

PRELIMINARY

UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

FRIDAY, MARCH 11, 1977

The House met at 10:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, my initial reaction to the various groups and individuals that oppose the annual seal hunt was to ignore their campaigns because I believed that to do otherwise would only serve to add publicity on which these people feed and depend for their financial support and existence.

However, in light of some of the charges that have been made by these people in recent days I feel that as Minister of Fisheries I have an obligation and a duty to give the true side of the seal hunt, and to challenge the actions of those people who, by their lies, false accusations and malicious propaganda would destroy the seal fishery, and in so doing the honour and integrity of those who engage in it as a means of supplementing their annual income.

Earlier this week the Minister of Justice received a telegram from the leader of one of these groups, these protest groups, in which he charged that the Newfoundland Government is paying hoodlums and law breakers to go to St. Anthony to confront and harass the protesters. There have also been charges which have received world wide attention that have portrayed Newfoundlanders as being a barbaric, cruel and brutal people, because they engage in the annual seal hunt.

These people, Mr. Speaker, in their desperation to brainwash the so-called do-gooders in the world, have gone to unbelievable lengths to discredit our Newfoundland sealers, and are causing unknown damage to this Province, and indeed to all of Canada. Mr. Speaker, I say now that this government will not stand by and let this happen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: We will go on a hunger strike.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to inform my hon. colleagues in the House of my intention to hold a public meeting in St. Anthony at 2:00 P.M. Monday for the purpose of outlining our government's position regarding the seal fishery. I have issued a special invitation to all national, international and local journalists, as well as to the protest groups, to attend the meeting to hear the true and factual side of the seal hunt.

MR. DOODY: What about the Minister of Tourism?

MR. W. CARTER: This is no longer, Mr. Speaker, a simple protest to stop the seal hunt, but has now emerged as a very serious moral issue in which the good name of our Newfoundland people is at stake.

And I am therefore, Mr. Speaker, especially proud to announce that leaders of the six major religious denominations in the Province have pledged their whole-hearted support behind our Newfoundland sealers and the continuation of the seal hunt. As an expression of their support they have unanimously accepted my invitation to accompany me to St. Anthony where they will attend our meeting and make known, in no uncertain terms, their respective church's stand on this very important issue.

The following clergy have been designated by their respective leaders to attend the meeting: Reverend Father Ron Cashin who will represent the R.C. Church.

Reverend Stewart Payne of the Anglican Church, Reverend Manual Saunders of the United Church, Reverend I. S. Wishart of the Presbyterian Church, Capt. Hynes of the Salvation Army, and Reverend R. J. Mills who will attend on behalf of the Pentecostal Assemblies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: You should get Father Hickey in there, too.

MR. W. CARTER: I know, Mr. Speaker, that I speak for all members of this House, and indeed for all Newfoundlanders, when I

Mr. W. Carter:

say how very, very proud I am of the stand that has been taken by these distinguished churchmen. They share my determination and the determination of government, and I am sure the determination of our Newfoundland people, to fight those people who by their questionable actions would destroy our very important sealing industry as well as the good name of our Newfoundland people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, let me first of all say, Sir, that we on this side welcome whole-heartedly this change in the policy which the administration have with respect to this very important question. The minister has changed his policy, he began by announcing that he had changed his policy, and I am very pleased he has, Sir, I said repeatedly and my colleagues said repeatedly both in the House and outside

Mr. Roberts.

that we thought the ministry's previous policy was wrong. I am glad they have now changed it because I think the new policy which they have adopted is the right one. Let me make that point first of all, Mr. Speaker.

Secondly, Sir, I am very pleased that the clergy have accepted the minister's invitation. The minister did not say that he had extended an invitation, but it is correct to say that he did extend them an invitation and I am very happy they have responded as they have. The clergymen involved, Sir, are generally speaking resident in the area; Father Cashin is the Parish Priest at Sacred Heart Parish at Conche; the Reverend Mr. Payne is the Rector of the St. Mary's Parish at St. Anthony, the Anglican Parish; Captain Hynes, I believe, is stationed at St. Anthony with the Salvation Army; Pastor Mills of the Pentecostal Church is stationed at St. Anthony; the Reverend Mr. Wishart and the Reverend Mr. Saunders are resident, the one in St. John's, the other I am told at Pouch Cove, the United Church Parish or charge there.

But I am delighted, Sir, that these clergymen will be present to lend their support in behalf of their respective denominations to the meeting.

Mr. Speaker, let me make a suggestion to the government that came up earlier today in discussion with representatives of the committees involved at St. Anthony. And by the way, they tell me, Sir, they are now expecting about 150 people to come, and they have made arrangements to billet them. And the arrangements for the demonstrations that will be held, I am told, have been completed in full co-operation with the civic authorities and with the police authorities. And I think the committee are going at it in a most responsible and most proper fashion in every way.

Mr. Roberts.

The suggestion, Sir, is this: Mr. Brian Davies is due at St. Anthony today or tomorrow, you know, imminently, with his flotilla of helicopters.

MR. HICKMAN: He cannot find them.

MR. ROBERTS: He cannot find the helicopters? Is that what the minister said?

MR. HICKMAN: Brian Davies was last heard of lost on an Magdalens.

MR. NOLAN: The government must have cut him off.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I would devoutly hope that Mr. Davies stays lost on the Magdalens . I do not wish him any ill in any personal sense, but if he were to confine his activities to some place other than our Province I for one would welcome it.

But I understand that he and his cohorts are due at St. Anthony at some point in the next day or so. But that is a little early, because the hunt does not open until Tuesday morning and no seals may be lawfully killed in these waters until Tuesday coming, the 15th. March. There is some thought that Mr. Davies is not coming to St. Anthony just to spend the weekend in the healthy climate of Northern Newfoundland, that he intends to use the weekend period to ferry fuel and supplies from St. Anthony to Belle Isle, which will be an advanced staging point for his forays to try to disrupt the seal hunt.

Now, Sir, in my understanding Belle Isle is Crown land. It is owned by the government of this Province. And I wonder if perhaps the government of this Province could not just pass an order saying to Mr. Brian Davies, "Stay out! Stay off that particular piece of our Crown land. You have no legitimate business being there, no proper business being there." We cannot ban him from the Province . That would be very wrong even if we could do it. We might be able to keep him off Belle Isle. And let us hamper him and let us make it as difficult as we can for him to carry out a chain of events which

Mr. Roberts.

he would like to carry out, which would disrupt a legal and a legitimate and a proper activity by our people and one which has extraordinarily widespread support among the people of this Province. And so I put that suggestion forward in a very positive and concrete way. I think it is a feasible one. I think it is a very good one. Just say to Mr. Davies, "If you want to disrupt the seal hunt you will not do it by making use of this large piece of Crown land which is some twenty-five or thirty miles to the North of St. Anthony itself and about twenty miles in fact off the nearest point of land Cape Bauld.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the committee at St. Anthony have asked me to ask the minister - I was to ask a question, but in view of the minister's statement that is no longer necessary. They say that they have not heard from the minister. He has not been in touch with them. And they are a little upset over that. They feel that since they have spearheaded this movement - in fact, a fact which has been recognized by the government giving them a grant of some \$1,000. - they feel that the minister should at least do them the courtesy to get in touch with them when he is having his public meeting. And they have asked me, Sir, to ask the minister if he will meet with the committee and in this they speak for the Trinity South committee as well, because they are in close touch with each other, Sir, the Trinity South people. There was a meeting there in St. Anthony last night. They have asked that the minister will meet with them first before he has a public meeting. They do not mind the minister making publicity. They are all for it

MR. ROBERTS:

as long as it is publicity aimed at the same ends as the Committee have in mind. But they do wish to meet with the minister first. So I hope the minister will give the House that assurance. If he wishes I can give him the names of the people heading up the Committee. They may be known to him already. But they have made that request of me.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I am very, very pleased the ministry have changed their policy. I think they are now doing the right and proper thing. I hope they go further than this and mount not just a campaign in St. Anthony but an outgoing campaign to tell the truth about the seal hunt. I shall be in St. Anthony myself. I will not be able to be there on Monday because I sometime ago accepted an engagement to speak in Labrador West. I shall ask one or two of my colleagues to be present, and I hope the minister will do them the courtesy, since he has obviously got seats on the aircraft, to give them a lift North to -

AN HON. MEMBER: What?

MR. ROBERTS: The minister obviously has seats on the aircraft. He is taking two clergymen, himself, probably an assistant or two and it is a very public thing. I think it is entirely proper if the minister would offer a seat to one or two of my colleagues to go to join in the meeting. If he does not, well and good. I think it is much more proper than the Minister of Social Services using an aircraft instead of the sixty mile drive from Gander to Grand Falls. If the minister chooses not -

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. HICKMAN: Your Honour has laid down the rules so often, that when a Ministerial Statement is made it cannot be the subject matter of debate, and that the hon. Leader of the Opposition or the designated spokesman from the Opposition is allowed to make a few comments and ask a few questions. I do submit that the hon. gentleman opposite was not doing that.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order. For once the government

MR. ROBERTS:

house leader has stated a rule correctly, but he neglected the further rule which Your Honour developed the other day, the tit for tat rule. And given the fact that there is some tit on the other side, we are allowed some tat from this side. And if I strayed, Sir - and if I did I apologize - it was only because the Minister of Social Services and the Minister of Affairs, Consumer and otherwise, have led me astray, have combined to lead me astray.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

There is no doubt that on the comment after a Ministerial Statement there should be no debate. And I would ask the Leader of the Opposition to confine his remarks to the subject matter.

MR. ROBERTS: I thank Your Honour for the very wise ruling, that there should be neither bait nor debate on the Ministerial Statement.

Let me conclude again by saying that I would hope the Minister of Fisheries would see fit to allow one or two members who sit on this side of the House to accompany him to his meeting in St. Anthony since he is not acting in a partisan sense but as he himself said voicing the feeling of every member of the House. I think it is entirely proper of me to suggest that it would be entirely fitting and proper of him to accede to that suggestion. I cannot be there myself for reasons which I have explained, but one of two of my colleagues would like to go. I hope we will and we will show the press and the others who will attend this meeting that in this matter the minister and the government speak for all of the people of this Province. I think, Sir, that is of the utmost importance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to outline the government programme for 1977 in relation to the Spruce Budworm problem.

In previous statements I have indicated that instead of a massive chemical spraying program during 1977, Government will undertake further research, experimentation and study into the current budworm problem in Newfoundland. Government has decided that during this year action

MR. MAYNARD:

on the problem will be undertaken as per the following four point program.

1. An independent review of the budworm will be undertaken by a review board. Members of this board will be impartial and objective people who will review a broad representative cross-section of the available literature on the budworm, and existing Government files, reports and studies on the current epidemic in Newfoundland. This review board will be requested to report to Government next Fall on the following items:

(a) the probable effects of the current budworm epidemic on the forest resources and the forest industry of the Province; *and*

(b) the realistic solution alternatives to the current budworm problem.

This report along with other findings and analysis will be used by Government in its further evaluation of the budworm epidemic.

2. A Committee comprised of officials of my department, representatives of Canadian Forestry Service, and the paper companies who are currently studying and planning a forest improvement programme for this Province will be asked to broaden their task and advise Government of ways and means of using improved forest management to make our forests less susceptible to budworm attack.

MR. MAYNARD: I must, however, caution that this approach is very long-term and will not significantly effect the current epidemic. However, it will over the long term reduce the probabilities of having to cope with periodic epidemics of crisis proportions. A forest in Newfoundland immune to budworm attack is almost impossible to attain, but hopefully over the years, through more intensive management, we might be able to mute the effects of this destructive pest.

3. In the meantime, however, we must investigate more immediate methods of dealing with the current epidemic. Towards this end my department will undertake an experimental spray programme during the late Spring - early Summer of this year.

This programme will test under Newfoundland conditions several of the insecticides, both chemical and biological, and the application techniques that are most likely to be used in the event of a necessity to implement a large scale control programme during 1978 or in future years.

Five pairs of test blocks will be treated with a different spray regime of the two chemical insecticides, fenitrothion and aminocarb (also called matacil), and the biological insecticide B.t. The test blocks are paired so that the results may be confirmed or compared for better assessment. Each block represents a single aircraft load of insecticide.

A DC-6 or equivalent aircraft will be used as the spray vehicle.

MR. NEARY: Where will it fly?

MR. MAYNARD: I have got a map test.

It will be guided by a computerized Litton Inertial Navigation System which is reported to be extremely accurate, and this is extremely important in Newfoundland because of the geography,

MR. MAYNARD: because of the terrain. Because of the relatively wide spacing of Newfoundland airports and other logistical reasons, this aircraft, together with its onboard navigational system, is thought the most likely to be used in any required large scale control programme. Each chemical insecticide test block will be 20,000 acres and each B.t. test block will be 4,000 acres in size.

The blocks to be sprayed are as follows:

Test Number 1 - one block in each of the Triton Brook and Taylor Brook areas.

Test Number 2 - two blocks in the North and South Twin Lakes areas.

Test Number 3 - one block in each of the Noel Paul Brook area and Lake Ambrose area.

Test Number 4 - one block in each of the Pinchgut Lake and Stag Lake areas,

Test Number 5 - one block in each of the Georges Lake and Harry's River areas.

None of these blocks are close to population centres. Each block will be intensively studied for pre-spray and post-spray budworm population levels and for effectiveness of foliage afforded. Adjacent control (unsprayed) areas have also been selected. They will also be intensively studied for comparison against the treated areas.

In order to protect our past investment of over \$2 million, and our proposed further investment this year of another \$2 million in forest improvement work on various stands across the Island, an additional twenty-eight blocks will be sprayed with the chemical insecticide "Matacil". These stands total approximately 28,000 acres and vary in size from 200 to 4,000 acres. All twenty blocks will equal 28,000 acres. They will be sprayed by two or three small agriculture type spraying aircraft.

MR. MAYNARD: While government is reasonably satisfied that the chances of serious environmental or health damage resulting from spraying are very slim, the spray programme will be closely and intensively monitored by an independent environmental impact monitoring programme under the direction of the Department of Consumer Affairs and Environment. This group will include officials from the Department of Consumer Affairs and Environment, the Department of Health, the Department of Tourism (Wildlife Branch), the Canadian Forestry Service and Environmental Protection Service of the Federal Department of Fisheries and as well Memorial Univeristy of Newfoundland.

MR. NEARY: Who is going to pay for all this?

MR. MAYNARD: They will monitor the effects of the spraying on human health, soil, water, air, stream insects, non-target forest insects, fish, birds and other wildlife. This work will commence prior to spray operations and continue throughout most of the Summer. It will consist of intensive field and laboratory analysis. A preliminary report is expected by late Fall.

4. The fourth aspect of the programme will be a public education and information programme. Since the current budworm

MR. MAYNARD: epidemic is a rather new phenomena to Newfoundland, the people of this Province are probably not as informed on the insect and its problems as are the people of other Eastern Provinces or States who are more experienced or familiar with the pest. In an effort to increase the understanding in this regard of the people of the Province, we will be conducting an information program on the budworm itself, the affects and problems it causes and the solution alternatives available. This program will make every effort to be as truly informative and as objective as possible. Its sole purpose is to assist in answering some of the many questions currently being posed by the people of the Province so that they will be better able to discuss this most important problem.

In conclusion , I must reiterate that although previous infestations of the spruce budworm in this Province have tended to be localized and have collapsed after several years without widespread serious damage, the current epidemic has reached unprecedented proportions and poses a very real and serious threat to the important forest resources and forest based employment of our Province. The purpose of the program I have just outlined is to provide more definite information on how to deal with this threat in the future.

MR. NEARY: Who is going to pay for it?

MR. MAYNARD: The government.

MR. NEARY: The whole shot?

