity perhaps if the hon. gentleman would let me reply and then went on to education so we would not get sort of at cross purposes.

MR. G. WARREN: Okay, sure.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: I think hon. members would agree then that the hon. gentleman can continue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Sure, yes.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: I certainly will not be long. Just to keep matters tidy.

Actually it is our intention to have three regional facilities, one in Clarenville for the Eastern Newfoundland - Burin Peninsula, a certain specific geographic area, one in Central Newfoundland, the exact location not yet determined, and one in Happy Valley - Goose Bay. And no one is suggesting that the one in Happy Valley - Goose Bay is not important. What we are endeavouring to do and what there have been negotiations on and what we hope we will get the federal government's concurrence with, is a Coast of Labrador DREE agreement in which that and other matters of great benefit to Labrador will be included. And we are hoping to get that facility in the Coast of Labrador DREE agreement and we are waiting for agreement on that matter.

MR. G. WARREN: Are you waiting for DREE for Clarenville or Grand Falls?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: No, no. The hon. gentleman really - What gives it the DREE input, the DREE potential, the DREE connection is the location and specific circumstances because it is a Labrador agreement. There is no Clarenville DREE agreement. No, there is no Central Newfoundland DREE agreement. But there is a Coast of Labrador DREE agreement being negotiated and we are hoping, therefore, that the federal government will participate in this as they have in many other matters relating to Labrador. And that is what we are negotiating and attempting to get their concurrence on.

May 28, 1980

Tape No. 1888

MB - 3

MR. G. WARREN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would say that in the answer that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) just gave me, if no DREE, no correctional center. That is basically what he just said.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: I did not say that but surely if we spend a million or close to a million then we certainly are not going to get the federal participation after the money is spent. We only have so much.

MR. G. WARREN: Okay, Mr. Speaker, I will continue on with the Department of Education. The hon. minister is in her seat now. If ever there was a minister in this hon. House that did a flip flop I think we saw the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) doing a flip flop a few days ago.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. G. WARREN: A flip flop in the verbal context, Mr. Speaker, She did really make a flip flop on bilingual education,

MR. WARREN: On her stand that she took on bilingual education it definitely was a flip-flop. Now, Mr. Speaker -

MR. LUSH: But it was a good flip-flop.

MR. WARREN: It was a good flip-flop and I think it was what this party, the Liberal party had been advocating in committee meetings to the minister, I think the minister can truthfully say that this is exactly what, in particular, the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) was trying to get across to the minister, that we definitely should keep the money that was allotted for French education, keep it to be used for that specific purpose.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the minister has one of the largest spending departments, the largest spending department in the whole government. Now she was delighted and, in fact, we were delighted to hear from her about all the good things that were in there. Now I want to point out to this hon. House one thing that the minister has not let the public know yet. The public do not even know yet that in adult and continuing education this year coming up, that anybody who is paying to go back to school will have to pay double registration fees. The fees are doubled. Because the minister is saying here on subhead 618-20, the revenue that she is expecting from Adult and continuing education is going to increase from \$181,000 to \$360,000. Now, in order for the revenue to increase, and in contradiction to what the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) has just said it is not a one hundred per cent increase in students. In fact, I will bet you any money there will be a decrease in students and subsequently the reason for the decrease is because the fees are going to be almost doubled. I believe the minister can verify that, that the fee that an adult person has to pay this year to obtain his adult education will be practically double what it was other years.

Mr. Speaker, awhile ago I asked a question of the minister and I talked to the school boards in Labrador - and this is of very vital concern. In fact, I received an answer back

MR. WARREN: from the school board in Labrador and also I received an answer from the minister's colleague, the hon. Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie) who was in complete agreement with my suggestions and I hope that the minister can get up and say that she is in complete agreement too. I think it is very vital that for two weeks in the school year, either at the beginning or at the end, it is immaterial which the minister will decide, but two weeks of the school year would be left to the teachers and the pupils discretion to go back to the traditional lifestyles to go back to their traditional way of life. The hon. Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development is in complete agreement with it and he did say in his letter to me that he is going to contact the minister and hope that he would get her concurrence too. I received a letter from the school board and there are some concerns there, there are some advantages and disadvantages to weigh. I would suggest to the minister that she look at this idea and see if we can keep the people in their traditional way of life as much as possible because if not it is going to be like the flag, you know, they are going to get away from their traditional way of life.