MR. MAYNARD: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House welcome the minister's statement indicating where and in what quantity the experimental spray programme is going to take place. But there is obviously a lot of questions to be asked and a lot of judgements to be made. Mr. Speaker, the very fact the people in this Province are concerned about the environmental damage on spray programme, two out of five of the areas that have been designated as a experimental spray programme, one block each

MR. FLIGHT: in Noel Paul Brook area, that is the site right now of an experimental salmon fishery hatchery by the federal and provincial governments. The one block at the head of Pinchgut Lake; Pinchgut Lake is the head waters of the Harry's River. One block each in the Georges Lake and Harry's River area; Harry's River is one of the most productive salmon rivers on the West Coast of Newfoundland. Not only is the river going to be sprayed in that area but the head waters of it. So this just brings out, Mr. Speaker, that it is practically impossible to talk about a spray programme in this Province where rivers, habitats of our wildlife and our people live.

One of the big concerns, Mr. Speaker, about a spray programme in this province is what it will do, not necessarily to the health as much - I would suspect that the minister and all his officials would make sure that a spray programme would not affect adversely the health of our people - but on a island where our wildlife is concentrated the way it is concentrated, we have in four or five areas of Newfoundland, the salmon rivers of the West Coast - all the salmon fishing in Newfoundland is basically in the West Coast area. The Central Newfoundland area and the Noel Paul Brook area is probably one of the heaviest populated moose areas in Newfoundland in the Millertown, the head of Noel Paul.

People are concerned, Mr. Speaker, about what the spray programme is going to do. And I read a minister's statement not long ago and it would make one shiver. He said, "We are not going to undertake a spray programme where we might drop a thousand gallons or ten thousand pounds of insecticide on a target and miss the target, and it would fall somewhere else." Now I would presume that this type of an experimental programme is to perfect the ways we will spray but we are going into a

MR. FLIGHT:

spray programme not knowing if the insecticide we are going to drop is going to drop on target or drop two miles down wind and two miles down wind will make-

PREMIER MOORES: You are against doing any spraying.

MR. FLIGHT: No, I am not against. I am against doing anything that I do not know what the results are going to be, that is what I am against. Mr. Speaker, the minister says that he is going to have a board; members of this board will be impartial and objective. Well then I suggest to the minister that I would expect that there would be very few people from the present paper producing companies in this province on that board.

MR. MAYNARD: None.

MR. FLIGHT: None?

MR. FLIGHT: Good, because they will not be impartial or objective. The pressure they put on this Province this past year for a massive spray programme rules out any possibility of their ever sitting on a board and being impartial or objective.

AN HON. MEMBER: And no government no anything.

MR. FLIGHT: No government, no anything. The results of this spray programme, Mr. Speaker will have to be publicized completely. There will be no possibility that the public of Newfoundland or any of their spokesmen will accept anything less than complete disclosure on the results of the spray programme.

Mr. Speaker, I am as responsible as the hon. the Premier. He says I am against everything.

PREMIER MOORES: I did not say any such thing.

MR. FLIGHT: But, Mr. Speaker, if the Department of Forestry had probably met their obligations this past five or six years and insisted that the -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I must point out to the hon. gentleman now that he is straying from the legitimate area of comment and getting into debate.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, it is accepted that forest management is just as important in budworm control as spraying. Now, Mr. Speaker, over the years people who have been familiar with the forest operations of Price (Nfld.) and Bowaters have indicated to past governments that they were carrying out a very, very ill-advised forest management. They were going in and taking out the most accessible and cheapest timber and as a result we have acres and acres and acres, hundreds of thousands of cords of over-mature, dying wood in the forest. There are people who basically believe that that is the cause of the massive infestation of budworm that we have today.

Had we followed a policy of harvesting over-mature timber, we may not have had the massive infestation we

MR. FLIGHT: have today. Now apart from a spraying project, the government, I would think, have the obligation to insist that the paper companies as of now harvest the over-mature timber and not be allowed to cut second growth while the over-mature stays there and, number one, increases the possibility of more infestation, or rots whilst the second growth is being taken out.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) I think, asked the minister who would pay for the spray programme. It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that the paper companies would share some of the cost of this programme. We know what the value of the pulpwood is to the economy of Newfoundland but we also know what it means to the profits of those companies. Over the years, Mr. Speaker, they have ruled supreme. They have done nothing, but nothing to guarantee our forests the stabilization of a supply. This Province will go out - some people say this Province will not have an economic wood supply by the year 2000.

The paper companies have just cut, cut, cut. There has been no reforestation, there has been no cutting of over-mature timber stands. They have made all kinds of money on our resources. And the result of their management is maybe one of the reasons we have such a spruce budworm problem. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the minister should have the paper companies contribute towards the cost of spraying our forests. In as far as the pulp itself is concerned they stand to gain more than anybody else.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: So, Mr. Speaker, having said that I want to assure the minister that the people from all walks of life will be watching that experimental spray programme and will be expecting that everything will be publicized. There should be no holding back of information received as a result of the spraying. Then having the experimental spray programme completed that the government will recognize the rights of the people who may be

Mr. Roberts:

had the opportunity to review the Hansards his colleague, the Minister of Justice said that upon the Premier's return to the Province he will be making a statement with respect to the "Scrivener" -

MR. HICKMAN: What page?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, it is found on page - I realize the Minister of Justice may not remember what he said, Sir, many times he does not know what he says - but it is found on page 2225, quoting the Minister of Justice, "Mr. Speaker, I will have to take that as notice and when the hon. Premier returns" - well that clause has been met - "I am sure" - the Minister of Justice is sure that - "he will be in a position to answer the question." Well, Sir, the Premier has returned. The Minister of Justice was sure that the Premier would be in a position to - the minister of Justice does not know what he says most of the time.

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

I would remind hon. gentlemen that to make with respect of what the Minister of Justice said or did not would be out of order, and I would ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition to proceed with his question.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, thank you, Sir, I was just trying to set the background for the question, because I did not know whether the Premier had had the opportunity to review this matter, and I do not want to mislead the Premier.

The point is, Sir, is the Premier now in a position to tell us whether the government are now going to have an impartial outside investigation into the Scrivener donation, which has now been admitted, and the Premier may not be familiar with this, by Mr. Richard Greene as having being in fact received by the P.C. Party?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I have had very little opportunity to give much thought to it since getting home, getting home late last night and getting in just at 9:00, just three-quarters of an hour before the House opened this morning. Before I left I asked the Department of Health and the Department of Public Works and Services to get all of the information together so we could see exactly what the cost escalation was, not just on the Health Sciences Complex, but on the Twillingate, Carbonear and Corner Brook Complexes as well, to find out what caused these increases in costs which is really the only concern of government and this House. And if we see there is any reason for suspicion we will have to look at the thing very carefully.

Equally I would suggest that if there is any reason why any political donation, whether it be in 1967-1968 when the contract was originally let with Mr. Doyle's involvement in the situation, whether there was any donation -

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Doyle?

PREMIER MOORES: Well his man made the first accusation that the Leader of the Opposition and others have quoted from, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, I will deal with that.

PREMIER MOORES: And I suggest that maybe the Minister of Health of that day, the Premier's Executive Assistant of that day, of the Premier of that day, Mr. Petten, Mr. Vardy was a bit difficult to get for testimony, Mr. Derrick Lewis, maybe under the Election Act we should be looking at the whole shebang, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER MOORES: Because I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, we have done a fair amount of investigation in this, and the political donations that have been made to this party are only small potatoes compared to what was associated with the party previously.

MR. NOLAN: Some small potatoes!

PREMIER MOORES: The fact is, Sir, that I think that should be dealt with under the Election Act regarding the increase in the

Premier Moores:

cost of the health services through hospitals. I would suggest, as I said last week, the position has not changed, that I will be receiving the report from Health and from Public Works and upon receipt of that report I will be tabling it in the House.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: I know I am not allowed to debate the Premier's answer, but I think his answer is cowardly as well as incorrect and I will debate it -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

The latter remarks of the hon. Leader of the Opposition would be out of order, with reference to cowardly. The other matter would be a difference of opinion. I would ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Sir, and assuming the government call the Address in Reply I will have an opportunity to debate it this morning anyway.

A supplementary, Sir, would the Premier -

MR. PECKFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Just for clarification, a point of order, As I understood Your Honour's ruling you had asked the hon. Leader of the Opposition to withdraw his comment he had made earlier, and the Leader of the Opposition has since gotten to his feet and proceeded to continue without the withdrawal that was directed by -

MR. ROBERTS: Did he?

MR. NOLAN: Your Honour did not ask that.

MR. ROBERTS: To that point of order, Your Honour.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. ROBERTS: Your Honour, I did not hear Your Honour request me to withdraw a remark, If Your Honour did, I certainly would, but

Mr. Roberts:

I certainly did not hear any such request.

MR. PECKFORD: That is your problem.

MR. ROBERTS: I did not hear any such request made, if one was made of course I would withdraw -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: - the remark.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please. I think this is a genuine question of whether I was heard or not. To the best of my knowledge I -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. SPEAKER:

point out that one word in the hon. Leader of the Opposition's remarks was out of order and ask him to withdraw that. With regards to that, he did not clear that.

MR. ROBERTS: Well I am sorry, Your Honour, I did not hear the ruling on that point and I will certainly withdraw the remark. If I could go ahead with the supplementary question? Would the Premier tell us whether in his opinion it is proper for his party to have accepted a donation of more than \$50,000 from a firm with whom the government were negotiating a contract during the period when that contract was being negotiated?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would like to welcome the fact that the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) is running in Humber West. I am delighted to hear that, and we all heard it here in the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: So am I. So am I.

PREMIER MOORES: Having said that, Mr. Speaker, because it would be nice to have him out of the House.

MR. SIMMONS: Provided the Premier -

PREMIER MOORES: I will resign if you promise to run in the by-election.

But, Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the question-as the hon. Leader of the Opposition well knows, political donations are made throughout before, after and during the term of office of any Opposition or government. He also knows very well that there were five elections in four years at that particular time, between 1971 and 1975. He also knows that the party collectors have no way -

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

PREMIER MOORES: I mentioned -

MR. ROBERTS: To a point of order, Sir. The Premier may not know the rules, he is not here often enough but, Sir, the point is this, the -

PREMIER MOORES: You are always here.

MR. ROBERTS: - rules say specifically, Mr. Speaker -

PREMIER MOORES: Put your hands in your pants pockets, it is more suitable.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the Premier is unduly tender -

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

I must interrupt all hon. gentlemen now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

When a point of order is being made it is essential that there be no interruptions. When questions are being asked and answers given, it is equally essential except for a point of order interjection. But certainly during points of order the tenor of the House and the ability of the Chair to follow argument and to maintain order become seriously undermined if there are interjections. So I would ask all hon. members not to interject on points of order.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the point of order is this, Sir. The Premier ought to realize that neither he nor any other member is allowed to cast - and if the Premier does not like my hands in my pockets, my answer is at least my hands are in my own pockets. I would commend that to him - Mr. Speaker, the point is this that the Premier is not allowed nor is any other member allowed to cast aspersions upon any member's motives. He has trice said in answering or attempting to answer a question that I ought to know or I very well know or words to that effect. And that, Sir, is clearly casting aspersions because it is clearly trying to indicate that I know some things which I will not acknowledge, or that I ignore in framing a question. That, Sir, is completely out of order. The Premier may not realize it. I accept that. But I would ask Your Honour, Sir, to direct his attention to the rules and to inform him that he has to follow the rules and would he please be kind enough to do so.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order. May I first remind hon. gentlemen opposite that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition asked for an opinion, invited an opinion from the hon. the Premier. The hon. the Premier, as I listened very carefully, was giving an opinion.

MR. HICKMAN:

The second point that is very relevant, that the hon. the gentleman opposite, the hon. Leader of the Opposition on his point of order so concerned about aspersions, started by casting aspersions upon the Premier, continued on that the hon. Premier obviously does not know the rules, etc. And having said all that he suddenly turns and says, "I do not want any aspersions cast upon me." I had not heard the hon. the Premier cast aspersions upon anyone. He is simply saying, that I am sure the hon. Leader of the Opposition is aware. And, Mr. Speaker, it is a facetious, frivolous, unprecedented point of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

On the point of order before the Chair, as I see it there is a difference of opinion. Whether an hon. member does in fact know something or does not is obviously a difference of opinion. And whether something which he should or should not know is, in my opinion, a difference of opinion and there is no aspersion upon anyone but a difference of opinion.

The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: I withdraw the remark that I made that the Leader of the Opposition knows how to run a political party. But, Sir, one would assume that one would know what is going on as far as the method by which donations are made. The fact is, Sir, that to my knowledge, nor to anyone else's knowledge on this side of the House, there has never been party influence in governmental decisions on things of that nature. If that answers his question, that is fine. It is absolutely true. They may be laughing on that side, Mr. Speaker, because they are not used to it.

MR. ROBERTS: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary by the original questioner.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I must accept the Premier's answer, but I do not have to believe it. Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary for the Premier. Would he tell the House, please, when he first became aware of the fact that the Scrivener firm had made several donations to the PC Party?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: I will have to take notice of it, Mr. Speaker, because we had several substantial donations at that time as I am sure the Liberal Party have had over the years as well. And that is the honest answer, Mr. Speaker, as opposed to the innuendo that we have been listening to otherwise.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Justice, Sir, what plans the government have to discourage increasing drunkenness among our people, especially among the youth, including those in their early teens?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I find it difficult to hear the question, which I have to do, so I would ask hon. gentlemen, in general, to be more quiet.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I asked the Minister of Justice if he would tell the House what plans the government have to discourage increasing drunkenness among our people, especially among the youth, including those in their early teens?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, how do I answer that question and remain within the rules and not make a speech, you know? And how do I

Mr. Hickman.

answer the question when I have to listen to the nonsensical interruptions from the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKMAN: I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the rules of this House be enforced to protect me from this type of vicious harassment, this type of vicious harassment that I am getting from the hon. the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons). I cannot stand it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKMAN: May I solicit the protection of the House?

PREMIER MOORES: Get his hard hat back.

MR. HICKMAN: Now to the very sensible and concerned statement from the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). I concur with him, with his feelings, that there seems to be an indication of increased use of alcoholic beverages by young people. I can give some personal opinions as to what I think should be done.

MR. NOLAN: What are you going to do?

MR. HICKMAN: I would think that the Board of Broadcast Governors, or whatever they call themselves, those who control broadcasting and televising in Canada, and who have exclusive jurisdiction thereof.

MR. SIMMONS: The CRTC.

MR. HICKMAN:— the CRTC, the Canadian Radio-Television Commission and Telecommunications, whose jurisdiction so far has been challenged but never successfully, I would think, I would hope that if they have any sense of responsibility that they would move away from allowing the advertising of alcoholic beverages, the tremendous emphasis they are placing on youth, the tremendous emphasis that they are placing on athletes. Have you noticed all the advertisements, Mr. Speaker, for beer; the national advertisements for beer that comes on? Every time now it is the teenagers, the teenagers are coming in off the ski slopes, and the first thing they do is reach for a bottle of beer.

Mr. Hickman.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of - and I would plead, I would appeal to the brewers, to those who manufacture this stuff and who avail of the free enterprise system to advertise, to please move away from the it must be a financially successful pattern of appealing to our young people in trying to make drinking amongst young people as respectable, 'and the thing to do if you are going to be a great athlete, if you are going to be a great outdoor person, you know, that is one very simple thing I can see that should be done.

Now what else can the government do? Can we get up and preach day after day? You cannot legislate.

MR. SIMMONS: You can blame the parents.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HICKMAN: You can also say very definitively and very definitely, Mr. Speaker, that the parents most assuredly have a responsibility -

MR. SIMMONS: What about the minister?

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, are you going to protect me from that jackal, that harasser, that man who will not go down and run where he was born, but goes down to Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

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

MR. HICKMAN: Can I be protected and allowed to give my few remarks in silence?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER MOORES: Who is going to pay the taxes?

MR. SPEAKER: As hon. members presumably are aware, the specific purpose of the Question Period is to allow hon. members, presumably as many as possible, as time will permit, to ask for information. And also to allow ministers then to provide the information asked for, and I think that interruptions unnecessarily prolong that process and deprive hon. members of the opportunity perhaps to ask as many questions as time would permit under regular circumstances. I would therefore ask hon. members not to interrupt.

Equally for the Question Period to serve the purpose that I understand it is designed for, requires that their care in both asking and answering questions not to consume unnecessary time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh! Oh!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman apparently has not finished.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker -

MR. SIMMONS: I have a question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: That is a speech.

MR. SPEAKER: No, I interrupted the hon. minister when he was answering the question.

MR. SIMMONS: But he is finished.

AN HON. MEMBER: Order, please 'Roger!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister is now about to have leave to complete his answer.

MR. SIMMONS: The Premier approves of Brian Davies. The Premier approves now.

PREMIER MOORES: At least he has got a Premier.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER MOORES: The man-boy.

MR. SIMMONS: He is a member of the harem -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER MOORES: Is it true when you fell in the harbour and they hauled you out, you left a ring around the waterfront?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

Now I must insist on a couple of things, one that when I call order everyone remain silent. Two, that during the question and answer period there not be interruptions. During this period I think it is easy for its purposes to become distorted. It is there presumably to afford members the opportunity to ask questions and to give ministers the opportunity to provide the information. And if there are going to be numerous interruptions, if questions are too long and if answers are too long, then the whole purpose of it becomes undermined. So I call that to the attention of hon. members. It would appear to me that on the whole the Question Period has been quite successful. But it is important that there be no interruptions. It is important that questions and answers be framed in such a way as to allow as many as possible members to ask questions and answers to be given.

The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I thank Your Honour and I wish to Your Honour that I am steadfastly attempting to stay within the rules to answer what was an opinion question that evokes a rather

MR. HICKMAN: lengthy but factual answer. Now may I deal with the second prong of the approach that I see in answer to the hon. gentleman's question, and I repeat, that no matter how one looks at it, that with respect to teenagers I hope there is no one half-witted enough in Newfoundland to think that there is not parental responsibility. And I hope there is no one half-witted enough in Newfoundland to believe that a lot of our parents, very properly, and very effectively show that kind of leadership.

But, Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question from the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) I say control, more discretion, less emphasis on youth in advertising, more understanding on the part of the parents of this Province, better programmes in our schools, which some schools are now starting, for which I am very grateful, to show the terrible evil, show young people the terrible evils that flow from alcoholism that is inevitable if teenagers have serious drinking problems at that time in their life.

That is the kind of thing. To legislate, you cannot legislate on the morals of the Province, you know.

PREMIER MOORES: We have legislation already.

MR. HICKMAN: And we have legislation and one other thing if I may, is there any other area that the hon. gentleman would like me to cover?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, sit down. Sit down. Sit down.

MR. HICKMAN: The hon. gentleman says he has a supplementary so I will wait.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: What I have to ask the minister, Sir, the minister has laid great stress and emphasis on the parents being responsible, what about the owners of these bistros, these cabarets and taverns here, do they not have a responsibility? And if so would the minister tell the House what steps his government are going to take

MR. NEARY: to make them responsible for the over embibing in their establishments, by people who they just take in to spend their money and drink all the booze they can, should they not be responsible for controlling this drunkenness to a certain degree? What steps will the minister take to curb that?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I am totally ad idem with the sentiments just expressed by the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), and I repeat what I said in this hon. House but two days ago, that both police forces in this Province, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and the Newfoundland Constabulary, have been asked to crack down as best they can on any breaches of the law by those who operate premises licensed to sell alcohol throughout the Province. In fact, it was only this morning I heard the Chief of Police, John Browne of the Newfoundland Constabulary, who is one of Canada's outstanding police officers, may I add -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKMAN: - saying the type of enforcement that his force is carrying out and the difficulty because obviously the taxpayers cannot afford to put a police officer in every single licensed establishment throughout the Province.

MR. NEARY: Put breathalyzers in the licensed establishments.

MR. HICKMAN: Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that there have been - and I heard it ratified today by the Chief of Police - many prosecutions of those who are selling alcoholic beverages to people under age. And this will continue. I would say - look, if any hon. gentleman in this House has reason to believe that a particular tavern operator is breaking the law in the strictest of -

AN HON. MEMBER: The Minister of Justice does not worry about it.

MR. HICKMAN: The Minister of Justice never has and hopefully not willingly broken the law. And I will do my best -

MR. ROBERTS: Have not broken the law?

MR. HICKMAN: Well, unless you call speeding - I suppose I have gone over the speed limit. But I will do my very best to avoid breaking the law. I admit that I once went twenty-one miles an hour in a twenty mile zone and it had such a traumatic experience upon me that I decided that the next time I had better be very careful, Mr. Speaker.

Anyway, have I covered all the angles that the hon. gentleman for LaPoile (Mr. Neary)? - May I say that I am not totally satisfied with

MR. HICKMAN:

my answer, I am not totally satisfied -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKMAN: I am not totally satisfied with the question and I give notice, Mr. Speaker, that on Thursday next I will debate this issue at the Late Show.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I just want to -

MR. SPEAKER: Is this a supplementary?

MR. NEARY: Well, it has to do with the same question. I want to tell the gentleman that he is too late because I have already informed the Speaker that I am dissatisfied with the minister's answer.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: A question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications. Is the helicopter being used by Brian Davies to pursue the seal hunt - or used in protesting the seal hunt - is the company that this helicopter is leased from doing any business with the government? And if so which company is it? Is the minister aware?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, first of all the company doing business with the Newfoundland Government at present is Universal Helicopters. And upon hearing the news this morning in fact that Brian Davies was coming in with a fleet of seven helicopters to the St. Anthony area, I immediately enquired to find out whether or not any companies that are involved with government are also involved with Brian Davies because if they were - and I am sure that I would get the support of my colleagues - while I am responsible for air services I would refuse to do business with any company who would support and lease helicopters to Brian Davies or in fact any other crackpot who is out to oppose the seal hunt.

So the company, to answer the hon. gentleman's question, the company concerned leasing the helicopters is a company called Trans-Quebec

MR. MORGAN:

Helicopters, and I had my Director of Air Services this morning contact the Universal Helicopters, who are doing work with government, and I am pleased to inform the House that the company doing work for the Newfoundland Government at present has refused to lease their helicopters to Brian Davies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Mines and Energy. Mr. Speaker, we are concerned about the proximity of the oil drilling sites to the major nursery banks, the fishing banks of Hamilton Banks, Hawkes Channel, Nain, Makkovik and Saglek Banks. Could the minister tell us whether he has any information on any blowouts or case leakings or emergency vacating due to ice damage of the oil rigs over the last five years in drilling off the Labrador Coast?

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

MR. PECKFORD: I do not have any information. I do not know if the hon. member is referring specifically to oil rigs or whether he is referring to the capping of the actual hole.

MR. STRACHAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. STRACHAN: Could the minister tell us the names of the companies in which the oil and gas regulations which will involve these environmental controls, the names of the companies to which we have distributed these oil and gas regulations?

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

MR. PECKFORD: I can get that information for the hon. member, all the major companies who have an interest off the East Coast have been given copies of the regulations and that is, Amico, Imperial, Shell, Eastcan and BP, but I can get the list for the hon. member if he wants it with all the companies that have a major interest in that area.

MR. STRACHAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. STRACHAN: Could the minister tell us when this House and the public of the Province are going to see these regulations, and whether there has been any concessions given to the companies under these regulations before they are made public?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. PECKFORD: Two points there; when they will be made public?

We are hoping that within the next month or so we will be able to make them public. And then the second part of his question, whether there has been any concessions made to this date?

There has been none, we are just negotiating. What we have indicated to the companies and what we have made public is that we will listen to their concerns in writing and also meetings with them. And then after we have all their concerns and they are satisfied that they have had ample opportunity get their points across, then government will re-examine its position vis-a-vis the regulations.

MR. PECKFORD: This past week we have met in Calgary with several of the companies, including Eastcan, and other meetings with the companies will be held in the next couple of weeks again. The problem is, one, that they have indicated to us, they have written us a page or two pages giving their immediate reactions and then they wanted their various exploration, economists and financial people to study the different royalty regimes and so on. Now they have come back in a lot more detailed but very expensive briefs that we are sitting down with them and going over point by point. Because many times we find that the companies in some of their responses are responding to a point which they have misunderstood in the regulations, and so therefore it takes a lot of back and forth chit-chat to clear up just what we mean, what the whole intent of the regulations are, and then give them a chance to respond.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, could the minister assure the House and the people of this province that there has been no concessions given, or will be given to companies like Eastcan in the awarding of exploitation permits, I am not talking about exploration permits, exploitation permits on the awarding of concessions of blocks or acreage in the Labrador sea?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. PECKFORD: I have already indicated, Mr. Speaker, that no concessions have been made as of this date. Whether I can assure all the people of the Province that no concessions will be made in the future is something that is highly, that is within the realm of conjecture and that I would not like to-

MR. STRACHAN: But to this day.

MR. PECKFORD: Commit myself to that. To this day, as I indicated in the previous supplementary -

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans has a supplementary?

This will be the last question.

MR. FLIGHT: With regards to the regulations, Mr. Speaker, the minister indicated that the regulations have been completed and it will take a month or a month and a half before they are made public, to the public at large or into the House.

Is Ottawa aware of those regulations, have the regulations been submitted to Ottawa and why will it take a month or a month and a half to make these regulations available to the House?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should - with all due respect - does not seem to understand some very basic things. (1) The regulations have not been made available to Ottawa at this point in time, number one. Number two: Why is it going to take another month or a month and a half? We are talking to twelve or fifteen or twenty companies and we are giving them time to answer to us in detail and then to sit down after they have responded to us in detail, to verbally make their case and this is what is taking the time. That is all. And sometimes we meet here in St. John's, other times it is in Ottawa and sometimes it is Calgary. It is hard to schedule it. It takes sometimes two weeks just to schedule a meeting with one company, especially if they have a main office or major offices all around the world and try to get them together to sit down to talk about them. So that is the only reason, and because the regulations are so detailed.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER: Order 1. The adjourned debate on the Address in Reply.
The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: When the House rose yesterday I had finished the first part of what I wished to say in support of this sub-amendment. Before I carry on with the remainder of my remarks perhaps I could just mention a very minor point. I happened to be looking through yesterday's Hansard, and I noticed on page 2494 there is a remark attributed to the gentleman for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall). I think it was made in fact by the Minister of Public Works. It is not an important point, but if we are going to have Hansard we should make it as accurate as possible. I think if the minister and the member look at it they will confirm it.

MR. ROUSSEAU: What page?

MR. ROBERTS: 2494 of yesterday's Hansard.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday in speaking in support of the sub-amendment moved by my friend and my colleague from the district of Stephenville (Mr. McNeil), I laid out some reasons which in my view - and I think the view of any fair-minded person - are compelling reasons for the setting up of a royal commission to investigate all the circumstances surrounding the donation by the Scrivener firm to the party which forms the government of the Province of a very large sum of money, more than \$50,000. At the same time as that firm were negotiating with the government, a government made up obviously of members of the PC Party, at the same time as they were negotiating with that government a renegotiation of the contract, and I set forth the figures which showed that one of the effects of that renegotiation obviously was to increase dramatically and greatly the amount of money payable to the Scrivener firm. We do not know in fact how much has been paid to the Scrivener firm, or now to their successors in the project, the SNC, I guess they are called, that firm that was brought in when the Scrivener firm relinquished the contract, we do not know that. Perhaps one of the ministers who speaks, and I assume at least one minister will speak in this debate, and hopefully several, that perhaps they could give us that information. It would be very useful to know exactly what was there.

Mr. Roberts.

Now before I deal with some of the points raised by the Minister of Public Works yesterday - he spoke on the Late Show. He raised two points that I think I should comment upon. Let me comment upon the answer which the Premier gave earlier this morning in the Question Period to a question or two which I asked him with respect to this contract and the government's response to the - not the allegations, because they no longer are allegations, they are facts.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, there is no quorum.

MR. ROBERTS: A quorum call?

MR. HICKMAN: Yes. Before calling a quorum and leaving, may I direct the House's attention that there are only two members opposite besides the hon. Leader of the Opposition. We do not have a quorum.

MR. SPEAKER: A quorum call.

Count the House, please.

There is a quorum present.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: The only thing I would say, Mr. Speaker, is that we should make the quorum call time a little longer than three minutes because it is simply not possible to get a cup of tea in three minutes. You know, in the old days, not so far back - I am not sure if it ever happened in here when we met in this Chamber, but when the House met down in the Colonial Building they regularly adjourned at 4:15 P.M. for a cup of tea. My friend from Fogo (Capt. Winsor) would have been in the House then. 4:15 P.M. was it?

MR. MURPHY: When the Premier at that time got vexed with us they would not allow us.

MR. ROBERTS: That is what happened was it? When the Premier gets vexed here we do not get that at all.

MR. MURPHY: Kit Murphy used to handle that machine.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, Kit Murphy. Kit Murphy, you know, alone did what it now must take ten or twelve girls to do, you know to transcribe it, She kept all the records and transcribed all the debates.

MR. MURPHY: Kit Murphy is a great person.

MR. ROBERTS: In any event, Sir, now that reminiscences period is over let me come back to the harsh reality of the government's conduct in this matter which I think is harsh and I think it requires examination and possibly even a word or two of criticism.

I am sorry the Premier is leaving again -

AN HON. MEMBER: He is going to get a cup of tea.

MR. ROBERTS: A cup of tea? Well that would be a change and a welcome one.

Mr. Speaker, let me however refer to some of the points which the Premier made in answering the question because I think his answers - did Your Honour rule that cowardly was an improper word, - or was it just improper in the use of the question?

MR. SPEAKER: In the particular context I asked for it to be withdrawn.

MR. ROBERTS: Okay, then, well that being so I shall not use it again. But let me say that I do not think very much of the tactics adopted by the Premier in his answer because they reminded me of what the Minister of Finance on the television the other night accused the gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) of doing, namely of conducting a smear campaign. And so let me just -

MR. NEARY: What was that?

MR. ROBERTS: The Minister of Finance the other night accused the gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) of conducting a smear campaign.

MR. NEARY: Me?

MR. ROBERTS: By tabling the Dick Greene receipt, and that was on, yes, on CJON television. Unless my very own ears deceive me it was the minister's very own voice and the minister's very own visage. But be that as it may, Sir, be that as it may the Premier's answer today was a masterpiece of some terms which I am not allowed to use.

First of all he referred to Mr. John Doyle, Now what the devil Mr. John Doyle has to do with the Health Sciences Project escapes me. I do understand, and this may be why the Premier brought it up, that Mr. Doyle, after Mr. Davidson left Scrivener, and according to the Ministry at the time back in 1973, Mr. Davidson's departure from Scrivener was entirely his own decision. I questioned that at the time, a number of us did, but the hon. gentleman opposite maintained that Mr. Davidson's decision to depart the Scrivener firm was entirely voluntary and they did it on the best of terms.

But subsequently Mr. Davidson became connected in some way, I do not know, I really do not care how, but did, I understand, become connected in some way with Mr. John Doyle. Well that is for Mr. Doyle to explain and for Mr. Davidson to explain. If the Premier does not know about it and wants to know about it then I would think that is one more reason why we should have a royal commission set up and let him subpoena - or let the royal commission subpoena Mr. Davidson. I doubt if Mr. Doyle would respond to a subpoena judging on his record of responding to invitations to appear in this Province at various judicial proceedings of late. Although, I ask the Minister of Justice, is John Doyle currently "a fugitive" from - what is the legal status? He is out on bail.

Mr. Roberts:

The Supreme Court of Canada ordered his bail be returned; other charges were laid and he has declined to appear. Does that make him "a fugitive"?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: No. I mean he has declined, Mr Doyle has declined the Crown's invitation to appear to answer certain charges which have been laid in respect of some allegations about stock dealings - is it? - wash trading of stock, but he is not in position, say, of Mr. Vardy, who is resisting an attempted extradition. There are no extradition proceedings now in train against Mr. Doyle, are there? And he left the country legally. Is that not true? I mean, I have not followed it. It is labyrinthine and very complicated the legal dealings of Mr. John Doyle and the Crown. The Crown have not been overly vigorous in pressing their case, I feel.