MR. CARTER: It is our flag now.

MR. WARREN: That is our flag. That is right. That is our flag starting in a few minutes, is it?

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please! The flag debate is over.

MR. WARREN: It is signed, is it?

Mr. Speaker, I am now going to jump from education to the Department of Health if the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) does not mind. The Minister of Health (Mr. House) I am sure, in all due respects, has to go through the difficult channels of going through Cabinet and that the people up in Labrador are concerned that not only is the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) not giving any jobs to Labrador

May 28, 1980

Tape No. 1889

AH-3

MR. WARREN: but the Minister of Health (Mr. House) is not saying, "Well, look, we will bring in a programme but we want to make sure that this programme could be used at the most opportune time for the residents in Labrador." What I am taking about is the air-ambulance programme and I believe, Mr. Minister, in all sincerity, I hope it is going to be to the benefit of Labradorians and the rest of Newfoundland when it is released. But I hope that you as minister, and other ministers in the Cabinet, will get together and try to get this through the system as fast and as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to touch on

Social Services

MR. WARREN: before we sit down. As the ministers know, the Minister of Health (Mr. House) and the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey), the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment (Mrs. Newhook) and the Premier, I have been to those four ministers. I have explained to them that there is definitely a problem in the community of Davis Inlet. There is no doubt about it, there is a problem in the community of Davis Inlet. Now, which way and how we are going to deal with that problem I do not know, but I did throw out a suggestion, I did throw out a suggestion, and I did receive answers back from all the ministers. But the answer I got back was, "Thank you, we received your letter". The Minister of Health was more sympathetic and he did show some concerns, but the other ministers said, "Thank you, we received your letter". Now, what I suggested in my letter was, well, I am quite willing to sit down with the ministers because, having lived there for three years, I do know some of the problems. Why not the ministers come into Davis Inlet and sit down with the leaders in Davis Inlet, because these are the people we need to talk to. Those are the people we need to talk to. The Minister of Social Services had the audacity and the intestinal fortitude - is it? - to send me a note and say, "No, I am not going in there for a joy ride".

AN HON. MEMBER: The Minister of Health?

MR. WARREN: No, no, the Minister of Social Services -

MR. SPEAKER: (Baird) Order, please! I wish to remind the member that his time is up. Does he have leave?

MR. NEARY: By leave, my hon. friend.

MR. WARREN: - no, just one second I will be finished - and to send me a note and say, "No, I am not going in there", and it is only for a joy ride for the member's benefit. Now, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Social Services is saying - a grave concern that I, as a member for that district, have expressed to the minister - is saying it is only a joy ride, I got news for the hon. minister. I am sure it will not be a joy ride if any member would go into Davis Inlet to see in what deplorable condition the houses are, the terrible state

MR. WARREN: of health in the community, the terrible state of social assistance programs, you know, the terrible condition of environment, the whole thing. So, I suggest to this government that, as soon as possible, they should definitely look at Davis Inlet seriously and quickly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (Baird) The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, one of the things, of course, that he mentioned first was the air ambulance, and I just want to point to the hon. member and all hon. members that a policy decision was taken by government earlier the year, announced in the Budget, and what was stated in the Budget, of course, was that we would be implementing an air ambulance program to Labrador this year and, of course, it specifically mentioned that it would not have, you know, referrals and that kind of thing involved. So that is a very broad, general statement. Now, from that broad, general statement we had to formulate a program, cost the program and formulate it. I have told the hon. member that that is in process now. The other thing you want to bear in mind that the Budget - of course, there was, I believe, a figure put on it, \$200,000 roughly, in the Budget - you want to bear in mind that that Budget has not been accepted yet. Of course, the Budget has not been approved yet, so, you know -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) flag.

MR. HOUSE: Well, the flag is not in the Budget.

That is a different little matter altogether. It is not in the Budget.

So I just want to advise and I have made this known to all the members in Labrador, to some of the people in Labrador, that this particular program will be coming into effect and we are looking at all the implications. I am sure that the time it is taking is going to be to the benefit of the people of Labrador. We do not want to come in with something that is, you know, a very shallow program. We want to look at all the bases, and I am sure that the people of Labrador will be happier that we have covered as much as we possibly can.