By in any event, Mr. Speaker, that is perhaps a little beyond the point. The point is that the Premier choose to bring Mr. Doyle name into it. I do not know what Mr. Doyle has to do with it. As far as I know he has nothing at all to do with this, except as I have said I do understand that subsequent to Mr. Davidson leaving the Scrivener firm he did enter into some sort of arrangements in relationship with Mr. Doyle, and that maybe is what is bothering the Premier. I do not know what else may be bothering the Premier unless it is that he does not want this debate to go ahead, and I can understand that, because the Premier and the government have shown a great reluctance to have the facts come out in this matter.

The Premier also mentioned when the contract - and I believe I am quoting him - when the contract was entered into back in 1967 or 1968. Well, Sir, that is just quite incorrect. The facts will show, and if the Premier had made the least effort to check his facts, he would realize that the contract with Scrivener was not entered into until late in 1971, in fact, I happen to have

Mr. Roberts:

here, by one of those lovely coincidences that makes life so worth-while, a copy of the letter which I wrote in June of 1971 to the Hon. John Monroe, who was then the Minister of National Health and Welfare in Ottawa, now the Minister of Labour in Mr. Trudeau's Administration up there, and that was the letter in June 1971 which acknowledged the fact that the Government of Canada had agreed to give us \$30 million towards the cost of the Health Sciences Centre, and that it was subsequent to that, of course, that arrangements were made to hire the Scrivener firm, and in fact the Scrivener preliminary design report and estimate was not presented or prepared until November 1971, in fact November 30, 1971. And at that stage, interestingly enough, the project manager, the man who signed the covering letter here was Mr. R. Harvey Self. So I mean Mr. Davidson came into it subsequent to that. In fact, I am prepared to say that Mr. Davidson was not involved at all with the Scrivener project in Newfoundland or to my knowledge with the Scrivener firm, but certainly with the Scrivener firm's operations in this Province until after the present government took office.

So, you know, the Premier is obviously on a sticky wicket, he is obvious tender, whatever his motives are I do not know, but his facts are completely incorrect. This whole train of events with the Scrivener firm began back in the Summer of 1971. Mr. Davidson, the gentleman who gave the contribution to the P.C. Party, did not enter into the picture, as far as I know, until after the present Premier assumed office and he and his colleagues came into the ministry, which was in January of 1972. So the Premier is on a bit of a sticky-wicket there. As a matter of fact, Sir, the Premier's statements are just completely false, inaccurate, incorrect and untrue.

Now, Sir, the Premier also in his answers managed, not successfully, but managed to avoid, and even tried to evade, I submit, the question, the real question of this motion, which is

Mr. Roberts:

not the escalation in costs - We will have another sub-amendment dealing with that. I think we could provide eleven or twelve more sub-amendments, I think there can be, Mr. Speaker, and then of course there has only been one amendment moved to the Throne Speech, Each of my colleagues has the right to move an amendment when the time comes, and we can have a full round. There are, counting the gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) for these purposes, I think there are eighteen or nineteen of us now in the Opposition benches, and we can have eighteen sub-amendments on each main amendment if they are in order. So I confidentially expect the Throne Speech will go for a little while yet, and we have a number of specific points we wish to raise, and one of them may very well be this question of the escalation, because that is worth a day or so of debate as well.

Since the will not produce any facts, since they have avoided it and ducked it and evaded it and tried to cover up and hide, misrepresented, all of the tricks and tactics that governments are guilty of then we shall

MR. ROBERTS:

have to force them to debate it by bringing forth these sub-amendments. And I think it is a very good parliamentary tactic, it is a new one, new to this House at least, and I think it is proving very worthwhile. In any event, Sir, the Premier in his answer talked a great deal about escalations but did not deal with the main issue, which is the propriety of the government accepting a contribution of more than \$50,000 from this firm under these circumstances. I asked him straight out, man-fashion, whether he thought it proper or not. He did not answer. Instead he launched on these completely irrelevant attacks on Mr. Doyle. He talked about me being Minister of Health. Well I will agree to have a Royal Commission look into my conduct of office as Minister of Health or Minister of Public Welfare anytime the Premier wants to do it, and all I would ask in return is that we have a Royal Commission into his conduct of the office of the Premier beginning with the affair of Mr. William Saunders and going on up through the piece. Anytime the Premier wants to do that I would be very happy, Sir, and I am delighted to appear before any Royal Commission and to answer any questions that anybody wants to put to me. I would be simply delighted.

The Premier may or may not be able to hear what I am saying. He has left the Chamber. He has made his brief visit and he is gone again. But if he is in one of the common rooms or one of the rooms where the public address system carries forth, I would hope that he will listen to what I say and I hope he will respond by accepting my request and my invitation.

But in any event, Sir, I did want to dispose of those irrelevancies. There may be some who felt that they were germane and they were correct. I think I have shown conclusively that the Premier's answer was a lot of hogwash and a lot of mishmash and a lot of nonsense, an absolute attempt to smother, to cover up as opposed to an attempt to expose and to answer.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Public Works yesterday in a very emotional plea - and there is an old statement in law, an old maxim in law, that when the facts are against you you argue the law and when

MR. ROBERTS:

the law is against you, you argue the facts, and when you cannot have either on your side, you get emotional. The Minister of Public Works got emotional yesterday in a Late Show debate item referring to escalations. I respect the genuineness of his emotion and respect his feelings on this matter. And I hope he will speak in the debate. If he chooses to be the minister speaking in response to the motion moved by my friend from Stephenville (Mr. McNeil), he has unlimited time, all the time he would need to speak at whatever length he wants as long as he is relevant to the debate.

He made two points, though, that I think require a little elucidation. First of all he keeps repeating that the escalation provided for in the Scrivener proposal was only five per cent. Well that is just not correct.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I used that as an example.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, he used that as an example. If that was all he used, it as it was a very bad example because, Sir, the preliminary design report and estimate - and this is the information which I had as Minister of Health in 1971, the end of that year, I am not sure when I, yes, I got it on January 5, 1972, which would have been a fortnight or so before I left office as Minister of Health. It was dated November 30, 1971, addressed to the Department of Public Works and subsequently it would have been received by that department and sent through to me. I have no doubt there are copies of it around. It is a printed book. That contained the original budget cost estimate figures of \$45 million. And I might add - my friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) would probably be more up on this than I am - that up until about a year ago the government were maintaining the project was still being done within that \$45 million estimate. We found that hard to accept, but they were maintaining it time and time again in the House and outside. But at that point, Sir, there was provided a total of \$4.5 million for contingencies and escalation, and that is ten per cent.

MR. ROBERTS:

The time escalation, item (g) on the list there, was \$2.5 million, and item (e) was called progressive design contingency, \$2 million. Total them, \$4.5 million, ten per cent of \$45 million. So the Minister of Public Works picked a very bad example, Mr. Speaker, a very bad example indeed. The original estimates provided for at least a ten per cent escalation over the life of the contract. That may not have been adequate. The rate of inflation has certainly been far higher than anybody anticipated and I will grant that. But the minister, you know, should not rely on his handy-dandy whiz-bang calculation. If he thinks that is an argument in his favour, it is not.

There is quite a lot of explanation in here of the factors affecting the budget cost estimate. I do not propose to go into them, Sir, because I have only got about half an hour left in the time allotted to me and there are some other points I wish to make. But any hon. gentleman who wishes to look at them I will be very happy to supply any and all concerned with copies of this preliminary design report and estimate. And this was the first proposal received with respect to the Health Sciences Complex. I may add at a time when

Mr. Roberts.

Mr. Davidson, to the best of my recollection and knowledge, was not in anyway connected with the Scrivener firm. Mr. Davidson came in when the Tories came in, as I recall it.

MR. NEARY: The spruce budworm, Davidson and the Tories came in at the same time.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Sir, - ah, but the spruce budworm did not bring the sort of goodies that Mr. Davidson brought to the PC Party.

The minister also - and I think this was the emotional point of his plea yesterday in the Late Show, Sir - spoke of his belief in the beneficial nature of the present contract existing with the Scrivener firm as opposed to the prior contract. Now I cannot argue with him. I do not have the prior contract.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I have it right here.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I am glad the minister has it, and I do not have it. And in any event even if I had it I do not see how we can compare them at this stage, because we do not know - I do not know how much Scrivener have got, nor do I know what they did for it. I do know that the whole Health Sciences Complex has been mismanaged very horribly. I think the evidence is quite conclusive on that. And I do not know whether that is the minister's responsibility or not. I know that his officials were after him. I happen to have a memorandum here dated May 6, 1976 from Mr. Brophy, you know, talking - and this is interesting one - a memorandum, it was sent to the Assistant Deputy Minister of Technical Services from the Director of Planning and Construction re Health Sciences Complex, May 6, 1976, signed M.R. Brophy, Professional Engineer. I do not know Mr. Brophy. I do not know whether he is still in the department or not. But apparently he sent this memorandum. It was in fact dealing with debate in the House. But he makes a remark in here which is very, very interesting. "While it is admitted that at the outset few controls existed, this has been remedied and control has been adequate since 1973." In other words, when

Mr. Roberts.

we left office the decision had been taken to start. The Scrivener firm had been engaged but as far as I know that is about all that had been done. I doubt if \$5,000 had been spent or committed on the project. Everything had been set. The money had been arranged from Ottawa, and the approvals had been given by Cabinet and by the authorities, but I doubt if much more than that had been done, and here we are in May, 1976, the Director of Planning and Construction advising the Assistant Deputy Minister that it was not until 1973 that there were adequate controls with respect to the expenditure. So it is going to be very hard for the minister now to maintain that the thing was in order, particularly in view of the fact that by 1973 these immense donations had been received by the Tory Party.

Mr. Speaker, all I will say about the question of whether the contract is more beneficial or not is that if the minister, as I believe he does, believes that it is more beneficial, then I would think, Sir, that he would be the very first to welcome putting it to the test in an impartial forum such as a royal commission. Because, Sir, it is one thing to make an assertion here in the House of Assembly, a body which by its nature is partisan; it is another thing entirely, Mr. Speaker, to have it submitted to an impartial and hopefully a judicial type of examination by a royal commission. So I assume, Sir, the minister's firm belief as stated here in the House, that the arrangement which was negotiated by him and his colleagues, was superior to whatever arrangement existed before they came into office or before the new one was made, then I submit, Sir, that that should be a very strong factor in urging him and inclining him to support the very idea of a royal commission to look into all of the incidents surrounding the Scrivener firm's involvement with the government.

Now, Sir, yesterday I spoke of what I referred to and what in fact are two very compelling facts that say we must have a royal commission. The first was that the Scrivener firm made an immense donation to the Tory Party, a donation that was admitted by the finance chairman who received it, Mr. Richard Green. The

Mr. Roberts

second factor was the fact that during the period that that donation was being received by the PC Party - and I suggest with the Premier's knowledge that donation was received by the PC Party - the Premier took it as notice, and he will answer me in due course, but I suggest it was with his knowledge. And we will let a royal commission determine that one, too. Because the man who told the Premier, of course, would also be able to testify as to when he told the Premier and what the Premier knew. Mr. Speaker, at the same time as that was done the fees were renegotiated and a very large increase in the item as to fees payable in respect to the various heads that I outlined and mentioned yesterday. And those were figures which we got out of the ministry.

Mr. Speaker, at the same time,

MR. ROBERTS: and this is a new point, the government were engaged with Scrivener in another matter, and this will be of interest to my friend from the district of Carbonear, they had engaged Scrivener to build the Carbonear Hospital.

Now, Sir, that was something done by the present government. To the best of my knowledge the Scrivener firm had not been retained in respect of the Carbonear project at the time we left office, no firm had been. We had decided as a government to build the hospital in Carbonear, I believe the initial contracts for the foundation work were let. But the decision to hire the Scrivener firm came subsequently when the present government took office.

MR. NEARY: In 1972.

MR. ROBERTS: 1972, at the same time of course as these immense donations were being received.

Now, Sir, back in 1973 there was a lot of debate in the House about the Carbonear Hospital, because the project had gotten out of hand, and because there had been cost-plus contracts awarded by the Scrivener firm, and because there had been some departures from the Scrivener firm. It may have been at about this time Mr. Davidson left the Scrivener firm. At that time of course none of us was aware of the donations that had been made. We might have had suspicions but we were not aware of any donations that had been made, and particularly anything of the order of \$50,000.

The Evening Telegram, a newspaper which the Premier was in the habit of referring to as "a yellow dog of journalism", once called a press conference for that, ran quite a detailed story back in February, 1973, that would have been before the contract was signed in fact. The Minister of Public Works at the time was Mr. Val Earle, who subsequently met a fate at the hands of the electorate of the district of

MR. ROBERTS: Fortune Bay and Hermitage.

The headline in this was "Hospital Fiasco Under Scrutiny," and I do not want to go through it all. It is here if anybody wants to look at it, February 24, 1973, The Evening Telegram. I will just read the points which the author of this story, Mr. Bill Kelly, then a Telegram staff writer, now the news editor at the Telegram summed up. It said, "Government officials consider the project 'a total fiasco from day one.'" Next point, "Performance of the construction managers, Scrivener Projects Newfoundland Limited is under 'close scrutiny' by the government, and despite the Progressive Conservative Government's announced policy that all work on public projects was to be awarded by open public tender, two contracts at Carbonear, valued at nearly \$350,000 were negotiated and let to one construction company. The whole project was at least two months behind schedule. Bidders on one aspect of the job were required to submit their tender to a specific Newfoundland firm -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: -which was the company that was awarded contracts without -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, my friend from Fogo and my friend from Bonavista South both have loud voices; please, if they want to converse would they do so outside the House.

And it goes on that "a site project manager quit his job and left the Province because he disagreed with the way certain contracts were awarded."

Now, Sir, the subject was debated quite extensively in the House in one of those infamous allnight sessions to which the gentleman from St. John's East used to subject us in his inability to get anything out of the House. Anybody who wants to look at the Hansard for Thursday, April 12, 1973, and Friday, April 13, 1973 -

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: It may be a point of order, it may be a point of observation, The hon. gentleman obviously needs to take a refresher course in Dale Carnegie.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman from St. John's East used to know some rules of the House, now he is just playing his ignorance of the rules of this House and his contempt for the process of debate.

Mr. Speaker, Friday, April 13th., there was a new Hansard, it was the same session, and there are some words here, some debate here quoting Mr. Earle, who was then the Minister of Public Works, putting up a very weak defence, an extraordinarily weak defence of the government's dealings. And interestingly enough, at about that same time, guess who was defending the government? Mr. Andrew Davidson. Mr. Earle quoted some letters written by Mr. Davidson defending the government and subsequently The Evening Telegram, actually the Telegram report was in February and the House debate was in April, but Mr. Andrew Davidson was defending the government in February 1973, which of course was five or six months before he got the receipt from Mr. Richard Greene in respect of these contributions,

MR. ROBERTS: some months presumably, at least two or three, after the money was paid by Mr. Davidson in behalf of Scrivener to the government. The point at issue was who had ordered that the contracts be given without tender, and the minister said, "Oh we knew nothing of it, like Pontius Pilot we must wash our hands of this," and Mr. Davidson agreed. Mr. Harvey Self, and he was the company president operating from the head office in Toronto, said that the order to give those contracts without going to the formality of tenders came from the government.

The man on the spot, our friend Mr. Andrew Davidson, disagreed with that. And if Your Honour or any other member wishes to look through the Hansards you will find there Mr. Earle making as best he could a very weak answer to a very strong case, and the best argument he had in his favour was the letters from Mr. Davidson and the Scrivener firm. Now, Mr. Speaker, - and we also know, we should add of course, that the Carbonear Hospital cost about twice what it ought to have cost; my friend from Carbonear I am sure is familiar with it. It was a year behind schedule being built, the escalations were terrific and of course Scrivener were in there as project manager and I have no doubt there fees were infinitely higher than they were. - As a matter of fact, it is not hard to understand, I was going to say it was hard to understand how Scrivener went bankrupt, but Scrivener Newfoundland did not go bankrupt; Scrivener Canada went bankrupt, Scrivener Newfoundland did not, and of course it is not hard to understand when you realize they were getting a fee which was a percentage of what was spent. So the more was spent obviously the more that they got and they could well afford obviously these very large donations to the Tory party.

MR. MOORES: I might say that the Carbonear Hospital is not finished yet.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, my friend from Carbonear has made a further point

MR. ROBERTS: which I should emphasize, that the Carbonear Hospital is not finished yet and in other words the final cost of it is not really known. Mr. Speaker, I think it is obvious that any fair minded person looking at the facts which I have outlined, and I have tried to outline these facts dispassionately, without rhetoric and without heat, because I believe, Sir, they are of great seriousness, of great importance.

And I think that any fair minded person, Sir, looking at those facts would have to agree that there is here a set of circumstances which cries out for investigation. We have on one hand the admission by the finance chairman of the PC party that he received more than \$50,000, and there is no doubt, Sir, that is a very large donation. I do not know what donations the PC party get, but I have said and I say again that in my time as Leader of the Liberal Party, and that is the only time of which I can speak, donations of that size are unheard of.

Now, Sir, at the same time that this firm was making these immense donations - and remember that this firm came to Newfoundland only to do business with the government and had no continuing presence or interest in the Province beyond doing this business with the government - the same time as they were making these donations they were negotiating with the government a new contract in respect to the Health and Science Center. They were also negotiating a contract with respect to the Carbonear Hospital.

MR. NEARY: And Twillingate.

MR. ROBERTS: They did some work at Twillingate, I do not know how much, not very much because I think by that time the government began to realize that Scrivener were incompetent and that Mr. Davidson and his colleagues were not doing the job. If only Mr. Self here then things would have gone better I believe, but be that as it may, the record is there.

MR. ROBERTS:

Now, Mr. Speaker, the jobs were horribly mismanaged but that is another issue. We will have the opportunity I am sure to debate that. And if the government will not call estimates, we will make them call estimates by putting down the sub-amendments. By my calculation we can have something like 180 sub-amendments yet on the Throne Speech and we will put down, if it is in order, 180 of them and we will have our estimate debate that way. We will go on having our estimates debate one issue at a time since the government insist upon sticking by this seventy five hour rule.

We have not debated the estimates of Public Works in this House for two or three years, but we will do it this way. If it is in order, and I believe it is, cross each bridge as we come to it. But we have these facts, Sir; extraordinarily large donations, re-negotiations of contracts with total payment for fees going in the estimates, heaven alone knows what they are in reality, they are obviously higher than that in reality, with the estimated total fees going from \$3.65 million to \$5.4 million.

MR. ROBERTS: No public tenders, needless to say, no public discussion. We also have the government hiring that same firm to deal with another hospital. Then, Sir, we have the president of the firm saying the government had ordered them to give out contracts in respect of that hospital without going through the formality of tenders. Then we have the minister of the time defending this action on the grounds that the president of the company did not know what he was talking about, but that the man here knew what he was talking about, and the man here said, Oh I never had any pressure from the government. This was the same man who made the donation of \$52,000, a fact evidenced by the receipt.

MR. NEARY: Who later tried to sell a story to the newspapers called, "The Watergate In Newfoundland".

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, and later made some affidavits which are libelous. They may or may not be accurate - if in fact they are accurate they are not libelous, and I could read them here because I have protection from libel. I have a copy of the affidavit. I do not intend to read it because I do not think it is the proper thing to do, and I think my friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) felt the same way because he did not read it the other day. He has a copy of it too. The Premier referred to it. There are lots of copies around.

You know, Mr. Davidson is somewhat of a discredited man in the testimony on this sense. But nobody could deny the fact he gave \$52,000 to the P.C. Party. That cannot be denied. The man who received it, a former law partner of my friend from Kilbride (Mr. Wells), has made a public statement saying that yes, he did receive it. There is nothing wrong with that, nothing illegal. There are those of us who think that things should not be done that way, but until the law is changed, and the present government have shown no inclination to change the law. Ten years ago no province, no jurisdiction prohibited donations, now many do. The United States does, but not Newfoundland. A few years ago it was just an idea, and now it is reality in many other places.

MR. ROBERTS:

Hopefully it will be here.

But we have all these facts, Sir, this tangled web, this skein, this mesh of dealings between the Scrivener firm and the government, and the question quite simply is; where does the truth lie, Mr. Speaker? What is the truth? The questions leap out of the page demanding to be asked. Why did Scrivener give \$52,600? Who asked them for it? Who received it? Was all that money spent for political purposes or was some of it spent for other purposes? There are questions.

Hon. gentlemen opposite know the questions. They may know the answers. I know the questions but I do not know the answers. What did Scrivener get in return? Nobody is going to convince me that the Scrivener firm, a firm with no history in this Province and no future in this Province, a firm that had come in only to do business on this one project until they were subsequently hired by the government for a second project and until Mr. Davidson came into the picture, a man who was not known in my time as a minister. I do not think I ever heard of him. Certainly the man with whom we dealt was Mr. Harvey Self. Nobody will convince me, Sir, or the people of this Province that the Scrivener firm gave \$52,600 to the P.C. Party without expecting or hoping for something in return. Naivete! It would be naivete beyond naivete for anyone to maintain that. I am sure my friend from Kilbride (Mr. Wells) does not believe that for a moment. Or my friend from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), or the Minister of Public Works or others I could name.

Not to say there is anything wrong. The crime of bribery and the crime of abuse of public trust, and they are separate crimes in the Criminal Code, are narrowly defined. And I am not alleging that there is either bribery or a breach of public trust in this case. There may have been. The evidence brought out by a royal commission might indicate there was but I am not making those allegations.

MR. NEARY:

Influence peddling, is that a crime in the Criminal Code?

MR. ROBERTS: Influence peddling may or may not be a crime depending on the precise circumstances, Sir. Bribery is a crime, and abuse of office is a crime. So is theft.

Mr. Speaker, the questions scream out for an answer. They demand an answer. The facts cannot just be ignored. I expect some minister will stand up and say - oh what will their tactic be? They may launch a stinging attack "on us" for alleged sins that were carried out while we were the government.

Well I find it interesting, Sir. They have been in office for five or six years now and they have not shown any evidence of an alleged sin despite all the witch hunts we saw.

Mr. Roberts:

I find as well, Sir, they have been in office for five or six years they made no move to make any reforms. They used to talk about public tenders. The Auditor General exploded that. I find it surpassing, Sir, that they now, these paragons of morality as they used to claim to be, the hon. gentlemen opposite, now apparently do not want this issue discussed and do not want it examined, and I find that passing strange. If this group of men, Sir, have nothing to fear in their administration you think they would welcome it. We have had royal commissions for far less in this Province. We have got one underway now out in Bonne Bay, into those land things for far less :- and the moment it was raised by the gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) in response to a petition which he received from people out there, all the ministers concerned went scurrying off to the Cabinet and said, "Let us have a royal commission to protect our good names." I find it passing strange, Sir, that there has been no such scurrying here with that request. There has been scurrying, I have no doubt. But, Sir, there has been no request that I know of, and there have been no announcement, and no decision that I am aware of to set up an investigation. So the question is, why not? What are they hiding?

Was something demanded of Scrivener? Was this more than a voluntary contribution, a response to a passing of the hat by Mr. Richard Greene? Was some of this money misapplied? Because, Sir, it is proper to receive political donations, but it is not proper to use those donations for anything except the lawful and proper expenditures of a political party. If any of this, for example, was used to purchase, say, a car or a house for the use of any individual, that would be improper. If any of it were used to pay for a holiday trip, it would be improper. If any of it were used for anything other than the legitimate expenditures of a political party, advertising, travel, purchase

Mr. Roberts:

of materials, of printing and what have you, legitimate and proper expenditures - it costs \$300,000, \$400,000, \$500,000 at least to run an election campaign in this Province.

MR. NEARY: One million dollars a year.

MR. SMALLWOOD: One million dollars at least.

MR. ROBERTS: One million dollars for an election campaign?

Well that may be why we did not win the election, Sir, We spent about \$350,000 in the last general election, the Tories spent something over \$1 million.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Even that ain't hay.

MR. ROBERTS: Well I agree it ain't hay, as my friend from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) would say.

MR. MURPHY: What it cost the Province \$10 million in debt the hon. member from Twillingate told us -

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, Sir.

MR. MURPHY: - - and I do not know what it cost to campaign.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, yes, yes, yes, and if we only knew what it cost the Province for the gentleman from St. John's Centre (Mr. Murphy) we would be further ahead.

MR. MURPHY: I do not know, I have no evidence, but I would like to find out.

MR. ROBERTS: But, Mr. Speaker, the point I am making is that these questions, Sir, come naturally and inevitably -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: - if the government will not set up the royal commission. Who got the money? Was it misapplied? Was it solicited? What was given in return, if anything? These are the questions that must arise, You do not need a suspicious mind or a cynical mind, you do not have to have the cast of mine of the gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) who sees worms under every rock. You do not have to have that to ask these questions arising out of this kind of factual circumstance.

Mr. Roberts:

They cry out.

Men of integrity, Sir, men of honour would demand an investigation. A cloud has been cast upon every member of the ministry, a cloud has been cast upon the Minister of Public Works. I do not think it is justified in his case. But the cloud is there, not by me, I am only giving voice to the facts. I have not made up anything, I have not invented anything, and I have not charged anything. But the cloud is there, the question is there, now it hangs over the head of the Minister of Justice. What is he going to do about it? Is he going to go to Cabinet? He is a righteous man, he has told us so on many occasions. Is he going to go to Cabinet and demand a royal commission, To clear my name and everybody else's name?

I understand, Mr. Speaker, that Your Honour wished to welcome a group of students who are in the gallery, and I would think that is a very worth-while thing, If Your Honour wishes I will interrupt myself for a moment or two.

MR. SPEAKER: On behalf of all hon. members I wish to welcome to the House of Assembly twenty-eight Grades X and XI students from the Swift Current Integrated High School, They are accompanied by two teachers, Mr. George Lockyer and Mr. Max Oldford, and I know all hon. members join me in welcoming these young men and women and their teachers to the House of Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I hope the students have come on an historic day because I hope that the minister who speaks in response to this motion will stand and announce that a Royal Commission has been set up to look into these circumstances and to clear up the allegations and that the ministry are a group of honourable men who want to dispel any suspicions that these circumstances may have raised because, Sir, the circumstances are raised. The questions are there. I did not invent the receipt. I did not invent Mr. Richard Greene confirming that the receipt was genuine, that the money was received. I did not invent the amount, the very large amount, of the donation. I did not invent the renegotiation of the contract with Scrivener. I did not invent the role of Mr. Andrew Davidson, defender of the government, the man on whom the government relied in an attempt to refute allegations that they had given out contracts at Carbonear without going through the tender process. I did not invent the fact that the costs of this project and the Carbonear project have escalated. All I have done is give voice to it, Sir.

So I say to the ministry now - the Premier with his usual assiduity to the House, his usual desire to participate in the legislative debates has of course absented himself. But I have no doubt he will be informed of what has gone on if he is not aware already. I had hoped he would speak and maybe he will. But, Sir, I say to hon. gentlemen in the ministry that they must answer this. The best way for them to answer is to set up a Royal Commission. They have done it for far less. If we can have a Royal Commission to look into some very general allegations about land purchases in Bonne Bay, something of far lesser importance than the natural circumstances, the natural questions here, questions of abuse of office at the highest level because we are talking of contributions to the government party and we are talking of actions taken by the government involving thousands and hundred of thousands and millions of dollars. So if we can set up a Royal Commission to look into Bonne Bay we can surely set up a Royal

MR. ROBERTS:

Commission to look into circumstances surrounding the gift of \$52,600 to the PC Party by Mr. Andrew Davidson on behalf of Scrivener.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about the welfare recipient who got a stove -

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, that is right. My friend from Bell Island (Mr. Neary) went through the fire and came through it unscathed. All the allegations made about a welfare recipient who may or may not have got a stove improperly valved at - what? - \$300 or \$400. I mean, you know, what is that? The government were quite willing to investigate that, Sir; quite willing. Now are they going to be quite willing to investigate the gift of \$50,000 to their party while they were negotiating a contract that has put millions of dollars into the hands of the Scrivener Firm? That is the question, Sir. That is the issue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Sir, we have put down this sub-amendment because we believe this issue should be discussed and we stand ready to debate it, Sir. I hope hon. gentlemen opposite will enter into it with facts. If they want to confine themselves to attacks on us, let them. But let it also be known that those facts are irrelevant. The Premier gets up and talks about John Doyle as if that had anything to do with this. And the Premier gets up and talks about 1967 or 1968 when the Premier was up in Ottawa not doing his duty. Mr. Eight Per Cent they called him then. He made eight per cent of the votes in the House of Commons during his time as a member. You would think they would have taken back his salary on the grounds he had been paid a minimum wage, Sir, and he would not even have earned it.

Mr. Speaker, all of the hon. gentlemen opposite now have a clear duty cast upon them. My friend from St. John's South (Dr. Collins), my friend from Exploits (Dr. Twomey), my friend from St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), my friend from Kilbride (Mr. Wells), my friend from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), all men of integrity and stature, men who are devoted to this Province, Sir, and they now have to search

MR. ROBERTS:

their consciences. I have laid out the facts. I have made no charges. I have made no allegations. I have asked the questions which must be asked growing out of these facts.

The only way, Sir, to answer those questions is with an impartial investigation by a Royal Commission. We urge the government to do it, Sir. We demand that the government do it. Whether they do it or not, Sir, will be a cutting test of their morality and their honesty and their desire to see the affairs of this Province carried out as they must be by a group of men above reproach whose conduct is above reproach. I will vote for the amendment, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. John's North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, the previous exhibition is a hard act to follow. Very briefly I will recap some of the points that the hon. gentleman made. He did not make that many points, but he took a long time to make them. The sub-amendment calls for a royal commission to investigate the Scrivener contribution. The Leader of the Opposition has said that money is part of politics, elections are expensive, and there is no offense so far. The receipt was valid, and in fact it has been confirmed by Mr. Greene in The Evening Telegram, March 10, 1977. He claims that the circumstances are unusual and so far, although this fact has been known for some time, he alleges that there has been no government rebuttal. Now I am not standing up to rebut for the government. I am standing up to make some comments upon this whole situation. He says that the sum is immense. I suppose that is relative. I would like to comment upon that. I would like to comment upon the immensity of the sum, because I recall well the events of 1971-1972. Certainly the amounts of money that the Liberal Party were spending then were astronomical. The increase in their demands was not arithmetical, it was exponential. There was practically no limit to their rapacity, and I am delighted to see the former Premier, whose name escapes me for the moment, sitting in this Chamber. Perhaps he can contribute to this debate.

MR. NEARY: Do not be so bold.

MR. J. CARTER: I cannot help a defective memory, Mr. Speaker.

I would guess - and here it is absolute guess work - but I would guess that on the night of January 18, 1972 somebody came by Mr. Greene's house with a wheelbarrow and said, Look, just I wish you well. He was probably so use to having enormous requests made to him that he probably came by with a wheelbarrow and a truck and started shovelling it in unbidden.

MR. NEARY: No, somebody sent him a letter from Bill Saunders.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J. CARTER: This would not surprise me one bit.

MR. WHITE: Bill Saunders, right.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): Order, please!

MR. J. CARTER: I do not want to get mixed up. If I could have some silence, Mr. Speaker.

Now I never, personally speaking, I never liked Scrivener. I never liked the whole project management concept. It defeats the spirit of the free calling of public tenders. And although in some complex jobs it appears to be necessary, or this is the defense that is made for it, it always in my view ends up costing you more, and it is very, very hard to control the costs. No project manager is able to give you a final irrevocable cost as a proper bidder is able to do, in fact must do because he signs a bond. He takes out a bond, what is called a performance bond, assuring that he can do the particular job for the amount stated. The project manager, as far as I understand the concept, does not do this, and does not have to do it, and he says, "Oh, I will put out the sub-contracts on tenders. I will get the best price possible for you." But it is a very difficult thing to control. Now there is nothing wrong with an individual or a company going the project management route, but it is something else when a public agency does that. And I feel that it is not the most efficient way to run a railroad. I did not like the Scrivener's attitude either. They had a very patronizing meeting one day that I attended while I was a member of the government, and they were saying, "Oh, we have all got to get together here and push, push, push this, that, the other." They were very patronizing, overbearing, and I just did not like their attitude. So I have never had any sympathy for them, but that is really beside the point.