MR. HOUSE:

Now then, the other thing, he mentioned the Social Services Department. Of course, I am not the Minister of Social Services, but I want to point out that, you know, we have had correspondence about the problems in Davis Inlet and, of course, I heard the Premier one day having a talk about Labrador and saying the different Labradors.

MR. W. HOUSE: I do not know about any other minister but since I have been a minister - this is the fifth year, I suppose, or in my fifth year - I have been in Davis Inlet three times. I have visited houses in Davis Inlet, looked at it and looked at the specific problems. And I was there twice as Minister of Education on specific education matters, looking at the school and the programme and the other time I was there I was a member of Social Policy, a member of Social Policy looking at the wider scope of problems.

One of the things I want to point out to the hon. member, that out of all the programmes we have in Labrador, and just recently had a kind of a brief and a report in Goose Bay about health services, one of the things that received a lot of praise was our public health services in Labrador. We have very good public health services. The questionnaire relating to it -

MR. S. NEARY: We need more.

MR. W. HOUSE: We may need more, that is a possibility. But it is good quality programming that we are getting there and, you know, we are aiming to do better and, of course, as money becomes available that will be there.

So the services - we have, I believe, a full-time person, a public health nurse and an assistant in Davis Inlet. I am not sure of the details of that but I know we are satisfied that we are doing a reasonably good job from our point of view. There are problems with the environment, they are special problems and I am sure the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) could address that.

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

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to comment briefly on the three education matters raised by the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren). His first point was to praise the government for our final position on the bilingual programmes in education. And I am very pleased with that praise, I certainly agree that it is true. It shows that government has been quite responsive to the comments and input from the public. We are not rigid and inflexible, we do listen to the people and we adapt our positions to respond to the needs of the student population.

His second point was the question of fees for adult education courses. I can say with certainty that the fees for courses in basic education for adults, the literacy programmes and the French language courses will not be increased next year. And, of course, these are the most important of the programmes offered by the Education Department, Adult Division and those serving the greatest number of adult students. It is possible that there will be fee increases for the personal interest or hobby courses, such courses as sewing, fly-tying, cake decorating.

His third point was to mention the desirability of allowing students to take time away from classes, at the beginning of the school year in September or at the end of the school year in June, to pursue native lifestyles, to hunt or to spend time in the woods or in the country. The fact of the matter is that this is something in the discretion of the school board, of the school office the principal and the teachers. And many students throughout our Province have, with the acquiescence of their school boards, taken such time off, at various points during the

MS. VERGE: school year, to pursue activities with their families. For example, in some parts of the Province the students are away from classes in September to pick blueberries during the blueberry harvest season. In other parts of the Province students have taken part in a seasonal fishery, when the demand was there at a certain peak season. So this is a matter which is in the discretion of the local school board, the principal and teachers who are, after all, in the best position to judge what is best in the overall interest of the students.

MR. SPEAKER: (Baird)

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

MR. HANCOCK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

(Inaudible) I have a couple of questions for the Minister of Health (Mr. House) and I will put them to him in questions so I will not take too long, Mr. Speaker.

Concerning that drug dispensary that was removed from the community of St. Bride's on the Cape Shore, every time I go up to the district, Mr. Speaker, I get more complaints about the removal, and really I have not got a legitimate answer to tell the people why that drug dispensary was removed from that section which serviced a large area. I understand it serviced -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. HANCOCK:

- I do not know, I would not go so far as to say that, Mr. Speaker - it serviced people from North Harbour to, well, I guess, Placentia or Great Barasway. The member from Placentia (Mr. Patterson) is well aware of what I am talking about. It was a necessity, Mr. Speaker, to that community and to those communities involved on that section of the Cape Shore, and I am wondering would the Minister of Health bring it up in Cabinet at the appropriate time and see if it is not possible to have that drug dispensary reopened again. Another thing, Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if the minister is aware of the ambulance service that was provided in that area or lack thereof, I should say. From the community of St. Mary's, you go all the way around to Placentia, travel a distance of about 110 miles - there is nowhere there an ambulance exists. If an accident takes place in Branch tomorrow, we have to wait for an ambulance to come from St. Mary's or to come from Placentia.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. HANCOCK:

Roughly 110 miles, you know, I have not got the exact mileage, approximately 110 miles. That, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, is a long while to have to wait for an ambulance to come. The Cape Shore, there is a large population on that Cape Shore compared to other areas where there are a number of ambulances, and I understand

MR. HANCOCK: there is an ambulance driver at St. Mary's who has applied for a licence to station an ambulance in the Mount Carmel area and he has been turned down by the Public Utilities Board or whatever necessary channels he had to go through.