Now the Leader of the Opposition did give us a very good performance. Gentlemen who were not here yesterday missed what I thought was a very excellent performance. At the crescendo of his speech, when he called out, "Has the government got anything to hide?" he received

Mr. J. Carter.

applause from both sides of the House. He reminds me of that eighteenth century revivalist who apparently was able to bring tears to his audiences eyes merely by the way he pronounced Mesopotamia. He, in fact, moved us all very deeply, but there was not much said.

Now the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) as far as I am concerned is the real villain of this piece. For some years now and certainly for some months he has been

Mr. Carter:

going around suggesting, "Oh, I know this, and I know that, and I know the other; and if I said this, and if I said that, I could hang this one, I could hang that one." In fact there is a word to describe gentlemen like that.

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

Mr. Speaker, the accusation, the allegation just made by the hon. gentleman, Sir, are completely untrue. And I ask Your Honour to ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw the statements that the gentleman made. I have not been going around saying I am going to hang this one, or I got this one that one, or I am going to hang somebody else. That is not true, Sir, that is just not true. And I ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw it.

MR. CARTER: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. Certainly I will withdraw any allegation of impropriety that I may have made, but the fact remains that the hon. gentleman has been going around with an owl-like cast to his face saying, "Oh, if I told what I know there would be trouble."

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order. The hon. gentleman cannot twist his words, Sir. The hon. gentleman now has shifted his ground, and is using now a different phrasology.

I ask Your Honour to ask that gentleman to withdraw the original statement, Sir, and apologize to the House.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): I feel that it is not an actual point of order but just a difference of opinion between two members.

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, a difference of opinion between two hon. gentlemen, what I would hoped you would say.

In any event there is a word for that kind of activity, and it is a four letter word and it begins with 'P' and it ends with 'P', and it is an unpleasant sort of activity, It does not do anyone any good. If the hon. has some evidence, some hard evidence, he should table it. He tabled something, a mere receipt.

Mr. J. Carter:

And I would suggest that the kind of sums that were being bandied about at that time were astronomical on both sides. Now I would want a little more than that before I would vote for a royal commission.

I have heard rumours that there is a great deal more that could be tabled, a great deal more evidence that could be presented. I do not believe it. I think if it were tabled we would find that it was just as circumstantial as the present piece of evidence.

MR. NEARY: That is not circumstantial, that is a fact.

MR. J. CARTER: It is a fact, but it is merely a tip of an iceberg. As the Leader of the Opposition himself has said that as far as the facts go there is no impropriety.

MR. WHITE: Let us have a look at it.

MR. J. CARTER: I had a look at it. I have a copy.

AN HON. MEMBER: Let us have a look at it.

MR. J. CARTER: I have a copy of it. I am coming to this and I will answer the hon. gentleman's point.

Now I will make no secret of the fact that I and quite a number of us, quite a number of the members of this House are not entirely happy with the record of this particular government over the last five years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J. CARTER: We were left with some monsters by the former administration that I do not feel we have adequately dealt with, and not necessarily in any particular order, but I will just go over them very quickly; hon. gentlemen know all about them. There is the Churchill Falls, Upper and Lower, that was a monster that was left to us, and impossible for us to sort out. There is the Labrador Linerboard, the debate is yet to come forward. This is another nightmare. Come By Chance is already closed, but it is still a nightmare, it still haunts us. ERCO is anything but satisfactory. The Health Sciences is really the subject of this

Mr. J. Carter:

sub-amendment, and the goings on related thereto. The cost escalations are certainly out of control. In fact there are some people who say that the Health Sciences should not have been conceived first nor last. We would have been much better off to use a few million dollars a year to purchase places at other universities. How many places for doctors would we have gotten if we were prepared to give \$3 million or \$4 million a year to Dalhousie, another couple of million to McGill, another couple of million to Toronto University. We could have all the medical and dental places we wanted. The same way we could have had as many legal places or placement for many law students as we wanted, and engineering students and so on. Memorial should in my view be merely a preparatory school where undergraduate degrees are given. There is no need - I cannot see the need for an expensive medical school, but be that as it may we now have it. Memorial University itself is a Hydra-headed monster, it is growing out of control. The sums that are required to keep that going each year are increasing geometrically, and we still do not have a precise accounting from them. We cannot get it. I never got it when I was minister. And I understand that it still cannot be gotten. We will see what happens this year.

Now the point that should be made is that the power of this House, Mr. Speaker, is very, very great. We can order anyone before this House, bring him in, we can strip him of his property, we can

MR. J. CARTER: even sentence him to jail, I suppose we could have him publicly flogged. We can dissolve marriages, we can declare sons illegitimate. I have the absolute right of free speech. If in the course of debate I should swear a horrible oath in three languages and four religions, the most that will happen to me is that I will be asked to withdraw, withdraw my statement and not my person. And all members have the right to reply.

So this House is a mighty, mighty instrument, and I am suggesting that any improprieties let this House look after them, not a royal commission. Lay your evidence on the table of this House, and I will go further and say that if any hon. member has any hard documentary evidence of any impropriety by any member of the Government or Opposition or any Crown Corporation, or any department of government, he not only has the right to table this and make this information available and ask that it be acted upon, but he has the duty, and I will go even further and suggest that any member who knowingly has information and fails to make it available to this House is committing an offence.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. J. CARTER: So I say, Mr. Speaker, that this is the proper way to proceed. Now let us hear from someone else on the other side.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Public Work.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, I said a few things last night and I would like to say a few things today. Last night my appeal was an emotional one, nor am I going to make any great announcements, nor am I going to give any great facts but I am going to give an undertaking.

Now unfortunately people downstairs have been tied up -

AN HON. MEMBER: See the government.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes. The people downstairs have been tied up for the past two or three weeks when I made commitments that I would give a statement on behalf of the Auditor General's Report. I am sure those gentlemen across the House who have served in the Ministry understand that there are times when it takes a lot of time to accumulate information. We are talking about information now. I have some files here and I certainly cannot as a lawyer read through the actual contracts that I have here, the files, and give the information without consulting with the people who have been involved since the early days.

And the first one I have here is C 57-'71, when the first Minute-in-Council was authorized to enter into negotiations with Scrivener Projects. However, I can assure hon. members across the House, and I can assure hon. members on this side of the House in case they need assurance, and I am sure they do not, and I can assure people in this Province, that there is absolutely no skulduggery, no corruption, no crookedness, and no problems that would embarrass anybody in respect to the Health Sciences Complex.

Now the obvious reply from the hon. Leader of the Opposition, who is not in his seat now, would be, Well why not call a royal commission?

MR. WHITE: He is listening.

MR. ROUSSEAU: - Undoubtedly he is listening - why not call a royal commission on that statement. What I am going to be doing now, and I am not going to be speaking that long, is to suggest this to the House of Assembly. I have given the House undertakings before and I have honoured these undertakings and I intend to honour this one. And if it takes all weekend, if it takes all next week and all next month, I do not know how long it is going to take, but I am certainly prepared, without

MR. ROUSSEAU: reservation, or without hesitation, as a matter happily to table in this House, and hopefully that when I have an opportunity, which I may not on this sub-amendment, that when the main motion comes forward, which I have not spoken on, or if another sub-amendment comes on when I have the information, or the Premier, because the information is going to be - there is going to be no question about the information. The Premier and I may be fighting about who is going to give it because we are so proud of it. Of course I will have to bow to the Premier, if the Premier decides to do that.

But if hon. members across the House are that interested in actual replies to the questions that have been raised in this debate, then let me, which I cannot do now on the main motion, but if there is another sub-motion maybe I can do it, to give me the time to do it. Forty-five minutes obviously will not allow me to spell the matters out. Because I would like to spell out certain facts in relations to

MR. ROUSSEAU: that agreement that I signed as Minister of Public Works on behalf of government in June, 1973 - previously, by the way, there had been no signed agreement, there was no signed agreement until that agreement of 1973, I have been assured by officials in the Department of Public Works and Services that the contract that was signed with Scrivener Projects in June of 1973 was more advantageous than the earlier understanding that was in force between the province and Scrivener. And on the basis of the assurance that I have received from the officials I stuck my neck out on a limb and I told the Premier on those assurances that I assured him that such be the case. Fortunately we have a gentleman, the ADM of Technical Services in the department, who has been involved with this from day one.

This is a letter dated July 2, 1971 from the then Deputy Minister of Public Works to Mr. R. Harvey Self in which he says, "For day to day working conveniences and expedition your contract point in this department will be the chief engineer, who is now the ADM." So we have continuity of officials in respect to the Health Science Complex.

MR. NEARY: Are you going to table that?

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, I would like to table everything. I do not want little bits - everything will come, I will table it all, that is not a problem there at all, but I do not want little bits coming out and that is why I can give some figures now that will show that the agreement in 1973 was more advantageous to the Province, and I am not suggesting, by the way, that the previous agreement was a bad one. All I am saying is that in the officials' opinion we were able to come up with a better agreement when the time came to sign the agreement.

MR. NOLAN: Will the minister permit a question?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes.

MR. NOLAN: I thank the minister very much. The minister intimated that the previous agreement, so-called, was not a signed

MR. NOLAN: agreement, that the only signed agreement as such, or contract, was the one that he instituted. Is that correct?

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, not the one that I instituted. The one that was instituted, I do not know on what date it was instituted but I have here again - and these are the things when we give the whole deal will be put on the table of this House, no problem. On June 9, 1972 from Jim Nesbit to the Deputy Minister of Public Works "I inclose a copy of the first draft of the agreement between your minister and Scriveners"

There were just letters, letters which said, you will deal with this one, you will deal with that one, but if you want to deal with me you can deal with me, But I do not see anything so far in the file that I have asked for from the department where I have any hard figures and facts. That is not to say that there were not any, I just do not have them here before me. But rather than give out individual pieces of information to rebut individual things that the Leader of the Opposition has done, we as a government are prepared to lay the whole case before this House of Assembly, barring nothing.

And what I said yesterday as an individual member of this House, as an individual minister of this administration, that I am - when my name went on that agreement it went with honour and integrity, and if there is any reason in my own mind that I believed that anything was done, or I was used, which I have no belief at all, I am prepared to do what an honourable man is prepared to do. What more can I do? But there is no question in my mind, no question in my mind that there is nothing underhanded, corrupt or anything else about government's dealings with Scrivener. There is no question in my mind, if there was I would not be standing

MR. ROUSSEAU: here in my place now.

MR. NOLAN: Would the minister permit another question?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes.

MR. NOLAN: I appreciate what the minister is trying to do and say. And while he says that he is satisfied and so on is he going so far as to say that he is taking the responsibility for Scrivener and any agents of Scrivener in their dealings? Is he putting his name on the line on something of that nature?

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, what the minister has said, and he said yesterday, is that he put his name on a document in June, 1973 in which he believes, on the assurance of his officials, was done on the up and up with the hardest possible deal that we could make and the best possible deal we could make with Scriveners, and the minister stands by that signature. I can also say for the record, not that it matters because it is not a dollar here or a fact there, that as a minister there was never pressure put on me by the Premier, by the Cabinet, by the government, by anybody on this side of the House, nor anybody in this province, to talk to anybody in Scriveners, anybody outside the House or anything else, no pressure was put on me when that agreement was signed and I can assure the hon House of that, but that be the case.

What really bothers me here, because I believe this to be the case,

Mr. Rousseau.

and I might say by the way that - you know, you talk about facts and figures. The hon. Leader of the Opposition was using figures yesterday. It has gone from three to five, whatever it is. Right here Section 908 in the agreement I signed says, "The budget for the project manager for salaries and fees is hereby set at \$3,500,000. If this budget is exceeded the project manager will only be reimbursed for the payroll costs of employees on the project, and the only way that he can have employees on the project is with the approval of the Department of Public Works." It is not because he wants one hundred or fifty or seventy-five guys on the project. So I do not know where the figures came from. But again we are in a game of figures.

It is a very fine thing what the Leader of the Opposition is attempting to do. What he is trying to do is indicate that there is indeed an increase in the cost, and because of an alleged political contribution that this was part of the cause for the increase in the cost.

MR. ROBERTS: There was a contribution.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Well, I have not seen the receipt. I do not know, and I do not want to see it by the way, but I, you know -

MR. NEARY: My son, I laid it on the table of the House.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I did not see it then.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The facts of the case or - ?

MR. WHITE: You should be interested in facts, too, you know.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. ROUSSEAU: An hon. difference of opinion.

But to tie this in with the fact that there was a cost escalation at the Health Sciences Complex - now I say to this hon. House, and I say to the people of this Province that I am prepared on the basis of the assurances that I have received from officials in the Department of Public Works, or the Premier, whichever one, when this

Mr. Rousseau.

information is available - now this information is being gathered, and I will go from day one to day now - and give the information insofar as government's dealing with Scriveners are concerned. I have no hesitation in saying that I am sure that when the hon. members see this information, digest it and read it, that there will be no cause for any concern. But I can assure hon. members of this House, too, if in the government's opinion anything is wrong, government would give it very serious consideration as the Premier has suggested this morning. What consideration, that is up to government. That is not a decision of one Cabinet minister. But on the basis of the information we now have, and on the basis of assurances from departmental officials - now I say to the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), who was a Premier one time, the hon. member for Conception Bay South, (Mr. Nolan) and the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), who were ministers of the Crown, you have at times to take this assurances of your officials. Now the basis of the assurances of these officials, one, Mr. Gordon Butler, the acting deputy minister now and the then Assistant Deputy Minister of Property Management, Mr. Tom Bursey, the Assistant Deputy Minister of Technical Services, on their assurances, I have assured the Premier nothing is wrong. Now, you know, I am certainly going to abide by the advice I have given the Premier, because I have given it on my - but that is not their problem. That is my problem. If I tell him there is nothing wrong, and if there is something wrong, you know, my neck is in the limb, and I am not about to do that unless I am certain of it.

This morning quickly before I got up here I called him in and I said, Look - to recall to these two gentlemen this morning - again I remember you saying to me that there is no doubt in your minds that the contract that was signed in June of 1973 was more advantageous to this Province than the original letters of intent and unofficial whatever we had at that time. And there was no question in their mind. I will get up here, and I will give the facts and figures

Mr. Rousseau.

from my old school teaching days as if it were a mathematical lesson and show it, because I put my neck on the line to say it is, and I intend to prove that.

But our point simply is this, that on the basis of the information that we now have, and on the basis of assurances of the officials that there is certainly nothing of any wrongdoing, in our estimation, and we are going to look at all the facts, present all the facts to the House of Assembly. And now and then I agree with my hon. colleague from St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) that the House is the place to deal with this. Aw look, you know, if you want to make politics out of it, good, you know, but do not ruin a person's reputation in the meantime. That is very important, too, because it is very nice for me to stand up here this morning and be able to defend myself, and to come back in the House and defend myself. Other people are not quite as fortunate as that. And it is unfortunate in this and in other instances that things of this nature have to happen. But on the facts I say it is a very fine line what the

MR. ROUSSEAU:

Leader of the Opposition is trying to do, you know, tie in this cost increase which I suggested yesterday. The Leader of the Opposition when he was Minister of Health says, I had just left the department when this was ready to be signed and so on and so forth. But he is telling me now that he knows the cost inflations were ten per cent. All I can say and repeat again - I am not saying he is lying or deliberately misleading the House. I am saying that my official, Tom Bursey who, was involved from day one tells me they underestimated the inflation costs, playing with figures, putting the inflation cost at what they were in retrospect, hindsight, twenty-twenty hindsight, in 1971 they would have come up with a figure of between \$60 million and \$61 million for the Health Sciences Complex.

Now I do not know what the hon. Leader of the Opposition is saying. Maybe he knew more than I know now when in 1971 he was Minister of Health. All I can tell you is what the ADM of Technical Services, who has been on this project from day one, tells me it was five per cent underestimated. And five per cent brought over from 1971 to 1977 would bring the cost of the project from \$60 million up through.