The raw sewage in Branch again, Mr. Speaker, is another problem that exists on the Cape Shore. I was over last week and had the opportunity to help launch a longliner, and the fishermen there in that community informed me that if they fell overboard they were not worried about drowning, they were worried about getting poisoned to death there. That is how bad the situation is in Branch. There is a little loop there that comes in around - the minister has been in the community, he is quite aware of what I am talking about. There is evidence and you can see the raw sewage.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. HANCOCK: There is, yes, but I do not know what they have done about it. They have not done anything about it.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) Mr. Nash?

MR. HANCOCK: Sure he has heard of Mr. Nash. If he has not heard of Mr. Nash, he is about the only guy.

I wonder if the minister is aware that these three or four problems - and they are major problems, Mr. Speaker. They may not seem much to the minister, but I can assure you that when a fisherman is afraid to fall overboard, afraid he will get poisoned rather than get drowned, it is a serious problem. Now, Mr. Speaker, I go on record as asking those questions and see if I can get some sensible answers for a change.

Thank you.

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

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate the kind of a district that the hon. member from St. Mary's-The Capes has. I do not know how many communities you have in yours, I have sixteen in my district, I think, and they are spread out over an area

MR. HOUSE: of about 150 miles, I think, in my case, so I can appreciate some of the problems that you have and some of the problems that you are facing.

With the drug dispensing, while the Pharmaceutical Act, I guess it is, permits the dispensing of drugs by Public Health nurses, it is only done in the cases, you know, in very special cases. It was deemed at first that, you know, it was quite in order for the people to get drugs from the doctor, I believe, in Placentia. Now, I recognize there is a distance there, but there is a real problem, and I do not want to put too much into this, I do not want anybody to read too much in it, but what was happening is the fact that there is a Public Health nurse down there and, I believe, a part-time, I am not sure, just recently added to the one who was there, added more time. The fact is that the people in that part of the area were not getting to the doctor. Now they were getting drugs through the Public Health nurse and they were bypassing the doctor and -

MR. HANCOCK: (Inaudible).

MR. HOUSE: Yes, okay.

MR. HANCOCK: The people who live in that area do not have the transportation to Placentia, they have to hire a taxi and a lot of people cannot afford to get from point A to point B to see a doctor (inaudible).

MR. HOUSE: Well, that is a problem certainly we can look at and we have looked at, but I want to point out that we think that a lot of the older people, who are on drugs, getting prescription drugs, getting them refilled, without going to a doctor, we do not think that is the best thing. We think it is better medically for them to visit a doctor periodically and, you know, there may be some side effects from these drugs that the nurse

MR. W. HOUSE:

may not be able to identify.

But anyway that is one I have discussed with the member. We have had two or three other places in the Province where that particular kind of thing pertains. Lamaline was another case and I believe there is a case in my own district. With regard to the ambulance service, again, I think I gave the hon. member the ambulance utilization thing. The distance is a problem there is no question there. A few years ago, because of the number of ambulances, the numbers around the Province, the different categories - we have the hospitals that have ambulances, we have private operators, and we have community operators, and it came to the point where we had to put the thing under the Public Utilities Board and, of course, they now determine where a facility is needed. But again, I think, we can have some input in that and look at this particular thing. I do not think you have asked me that particular question before. I think you asked me questions before about who can order ambulances. And at that time I made known that except in emergencies, such as industrial accidents, road accidents, suspected heart attacks, threatened abortions, an ambulance is used at the discretion of a doctor, a nurse, police, or welfare officer, or some other responsible person, it is pretty wide. And in these cases that I just mentioned, anybody could call for and get the ambulance service in. Certainly when you are talking about 110 miles, I recognize that is a bit of a problem, and certainly I will ask Mr. Lundrigan, our director of ambulances, to look at the situation with respect to the Public Utilities Board. Now, with the raw sewage in Branch, I am a little bit concerned about that, hearing the statements from the hon. member. Usually the Department of Health does not get involved in that unless there is some kind of a proposition made to them, somebody writes them about it. And we work very closely with the Department of Municipal Affairs in that kind of respect. And I think one of the criteria for getting, for instance, water and sewer

MR. W. HOUSE: projects going is is there any health hazard presented? And most cases that the Department of Health has listened to when we say that there is a health hazard. And I do not know, at any point in time, if there has been a proposition from that community for a water and sewer project and whether the Department of Health has been asked to make a presentation to the community but certainly we can look at that. But I know of a number of cases where Municipal Affairs have come in and said here are some projects of this certain community and it is a high priority for the Department of Health or the Department of the Environment. But I cannot say that I have heard that in this particular context. Because it is a specific question, I will just check into it and see what our report is on it.