MR. ROBERTS: A question?

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, I will not permit a question from the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. ROBERTS: A question. If you want I will raise a point of order though.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Okay.

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. gentleman may not be familiar with this document but that is the one I was quoting which said that ten per cent escalation had been provided in that. Secondly, my question is this, Sir: In light of the statement he has just made could he tell us why the ministry up until very recently kept maintaining the cost of the project had not escalated beyond \$45 million?

MR. ROUSSEAU: First of all I think I suggested that I did not think the hon. Leader of the Opposition was lying or misleading the House.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, good! I am not.

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, I just said that before probably while you were between the speaker and the House, the speaker in your office and the House. What I am saying is that Mr. Bursey who has been with that project from day one - ouch! Excuse me, I just hit my knee on the -

MR. NOLAN: Painful!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROUSSEAU: All I am saying is I have a memo that I sent to the Premier which I had from Mr. Bursey. Consider for instance that the forecast inflationary rate was on the average a five per cent low low over the period of the construction in question and assume no changes in scope whatsoever, the estimated cost of the project to be completed at the end of 1977 would be \$60,304,000.

MR. ROBERTS: The government were saying up to very recently that it was only \$45 million.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Not very recently. And I remember I was saying it because I kept getting the statement made to me that it was on target and on budget. It is only in the past couple of years, of course, the inflationary spiral.

MR. NEARY: How could they -

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, do I have the right to, if I may - but the point being made is this, that I am prepared and I give my undertaking to this House, and as a matter of fact the gentlemen down in Public Works are now working at it, that all the information involved with this, the suggestions that the agreement signed in 1973 was more advantageous to the Province, this research will be done. As soon as it is done a full statement will be made in the House. All documents - and I tabled a document on the 1973 agreement previously - all documents will be tabled in this House. We have no fear of anything, I can assure hon. members of the House of that. No skulduggery has been involved in any dealings between Scriveners and the Health Sciences Complex. As project manager, Scriveners, I can also say that there was no pressure put on me when I signed that agreement in 1973 by anybody inside or outside this House in any way, shape or form, directly or indirectly or by innuendo, that I should sign an agreement that I

MR. ROUSSEAU:

thought was not in the best interests of this Province. There is no doubt in my mind about that, and I would like to assure hon. members of the House so.

So all we can leave it with now is that as soon as I do - and I would hope that by sometime next week, and I do not want to draw myself down again because when you go back into the details it takes a little while to dig out the files and so on and so forth - but as soon as possible we will have this information and we will present it to the House. I think from the information if hon. members of the House are objective in their consideration of this they will see that there is certainly nothing here that would require any concern on the part of either the members of this House or the people of this Province.

As I say I would like to next week if it is for my part - the Premier has ninety minutes, I do not - and if the decision is made that I would do it, I would assume I will have to do it on the main motion or any other sub-amendments that hon. members may bring in -

MR. ROBERTS: There will probably be a number.

MR. ROUSSEAU: - well that the hon. members of this House and the hon. members across would give me leave to go beyond forty-five minutes to present all the facts. If it is the Premier's will, so will it be.

So you have that commitment from me. I would hope, as I say, sometime next week when all the information is available to present it to the House or lay it on the table of the House and show hon. members that there is certainly not a matter of concern in any dealings between this government and Scriveners. I have made my position quite clear. I am certainly not prepared to

MR. ROUSSEAU: lash out in the dark and say, "Yes, I agree with a royal commission or not." We want to look at the facts and the figures and I think that is a reasonable assumption for a reasonable government to take, and when we digest those if we see anything there that is of concern the Premier said he will give consideration to any action the government must take.

MR. WHITE: Not ruling it out.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I did not say I did not rule it out. I said the Premier said he would consider any facts that were put before him, or this government, in respect to it. And he did not say what was going to be done. Now we will consider. You know, we are hon. member, as I said before. We have no reason to believe there is any skullduggery involved, none whatsoever. And I would hope that in the run to give the facts between the Premier and I, you know, because the will be honest facts that this House will give honest consideration to them. They will be given honestly and hope that as a result of that then all thoughts of any wrongdoing or any other terms that have been used will be not in the minds of anybody either in this House or in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentlemen can pound on their desks how they like, Sir. What the minister just said was absolutely nothing. It is unfortunate, Sir, that the minister is taking this matter personally. It is not a personal matter. The minister seems to stand up and tell us "Well, I will lay my integrity on the line."

MR. ROUSSEAU: I signed the agreement.

MR. NEARY: And the minister signed the agreement and he is

MR. NEARY: prepared, oh he put his name on the document, giving us assurances it is on the up and up. That is not the question at all, Sir.. The minister can table all the documents he wants from day one right up to the present time, table all the contracts the minister wants. But, Mr. Speaker, there are certain circumstances over which the minister had no control, things that went on outside of the minister's department in a good many instances.

The minister cannot, Sir, cannot give us the information that can be gotten by a royal commission. Of course we are not questioning the minister's integrity. And neither, Sir, neither can the Premier and the government drag in the red herring that we are questioning the impropriety of making donations to political parties. The Leader of the Opposition I think made that perfectly clear. There is nothing illegal about that, nothing illegal about it, Sir.

MR. MURPHY: Well why are you dragging in the name of a man not in the House?

MR. NEARY: Why drag what?

MR. ROBERTS: Who? Whose name?

Mr. Speaker, to a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. ROBERTS: First of all the gentleman from St. John's Centre (Mr. Murphy) is not in his own seat. Sir, secondly he distinctly said he -

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the Opposition. Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, he distinctly said that it was criminal to drag in the name of a gentleman who is not in the House. Now that is one of those statements, Sir, that can only lead to further heated debate and in turn lead to unfortunate things. The hon. gentleman surely has an obligation either to make a charge, if he feels somebody has done something criminal or if he has not made such a charge, Sir, to refrain

MR. ROBERTS: from making such statements and furthermore I would ask that he be asked to withdraw that one because it could only refer to gentlemen on this side, Sir, and you can libel a group of members just as easily as you can libel an individual member, and he distinctly said that a certain course of conduct was criminal. Then he either has to make the charge or withdraw it, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order, I use the word "criminal" because to me it is criminal to bring someone into this House who cannot stand up and defend themselves. I think it is character assassination and if the word "criminal" is wrong, I say it is pretty low and pretty contemptable, that is all I can say, Sir.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: On a point of order, the hon. Minister of Rural and Industrial Development.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I distinctly heard the hon. minister in his comments and I believe he was using the word "criminal" in the sense that it was disgraceful, it was obviously not a good thing to do, he was not using the word "criminal" in a legal sense, as the House I am sure is aware. I believe what he is really indicating was the sentiment which I feel very strongly about, that it is a disgraceful act and that is exactly what the minister was saying.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if I may.

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

MR. ROBERTS: The gentleman from Grand Falls really beggars all description, Sir. The gentleman from St. John's Centre already told us in what sense he used the word "criminal" and he used it in the only sense it can be used. If I were to call the gentleman from Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) a criminal

MR. ROBERTS: or say he did something criminal, I cannot get away from that but saying, "Oh, I did not really mean it. I meant - ", I mean the gentleman from Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan), Sir, has not even got a -

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Grand Falls is not a criminal but he is stupid and he insists upon displaying his ignorance in the House, Sir.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Do not mind me, talk about the point of order. Get to the point of order.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is the point of order and his conduct in making that point, Sir, is I submit the reason I am replying to it. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from St. John's Centre (Mr. Murphy) may very well feel that we have not acted as we ought to, that is his perfect right. And if he wishes to say so in the debate he has the perfect right to do it. But he has no right, Sir, to use the word "criminal"; that is what I object to.

MR. ROBERTS:

The only name we have mentioned, that I have mentioned or anybody over here has mentioned that I have heard is Mr. Richard Greene. Mr. Richard Greene's name came in only in the sense that he signed a receipt which he has acknowledged is genuine. There has not been any other reference made to Mr. Richard Greene at all, and I challenge any member - Mr. Speaker, it is pretty hard to mention a receipt signed by an individual without giving the name of the individual. Then you are accused of McCarthyism. There has been no mention made of Mr. Richard Greene. There has been no protest from Mr. Richard Greene to me. I believe he has not been in touch with the gentleman for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). Mr. Richard Greene obviously has no quarrel with anybody in this House with respect to this item.

But the fact remains, Sir, that the member for St. John's Center (Mr. Murphy) used the word 'criminal'. I think he used it in the heat of debate. He obviously feels strongly on the point. He is entitled to. So he should withdraw it.

AN HON. MEMBER: He has withdrawn it.

MR. ROBERTS: The member for St. John's Center (Mr. Murphy) has not withdrawn.

AN HON. MEMBER: He did.

MR. ROBERTS: No, Sir, he has not. He said he would if he was asked to by the Speaker, and then the gentleman for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) insists upon inserting himself irrelevantly into the debate again, Sir.

MR. MARSHALL: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

The hon. member for St. John's East.

MR. MARSHALL: You know, we have been treated to lectures by the hon. Leader of the Opposition time and time again during this session. Now if somebody gets up on a point of order, they surely have to refer to some authority or some quotation to back up their statement. Now it is quite obvious that Beauchesne -

MR. ROBERTS: Citation 155 Beauchesne.

MR. MARSHALL: What page?

MR. ROBERTS: Citation 155.

MR. MARSHALL: Well the hon. Leader of the Opposition should - I know what he is referring to, you cannot refer to a member or call an individual a criminal. But I heard what the hon. member for St. John's Center (Mr. Murphy) said. What he said was that words that were spoken, the words that were spoken, were criminal. You know, this was his impression. Now that is not alleging anyone in this House is a criminal or anything. Words cannot be criminal in themselves. So really what he was saying was that the words spoken were distasteful and disgraceful and what have you. So there really is no point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. gentleman for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) is on a sticky-wicket and the ground is about to be cut out from under him. Citation 155, (1) of Beauchesne found on page 130 - and I did not refer to it because it is to anybody but the gentleman for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) as clear as mother's milk - citation 155 says it will be useful to give examples, and as Your Honour has ruled on many occasions, these are but examples. They are not exclusive. They are but examples. "To give examples here of expressions which are unparliamentary and call for prompt interference. These may be classified as follows: 4. Use of the word 'criminal'."

It says, "Abusive and insulting language." And it specifically gives the word 'criminal'. Now there is no possible way that the gentleman for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) can twist that or pretend that it is in way in order, nor can the gentleman for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan), because the word is clearly unparliamentary. That was the point of order I raised. The gentleman for St. John's Center (Mr. Murphy) has offered to withdraw it and I am sure that he will if Your Honour asks him to.

MR. MARSHALL: Your Honour just one point, if I could. You know nobody is disputing. You know he wants to get into these little debates. But what that section refers to is calling hon. members and referring to all members. What I am saying is that the hon. member for St. John's

MR. MARSHALL:

Center (Mr. Murphy) was not referring to an hon. member but was referring to words that were said. I mean, you know, the pedanticness of the Leader of the Opposition knows really no bounds.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

With reference to the term 'criminal', I think that again it would be a very fine splitting of hairs to identify the object of that adjective. You know, if it was not a person, was it a group, was it an activity, was it a thought, what was it? It seems to me that terms like 'criminal', and one we had a few days ago which was 'lack of integrity' and then there was some debate on whether it was lack of integrity in quoting properly or lack of integrity in the person, and the Deputy Speaker made the ruling there in a board context.

I think words like that, often said in the heat of the debate without the real intention one has when one prepared what one is going to say, are words which can only lead to animosity, confusion, detract from the orderly progress of debate and should be withdrawn. I call upon the hon. minister to do what he indicated he is willing to do and to withdraw the term.

MR. MURPHY: I certainly do withdraw that word, Sir, if it is not parliamentary but it certainly describes the feeling within my heart

Mr. Murphy:

that it is an abusive use of this House. But I withdraw it though having used the word, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NOLAN: An unqualified withdrawal.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, we have had this one out many times and I would think that I have been as guilty as the hon. gentleman from St. John's Centre just is, but I mean the ruling is clear; when you withdraw it you cannot promptly say, Well I withdraw it, but I think it anyway. It just is not in order. The withdrawal has to be unqualified without reservation. And whether the gentleman from Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) appreciates it or not, Sir, that is the rule.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: I think the hon. minister who is a veteran in this Legislature is aware that one cannot indirectly suggest what would be out of order directly.

MR. MURPHY: I am a veteran as a member, Sir, but I am not a veteran in Beauchesne. I will retract that one.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member from LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, so far in this debate, Sir, and in this whole unsavoury matter that has been uncovered there has been no name calling, there has been no smearing anybody's name, the debate, the reference to this whole matter so far has been on a very high level. We were hoping, Sir, that the government would respond to our requests from this side of the House for a royal commission of inquiry to investigate this whole matter. The government have responded so far, Sir, in a negative way, and only a little promise from the Minister of Public Works and Services that he would table all of the documents. Sir, that is not good enough.

The minister, Sir, the minister does not know. I would suggest the minister is being very naive. The minister does not know what transpired outside of the minister's department, probably

Mr. Neary:

outside of this building, in connection with all of these contracts, The Health Sciences Complex and especially the Health Sciences Complex and the Carbonear Hospital. Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister does not know, and cannot give us a satisfactory answer, for instance, of why his leader, the hon. the Premier of this Province, the Chief Executive Officer of this Province had to summon Mr. Andy Davidson, the gentleman who gave the donation to Mr. Dick Greene, why that gentleman had to be summoned by the Premier to the Premier's office to sign a letter saying that the Premier of this Province -

AN HON. MEMBER: What?

MR. NEARY: Yes, that the Premier of this Province did not know any of the wheeling and dealing that was going on, and the Premier has that letter in his file right now. Can the Minister of Public Works explain that to the House? Or table that document in this hon. House? I saw it myself. The hon. the Premier was good enough to show it to me. The hon. the Premier was trying to protect his integrity.

MR. ROBERTS: The letter is signed voluntarily?

MR. NEARY: The letter was signed by Mr. Andrew Davidson. I do not know if it was signed voluntary or involuntary, but it was signed.

PREMIER MOORES: Put him on the rocks.

MR. ROBERTS: Well the Premier I am sure would like to put him on the rocks. I would like to see him on the stand, under oath.

MR. NEARY: That is the kind of information we want, Sir. Can the minister table information on this particular situation, that Mr. Andrew Davidson around the time that the negotiations for the contract were going on, that Mr. Andrew Davidson wired his head office Scrivener of Toronto Telex 291, November 28, 1972 at 12:55 noon, Attention Telex Operator Toronto Office, all copies of this telex to Mr. R. H. Scrivener, personal only, attention Mr. R.H. Scrivener, if new fee proposal of sixty-five

Mr. Neary:

by ten thousand five hundred by four by point nine fifteen approved on the Health Sciences project instead of the two and seven-eights per cent proposal, can we make a party donation of \$250,000?

MR. ROBERTS: Good God!

MR. NEARY: If not and two seven-eight per cent fee proposal is accepted, what will be party donations? Need reply before Thursday. Signed Andy. Signed Andy, I do not know if it is Andy Davidson or not. I can only assume.

AN HON. MEMBER: Table it.

MR. NEARY: I am going to table it. Of course, I am, Mr. Speaker, I am long enough in this House to know that when you read a document you have to table it.

MR. ROBERTS: Appoint a royal commission, boy!

PREMIER MOORES: For clarification, Mr. Speaker, if the member would allow. Is that when Mr. Davidson was employed by Scrivener or by Mr. Doyle? Do you know?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I just gave -

MR. ROBERTS: I can answer that he was employed by Davidson's because in 1973 when the -

PREMIER MOORES: No Davidson I am talking about.

MR. ROBERTS: - Minister of Public Works was citing Andy Davidson in his own defense.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, to answer the hon. Premier, Sir, -

MR. ROBERTS: He was employed by Scrivener at that time.

MR. NEARY: To answer the hon. the Premier, Sir, Mr. Andrew Davidson, signed Andy, was then the project manager over at the Health Sciences Complex

Mr. Neary.

and for the Carbonear Hospital.

MR. ROBERTS: -Contract for Carbonear.