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

MR. T. BENNETT: Just a few general comments, Mr. Speaker. I was glad to hear the hon. member for Mount Scio, the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) suggest that he believes in openness in government. So, I hope in the future it gets to be that way, as I feel it has not been such an open approach to government as a lot of people would like to have had or liked to have witnessed. I have not witnessed it myself at least. So I hope in the future it is more openness so we can get to understand why, Mr. Speaker, we see our roads programme doctored up like it is, where Tory districts get two to one as opposed to Liberal districts. Why we get such political appointments that we are all aware of and I will not dwell on any specific case but I think we are all aware of it and it is blatant in my opinion, Sir. The hon. gentleman said something about government being employed or elected to govern, to manage. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, how many of us would get the privilege, how many of us would be considered as managers to go out and manage corporations, businesses? How many of us would be recognized and considered as experts in that field? Still we take it upon ourselves to manage the country. I say that when I look at things that happened in my district, where the present

MR. T. BENNETT: government fails to invest probably less than \$100 thousand to activate 100 jobs, turn on a cash flow of \$4 million or \$5 million this year. Now, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, if that is management that is not a way a business operates successfully. So, I am suggesting the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour - after awhile he will get around to explaining to us in the open approach why over on the West coast we have only one job in offshore, probably we had only one application. I suspect we had a lot more than one application. The minister said just a few days ago one, one employee on offshore as opposed to the rest of the Province. You know, we are supposed to manage the economy. We manage it as though we have a bottomless pit and every time we run out of money or go short on cash, if we cannot panic off to Ottawa and get DREE dollars, then we inflict another tax on the worker, the taxpayer, we inflict another cent or two on a pack of cigarettes or on booze or whatever we can hit the hardest or whatever we think we can get the most dollars from, things that people are reluctant to give up. So this is openness and this is management. In the openness and in the open approach, in the future that I understand we are now about to embark upon, probably rather than the Minister of Transportation and Communication, the Minister of Mines and Energy might be able to tell us in his openness, open approach, describe to us the dollars from Ottawa for our transportation, not only here, tell it to the airways, tell it to the people in the country, tell them that 75 or 90 per cent of X number of millions of dollars coming down is being spent in any given area. Tell the people, tell them it is federal dollars or provincial dollars. If it is going to be so open and aboveboard in the future, and I agree it should be, I would hope that the minister will do just that, be open and above and tell the people. I doubt very much, Mr. Speaker, the management we have in this country at the moment. I doubt very much if they went to the electorate, a week after they started telling the truth and telling it as is, I doubt very much if they could take the country back and get the opportunity to

MR. T. BENNETT: govern and manage the affairs of the people. Just a few brief comments Mr. Speaker, and I hope you take it to heart because I would like to see some of the dollars more wisely spent than at presently experienced. I would like to reiterate, there is an instance in my district where if \$50 thousand or \$60 thousand were spent it would activate 100 jobs, it would turn on a cash flow of \$4 million or \$5 million this year. That in itself would generate cash flow right back into the treasury that would do well for the Province, do well for the treasury, do well for the government in power. It would be a smart move to find that \$50 thousand, \$60 thousand or \$70 thousand to go out and activate 100 jobs and without doing that, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, it is not management. Thank you very much.

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

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, If I speak now, I do not close the debate I do not think although I will have a few minutes. First of all I want to deal with the matter which concerns me very much about the administration of justice in this Province, if my hon. friend here will forgive me, and it has to do, Mr. Speaker, with the case presently under investigation by the R.C.M.P. involving a political poll conducted in this Province, using public money to pay for that poll. Now, I do not know what directions the Minister of Justice gave the R.C.M.P., but I was flabbergasted beyond words to discover the other day that one of the prime suspects in this case, prime suspects, called up the R.C.M.P. and said 'I heard or I read in the newspaper that this case was going to be the subject of a police investigation and I would like to volunteer, to voluntary pass you over any records that I have' And the R.C.M.P. took what they considered, I suppose, to be the total number of records and up to this moment have not asked for a search warrant to search the offices or the premises of that individual. Now, hon. members will remember in this House, I came in here a couple of years ago and raised and proved a prima facie case. When my office was raided I was

May 28, 1980

Tape No. 1894

RA - 3

MR. S. NEARY: the complainant Mr. Speaker, I was the
complainant trying to catch crooks in the government and I have been

MR. NEARY: completely exonerated in that matter with the various and sundry things that are happening in court cases, police investigations, the Public Accounts Committee, that I was so right, so right, everything that I said at that time has come true. I was trying to catch crooks and embezzlers and people who would conspire to defraud the public treasury and for that I was rewarded by the RCMP coming in and raiding my office. I am the complainant. And in this case you have a prime suspect and his office and premises has not yet been raided by the RCMP to seize the records and the documents and the books of that particular firm and that particular individual. I would like to know from the minister what instructions, what instructions did he issue to the RCMP when he undertook this investigation? Did he tell them to go slow, tread lightly, there are people in high placed involved in this, the former Premier, present Cabinet ministers are involved? Did he instruct the RCMP? What instructions did the hon. gentleman give the RCMP when he asked to have this matter of this political poll investigated? Up to this moment, to my knowledge, no search warrant has been obtained to seize the records of this company, of this firm that was involved or any other of the individuals that were involved, all prime suspects. I was a complainant myself at one time trying, as the hon. gentleman knows - he was out off the House and that is why I am repeating it, I was a complainant trying to catch crooks and embezzlers and people who would conspire to defraud the Public Treasury and my reward for that was that the Minister of Justice sent the RCMP into my office. And in this case -

AN HON. MEMBER: With a search warrant.

MR. NEARY: - with a search warrant mind you. And I later proved a prima facie case in this House, as the hon. gentleman knows, that my privileges had been breached, and the Speaker upheld this fact, it was referred to a Committee on Elections and Privileges and never ever dealt with. But that is not the point, I will deal with that with the MacDonald Royal Commission. I intend to deal with that in a different way. The House did not deal with it. Although the Committee

MR. NEARY: was directed by the Speaker and by the House to deal with it, they never did deal with it, so I am going to deal with it in another way. I am hoping to have a hearing before the MacDonald Royal Commission of Enquiry into wrongdoing by the RCMP to ventilate that matter. But I am flabbergasted, Mr. Speaker, to learn that the RCMP have not asked and apparently are not going full-speed ahead with the investigation as the Premier told us and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) told us they would. I am amazed. It is shocking, the dereliction of duty. I cannot find adjectives to describe it. And the owner of this firm calls up the RCMP and says, "Look, I heard or I read that there is a police investigation going to be held and I would like to turn over everything that I have to you." How do they know he turned over everything? How do they know how much he destroyed? Sufficient time has gone by now to destroy whatever evidence was around, whatever documents were lying around. And we have had too much of this, Mr. Speaker, we have had too much of this cover-up, treading lightly when it comes to looting the public treasury in this Province, too much of it and I would like to find out what instructions the minister gave the RCMP when he told them that the government had decided to have this matter investigated. I can go back over those last seven or eight years and I could show this House examples of where the RCMP were not shy, were trigger happy when it came to getting search warrants to go into people's houses.

MR. S. NEARY: And I can only think of about two weeks before Christmas, back in 1973, I think it was, when the RCMP were sent by this crowd to the residence of a former Premier of this Province. They were not so shy then, they were gung ho then when they were manipulated for political reasons by the administration of that day, some of the ministers presently sitting on the government benches. And they can argue all they like that they were only doing their jobs as policemen, but I have evidence down in my office that can prove otherwise, that behind the scenes there was correspondence going back and forth between the Minister of Justice, the SCC, Consumer Affairs in Ottawa, Mr. Crosbie, Mr. - what was his name? - I will think of it in a minute. Mr. Crosbie and the SCC, Mr. Crosbie and Mr. Sparling and Mr. Sparling and Mr. Crosbie and the fellow that he manipulated into taking over Canadian Javelin and Mr. Crosbie. All this going on behind the scenes while the RCMP are claiming, 'They are only doing their jobs as policemen'. I have one piece of correspondence down there from this gentleman, I cannot think of his name at the moment, and Mr. Crosbie saying, 'We have so and so on the run now. The RCMP have them on the run. Let us keep them on the run, it will help your political career!'. And the RCMP say, 'Oh, we were not manipulated, we were only doing our jobs as policemen'.