MR. NEARY: The date, just to refresh the Premier's memory, the date is November 28, 1972.

PREMIER MOORES: If I may, Mr. Speaker, for a point of clarification. When it was circulated whose employ was he in?

MR. NEARY: When what was circulated?

MR. ROBERTS: It does not matter.

PREMIER MOORES: This information.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have no idea in this world, Sir, no idea at all. All I know is I have a copy of a telex that was sent off by Mr. Andrew Davidson to his head office requesting -

MR. ROBERTS: The Pacific scandal, Sir John A. went out of office.

MR. NEARY: Now then, Sir. Mr. Speaker, in all fairness I have to read the reply, and I must say that the story is not ended in these two documents that I have in front of me. This is not the end of it.

MR. ROBERTS: - Mr. Davidson had in mind.

MR. NEARY: And I do not know, Sir, whether the \$250,000 was ever delivered. I have no idea at all. I am only just quoting factual information. The reply received, Scrivener, SNF Scrivener, Toronto, November 28, 1972, 1:00 P.M. -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Put it in the garbage can.

MR. NEARY: Put it what? Put it in the garbage can.

MR. WHITE : The hon. member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) said that.

MR. NEARY: - Telex No. 268 - all these facts can be verified, Sir. All these telexes are on record and can be verified. "The figures regarding fee in your telex 291 do not make sense. Please clarify. What does the figure 4 mean?" Remember I read the 4 there, by 4 by 9. "How can one salary apply to all staff? Mr. R. H. Scrivener, Scrivener, Toronto."

Mr. Neary.

Mr. Davidson - the reply went back - Mr. Davidson is out of the office right now. Do you expect him back? - came back the answer. He may be back this afternoon, not sure. Okay, thank you. And then that was the end of these two documents.

Can the minister explain what was going on, what Mr. Davidson was up to at that time? Will the minister put that on the table of the House? No, Mr. Speaker, I would submit the minister will not, because the minister cannot. And that is why we are calling for a Royal Commission of Investigation to get the information the minister cannot give us. I know what the minister can give us. The minister can give us all the official documents, all the official documentation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to put these on the table of the House so every member will have access to them.

Mr. Speaker, we have laid out so far - my hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition has laid out one of the strongest cases I have ever heard for a Royal Commission of Enquiry. I have sat back for the last few days and let the hon. Leader crack away at it, doing a magnificent job. I laid the egg, and the member is trying to hatch it. And I certainly agree, Sir, that if there is nothing to this, if this is all just gossip, if this is all just foolish nonsense, if it is all just the work of one man, a fiction of one man's imagination, Mr. Andrew Davidson, then so be it. So what! But the administration should be prepared to be men enough to find out if that is so, because, Mr. Speaker, I have to go back again. Sir, when the Premier of this Province thinks that a matter is serious enough, that a matter is serious enough that the Premier of this Province has to call a gentleman to his office to protect the Premier's honesty and integrity, then I would say, Sir, that in itself is sufficient to warrant a Royal Commission of Investigation. Was the letter dictated in the Premier's office by the hon. Premier, or did the hon. gentleman volunteer the information?

PREMIER MOORES: That is absolutely incorrect.

MR. NEARY: What is incorrect, the Premier does not have a letter?

PREMIER MOORES: You said that the letter was sent with my knowledge -

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am only asking a couple of questions.

PREMIER MOORES: You will get an answer.

MR. NEARY: What is the answer?

PREMIER MOORES: No, it was not.

MR. NEARY: Okay, Sir, I take the Premier's word for it that it was not.

PREMIER MOORES: Okay, where did you get the information for the accusation?

MR. NEARY: What accusation? The Premier showed it to me. The Premier showed me the letter. I was invited down to the Premier's private dining room.

PREMIER MOORES: That accusation that I dictated the letter and that it was done in my office. Where did you get that information?

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, no, no! No, Mr. Speaker. I am not going to.

PREMIER MOORES: Well, why did you say it if it is not true when you have no information to back it up?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am not making any accusations. The Premier should not be so sensitive and so irritable and so touchy. I am not questioning the Premier's integrity in this matter, not in the slightest, no more than I am questioning the integrity of the hon. Minister of Public Works and Services. But I am suggesting to the House that the minister cannot lay that kind of information on the table of this House. I would like to hear from the Premier why it was necessary - if Mr. Davidson volunteered this letter, fine - ~~why was it necessary.~~

MR. NEARY: why was it necessary for him to volunteer this letter clearing the Premier of any of the goings on between the Tory bagman and Scrivener, why was it necessary? Can the Premier tell the House that? I will take my seat and listen to the answer if the Premier will give the House that information. Does the hon. the Premier want to answer it? Well maybe we will wait until later on, maybe we will get an answer.

But, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that this project has now been going on for - or will be by the time it is completed, it will be going on for eight years. It is a relatively small project, Sir,

PREMIER MOORES: By some standards. I suppose.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon? It is a relatively small project when you look at some of the projects that have been carried out throughout the world in much less time. In my opinion, Sir, it is halfway between a national scandal and a bitter Newfie joke. The hon. minister tells us about the great planning and the great management that went into this project, Sir, what kind of management and what kind of government permits this project to drag on, and on, and on? Why, Mr. Speaker, the tallest building in the world, back in the 1930's, the Empire State Building, which cost \$40 million to build, by the way, almost the same amount that is going to cost to build the Health Sciences Complex, the tallest building in the world at that time costing \$40 million only took fourteen months to build, fourteen months.

And does the House realize, Mr. Speaker, I am sure Your Honour does, that to build the Eiffel Tower, the Brooklyn Bridge, the San Francisco Bridge, and what else-

MR. SMALLWOOD: In fairness would it not be to our advantage to spread the cost over four more years? ,

MR. NEARY: Spread what cost? Of the Empire State Building?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, no the Complex.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, it is not done to spread the cost because if you spread the cost you are adding to the cost really. The inflationary-

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Call it phasing.

MR. NEARY: Oh phasing my eyeball, Mr. Speaker-

AN HON. MEMBER: Are you the Premier's advisor now?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is, I am not accepting that, Sir, because the financing could have been spread over a period of seven, eight or ten years, but the not the construction of the building itself. They could be paid, Sir, the financing could have been done over a period of ten years for that matter, the financing could. The government could have gotten this \$45 or \$50 or \$60 million, the government could have gotten it. The government of Canada could have come down and gave the Minister of Finance a cheque for \$40 million or \$44 million.

But this is just a red herring, Sir, I am sorry that the hon. member for Twillingate threw that in there because it gives the administration something to grasp onto, they are grasping for straws over there now, that in fact is not so.

The Empire State Building, Sir, was probably financed over a period of fifty or one hundred years but it was built in fourteen months, and this project could have been financed in six months, paid for, the money could have been raised and it could have been built in a couple of years.

The Canadian National Tower, Sir, the tallest structure now in the world up in Toronto, and the Eiffel Tower, the Brooklyn Bridge and the San Francisco Bridge, put them all together and it would take less time to build them than it has taken to build the Health Science Complex. So what kind of weird planning is behind these scandalous delays, Sir, in the Medical Health Science Complex? Not to mention the Carbonear Hospital

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, the only conclusion that I can come to is that the project managers were deliberately mismanaging the projects to make the job last, to drag it out, and the contractors now, Sir, I would say are doing the same thing. Even if you take into consideration, Sir, the strikes, the labour problems they have had on that project, take all that into account and, Mr. Speaker, there is still no need for the long delays.

We understand now that the deliverly date is going to be twenty-four months late, and I would submit, Sir, that the contractors at the present time are deliberately stalling and slowing

MR. NEARY: up the work because of the slack construction season ahead in our Province.

And, Mr. Speaker, let us look at a few facts. The hon. Leader of the Opposition brought out some interesting facts but it is good to go over them again because apparently they have not sunk in.

MR. ROBERTS: That telex is a pretty interesting fact, too.

MR. NEARY: That is right. Well, there are a few more interesting facts to come out yet but I am hoping and praying and asking -

MR. ROBERTS: The Premier has no choice now but to set up one.

MR. NEARY: - and asking the government to respond to our request for a royal commission before we get into a muck raking controversy and mud slinging and name calling which has not happened right up to this particular moment. It has been done on a very high plane.

AN HON. MEMBER: Would you permit a question?

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, I will not permit a question. Mr. Speaker, to anybody else in this hon. House except that hon. gentleman.

Fact number one, Sir, the terms and conditions of the contracts, both on the Health Sciences Complex and on the Carbonear Hospital, that the minister did not make very much reference to in the minister's remarks, were altered substantially, Sir, and how can the minister tell us that it was a better deal. I will show the minister what kind of a deal it was, in connection with the Carbonear Hospital.

AN HON. MEMBER: I did not say the Carbonear Hospital.

MR. NEARY: No, but, Sir, the Carbonear Hospital is a part of this request we are asking for a royal commission.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Table that one too.

MR. ROBERTS: Scrivener made money on the Carbonear Hospital, too.

MR. NEARY: It started out, Sir, to be a project whereby Scrivener was going to get \$63,000. They would get a flat total payment of \$63,000 to Scrivener for the construction management of this project.

MR. ROBERTS: That would not even cover the donation.

MR. NEARY: Three days later, April 21st., 1972 a revised schedule was submitted providing an increase in these fees to a guaranteed minimum of \$83,000.

MR. ROBERTS: Getting close to covering the donation.

MR. NEARY: Plus an additional new sum equal to all payroll expenditures for the project.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh cost-plus.

MR. NEARY: Management - that is right, Sir, cost-plus. Will the minister put all these facts on the table and tell us what led up to all this and why such a low offer was made initially? And then we had the management staff to be included, estimated at \$275,000, made during the month, times one point nine out of which Scrivener Project Newfoundland would pay the management payrolls. Thus, Sir, the new formula resulted in an increase in the management fees to \$329,778 from an original fee of \$63,000.

MR. ROBERTS: They could pay the \$52,000 then.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, let me repeat these figures for the benefit of hon. gentlemen and these cannot be disputed. The minister will verify what I am saying. But the minister may give a different reason why the cost escalated in a matter of three days. It went from \$63,000 up to \$329,778 from an original flat fee of \$83,000. Well it was finally \$83,000 they agreed on, that was in the beginning, but then it went completely out of control.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these are facts. The Leader of the Opposition stated these facts. I am stating these facts. The

MR. NEARY: contracts were altered. The government, for some reason or other and probably unknown to the minister or the Premier or anybody else - There may have been discussions outside of this hon. House that the hon. Minister of Public is not privy to. Mr. Davidson may have had discussions with certain people outside of this House, outside of government altogether the hon. minister does not know about. But for some reason or other the contracts were altered and altered, Sir, in favour of the government, and the minister being a little more generous to Scrivener Project Newfoundland Ltd. for managing the Health Sciences Complex and the Carbonear Hospital.

Fact number two is, Sir, that it is going to be two years late. Two years before we take delivery of the Health Science Complex. The cost of the Carbonear Hospital practically doubled. The cost of the Health Science Complex is going up by about another \$15 million or \$20 million. Fact number three is, Sir, that there are cost-plus jobs, cost-plus contracts on both of these projects. That is a fact. It cannot be denied that there have been extensions to contracts, that there have been benefits given to contractors that were not previously included in their contracts. Facts, all facts, Sir, and the fact that a substantial donation was made to the - I hope, Mr. Speaker, that any member who speaks on this debate will not try to drag that in as a red herring to lay the stress of my emphasis on the donation. It is a pretty

Mr. Neary:

hefty donation. As the Leader of the Opposition said it is probably one of the highest ones he has ever seen. But still there is nothing illegal about that, Sir. Nothing illegal.

MR. ROBERTS: It is the highest that I have ever seen.

MR. NEARY: That is what I said, the highest that the Leader of the Opposition has ever seen. There is nothing illegal about it. And unless and until we change our whole political system, Mr. Speaker—I can give the House quite a debate on why I think that should be done, I believe the government this session of the House if it wants to avoid this sort of skulduggery, underhanded, fraud, not by the administration, by people outside of government I am talking about; some of the people that I have mentioned in some of these documents I have tabled, fraud, blackmail, misuse of public funds—if we want to avoid all this in the future, the administration is going to have to bring in legislation, make it illegal for anybody to donate to a political party or to a politician, and make the penalty pretty heavy, Sir. The penalty by law should be a jail sentence.

AN HON. MEMBER: \$10,000.

MR. NEARY: No option of a fine. Anyone who breaks the law once it is brought in should be put in jail, heavy terms of imprisonment for breaking that law. But that is all in the future, Sir.

I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, as a result of these disclosures now we are going to have probably before this session is over legislation making it illegal to donate to political parties, but that is in the future, Sir.

MR. ROBERTS: We were promised that last year.

MR. NEARY: We were promised it last year. We will probably get, I hope we will get it this year. And it will be a good thing. It will stop it in the future.

MR. ROBERTS: It will have more loopholes in it than the Public Tender Act.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. ROBERTS: It will have more loopholes in it than the Public Tender Act.

MR. NEARY: Yes, the hon. Leader of the Opposition may be correct. But, Sir, that legislation should be brought in as quickly as possible but that is for the future. We are dealing now with a specific instance, with a specific situation. There is no point in any member getting up and saying, oh we are going - that is the way the system was, we are going to change all that. No way, Sir. No way will that wash with the people of this Province at the present time.

We have before us a matter that has to be dealt with, and has to be dealt with quickly.

MR. ROBERTS: Never before -

MR. NEARY: Our people are frustrated, Sir, bewildered and browned off with this whole matter. And they want a royal commission of enquiry, not the kind of a white wash job that we have seen in the past where Tory hacks, or Liberal hacks for that matter, are put on royal commissions to do a white wash job. This must be completely independent, impartial, objective royal commission.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Warren Commission.

MR. NEARY: The what commission?

AN HON. MEMBER: The Warren Commission.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you this. Look I, personally speaking, I have lost faith in royal commissions. I would like to see the Premier take it upon himself if we want a select committee of the House, fine, I will go along with that, because then we have access to the RCMP. I would like to see an RCMP investigation into this whole matter.

MR. ROBERTS: And let us question witnesses -

MR. NEARY: And let us question the witnesses.

Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that the remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred and that this House on its rising to adjourn until, Tuesday next at 3:00 of the clock, provided that if it appears to the satisfaction of Mr. Speaker after consultation with the government that the public interest requires the House should meet at an earlier time Mr. Speaker may give notice that he is so satisfied and the House shall meet at the time stated in the notice and shall transact its business as if it had been duly adjourned to that time.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved that the House adjourn until Monday next at 3:00 P.M. -

MR. HICKMAN: Tuesday.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry. - that the House adjourn until Tuesday next at 3:00 P.M. provided that if it appears to the satisfaction of the Speaker after consultation with the government that the public interest requires the House should meet at an earlier time the Speaker may give notice that he is so satisfied and the House shall meet at the time stated in the notice and shall transact its business as if it had been duly adjourned to that time.

Those in favour "Aye"

SOME HON. MEMBERS: "Aye".

Contrary "Nay".

SOME HON. MEMBERS: "Nay".

MR. SPEAKER: Carried.

The House stands adjourned until tommorow Tuesday at 3:00 P.M. or earlier.

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

MARCH 9 AND 10, 1977

MAR 10 1977

Answered by the Honourable Minister of Education.

Question 119 asked by the Honourable Member for LaPoile as on the Order Paper February 17, 1977.

Answer:

1. Yes. It operates a program for one semester. The program is subsidized by the Secretary of State's Department and the total cost to the University, including heat and light, is \$10,000 per year. The course is taught by a regular member of the faculty with local assistants. There are usually 30 students enrolled during each semester.

More specific information is not available.

MAR 9 1977

Question #198

Mr. Neary (LaPoile)

Reference to questions regarding the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities.

Question #1 98

<u>Members</u>	<u>Salaries</u>
Clarence W. Powell, Chairman	\$40,000.
Charles W. Earle, Vice Chairman	32,400.
George F. Lawrence	24,840.
Reginald E. Good	24,840.

Question #2

Frederick Saunders, Clerk of the Board & Executive Director \$23,139.