Well, Mr. Speaker, they were sent on a witchhunt. They might have been doing their jobs as policemen, in the process they might have found a few little evidences of alleged crimes committed. But I could take the RCMP Commercial Crime Section today and I could send it to any business in this Province, any business! Crosbie's, Ayre's, Bowring's any of them and I could say,

MR. S. NEARY: 'Go in, get a search warrant and go in'. And I will bet you a dollaar before six o'clock they could have evidences of alleged crimes that have been committed.

But here we have a situation where the government has taken the initiative, the minister has instructed the RCMP to investigate either a fraud on the Public Treasury, because that is what really they are investigating or a conspiracy to defraud the Public Treasury. The minister must have some evidence of wrongdoing when he asked to have a police investigation and the law enforcement officers that he issues the instructions to, do not think it is worth their while to get a search warrant to go and seize the records and they have not done it to this moment. They have not done it with a soul. Mr. Moores is one of the prime suspects, Devine Advertising and other people associated with this scandal, and they have not thought it worth their while to go in and ask for a search warrant to seize the documents.

MR. L. THOMS: They are afraid.

MR. S. NEARY: Well, maybe they are afraid. So I want to know from the minister what kind of instructions, how do they communicate the instructions? Does the minister do it himself? Is it done by Mr. Goodyear, the Director of Public Prosecutions whose name pops up again, who is going to tread lightly when it comes to his buddies in the RCMP? What kind of an administration of Justice are we developing in this Province, a buddy/buddy affair, a kissing cousin situation?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member's time has expired.

MR. S. NEARY: Well, I will be back at it again if I can get the minister on his feet for a few minutes.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, it indeed will be a few minutes because I only intend to deal with those matters which have transpired since I have been Minister of Justice. I do not intend to go back on the other matters in 1973, 1974 or whenever.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Well, I said what I plan to do is respond to the matter the hon. gentleman raised with respect to the Auditor General's report when this first came to the attention of the House. The instructions were obviously verbatim, the instructions to the RCMP were with reference to paragraph so and so, whatever paragraphs they were, hon. members will recall, in the Auditor General's report which made these allegations, to investigate the matter and to report whether

MR. OTTENHEIMER: there was any, in their view, criminal activity involved. That, essentially, is what the instructions were. The police investigation is still in progress, it is not completed. As long as it is being done and being done properly, I can certainly assure the hon. gentleman that there is no suggestion that anybody was told to go slowly or because people might be of this political party or another political party. There was certainly no suggestion of that whatsoever. The police investigation is ongoing. It is not completed, and until it is completed and in the department -

MR. NEARY: But it is started?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes, it is ongoing, so obviously it has to be started. It is ongoing but it is not completed, and the instructions in general were with reference to section so-and-so, section so-and-so, whatever they were, of the Auditor General's Report which was tabled in the House, to investigate the matter in order to determine whether there was any evidence of criminal activity. That is essentially what the instructions were and are, and the investigation is ongoing and not completed.

MR. NEARY: Just to rephrase that, I only want to ask the question, the hon. gentleman -

MR. SPEAKER: (Butt) The hon. member for Lapoile.

MR. NEARY: did not deal with the point that I raised. Naturally, in the process of conducting this investigation, you would expect that by now the evidence, the books, the records of the companies and the various individuals involved, would have been seized by the RCMP using a search warrant to get the information. I mean, why has it not been done? How fast are they moving on this? Does the hon. gentleman know, because I have the strangest feeling that they are going slow for some reason or another? Maybe the hon. gentleman did not give them instructions to go slow, but I have not seen or heard of any activity going on, and I certainly would have heard about it.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I certainly gave them no instructions to go slow, I am morally certain of this, nor did, obviously, anybody in the Department of Justice give them any instructions to go slow at all. The matter is being investigated the same way any other matter would be investigated. There was certainly no such instruction at all. With respect to, you know, why search warrants were not issued or why they were in any particular investigation, you know, that depends upon the course of that investigation. I do not, and the department itself does not, conduct the police inquiry. The police conduct that, and that is a matter inherent in the police inquiry. I do not, nor do any of my assistants or staff, conduct the policy inquiry. It is the police who do it, and they have to do it according to their own professional competence. But with respect to any special instructions given on this or that, I am certainly sure that I did not and I am morally certain that nobody did.

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

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, probably I can answer the member for Lapoile (Mr. Neary) probably better than the Minister of Justice because there is now a limitation period. Anything that happened prior to March the 17th., 1979, Mr. Speaker, is swept under the rug and ignored by this administration. Anything at all that happened prior to that time, nobody in this administration takes any responsibility for, whether they were in the Cabinet or not, it does not matter. Everything that happened prior to that historic date of March the 17th., 1979, is completely ignored. It is as if it never happened, as if it never happened. So any hopes that my friend from Lapoile would have that there is going to be any investigations of anything that happened then, I am afraid he is barking up the wrong tree.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot let this particular debate on the Estimates pass without taking the opportunity to congratulate the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) who reversed her decision in connection with the money for the French program in this Province.

MR. LUSH: She did it voluntarily, though, it was quite a withdrawal.

MR. THOMS: Just waiting, Mr. Speaker, I might, if the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) and the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) could just give me a moment, I would like to speak directly to the Minister of Education. I was in the process of congratulating the minister on her reverse stand on the French question that was brought up in the House by my colleagues on

MR. L. THOMS:

this side. I think she did the right thing and she certainly gave me a ray of hope, because I did not think there was anybody on the other side of the House, Mr. Speaker, who had a mind to change. But, Sir, it is nice to see, at least, somebody over there who can change their mind and do the right thing. It is too bad that we did not have many more who were prepared to change their minds and give the people of Newfoundland a little longer to decide whether or not they wanted that particular design for a flag that we now have, that received Royal Assent at 4:00 p.m. this afternoon. The administration could not wait, they had to bring in the Lieutenant-Governor at 4:00 p.m. this afternoon to make sure that we got the flag. I do not know, maybe we are going to have a flag raising ceremony tomorrow afternoon, maybe it is true there are boxes of flags in the dungeons of Confederation Building, maybe there is.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

The hon. member is being irrelevant.

MR. L. THOMS: Mr. Speaker. I would like the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge), if she could take just a couple of minutes before we close for this afternoon, to tell me what she anticipated - it is a job to get a minister's attention these days, Mr. Speaker - I was wondering if she would take just a couple of minutes to tell me and tell the House what she anticipated cost now of Grade XII is going to be. I am really wondering if you could maybe take a moment as well to tell me what the real benefits of Grade XII are going to be? As I understand it Grade XII is going to be Grades X and XI spread out over three years. And from what I have seen of the educational system today, I doubt if they have enough work now to do in Grades X and XI.

MR. L. THOMS: So if we now take that work and spread it over three years, I am just wondering what the real advantage to Grade XII is going to be. I am also interested in what the anticipated cost of Grade XII is going to be.

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

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, first I would like to again acknowledge praise from the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. L. THOMS: I am gallant! I am gallant!

MS. VERGE:
-for the government's wise decision on bilingual programmes in education.

Now, as for Grade XII, what is being planned by the Education Department is a re-organization of senior high schools expanding Grades X through XII. There will be an additional year of high school with the twelfth grade. But the three senior years will be treated as a unit with a credit system introduced which will afford many advantages on flexibility scheduling courses and making up the student's timetable, an advantage which will benefit particularly the small schools around the Province. I mean, after all we are a Province of small schools.

Among the advantages of the re-organized programme which is being planned, which were identified by the Advisory Committee to the minister which recommended Grade XII are: first, that the high school programme will be lengthened, it will be broadened so that students, by the time they graduate from high school, will have the opportunity to experience a greater number of courses and options so that they will leave high school

MS. VERGE: with a better, with a more well-rounded education. Students now complain that within the limited time available to them, they cannot take all the courses which they would like to take. They have to make difficult choices of studying either French or Chemistry when they would like to study both subjects -

AN HON. MEMBER: Let us call it six o'clock.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed to call it six o'clock? Agreed.

It being six o'clock, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, at three o'clock.