

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
THURSDAY, MAY 14, 1981

The House met at 3.00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR.SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

Reference was made to the point of order raised yesterday by the hon. the President of the Council concerning certain words used by the hon. the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) and having now reviewed Hansard, I quote the hon. member for Port au Port, "First of all the member opposite is not telling the truth. He is not telling the truth. First of all all is not telling the truth. Secondly, that quizling, that traitor opposite."

SOME HON.MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

That is the pertinent quote in this point of order. I would like to make some general comments and point out some references. First of all Beauchesne, page 114, fifth edition, paragraph 322 in part says, " A statement by a member respecting himself and particularly within his own knowledge must be accepted, but it is not unparliamentary temperately " and 'temperately' is the key word, " it is not unparliamentary temperately to criticize statements made by a member as being contrary to the facts; but no imputation of intentional falsehood is permissible." Also Beauchesne, page 103, fifth edition, paragraph 316 (e) says, "A member must not impute bad motives to another member." And subsection (f) states, "A member while speaking must not make personal charges against another member." I would also draw hon. member's attention to Beauchesne, fifth edition, pages 104 to 114, which show certain words and phrases that should be considered unparliamentary. Obviously they are not all contained in those few pages. Some of the same words you will

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): find also have been ruled parliamentary on occasion depending on the circumstances and the tone and manner and intention of the person speaking. In fact the words "not telling the truth" are in that category. I emphasize that by quoting Beauchesne, page 115, paragraph 324 (2) which says, "An expression which is deemed to be unparliamentary today does not necessarily have to be deemed unparliamentary next week." Therefore having considered the matter, and considering the tone and manner in which these remarks were used, I would have to rule that these remarks are unparliamentary and I would ask the hon. member from Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) to withdraw them.

The hon. member for Port
au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I respect the Speaker's ruling and I realize that unparliamentary language is not permitted in the House and if I were to continue with it or not to withdraw, that I would be suspended from the House. And I do respect the Speaker's ruling. I hope the House understands that I was provoked by a member who will serve his party over there no better than he served ours, that is when his selfish ends conflict with his party's aims.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER: I do withdraw the remarks.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member has withdrawn the remarks.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I am sure hon. members of the House will wish to be associated with an expression of sorrow and sympathy at the recent assassination attempt against

May 14, 1981

Tape No. 1541

AH-3

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

His Holiness the Pope and

I would move, and I am sure hon. members opposite will second, that you, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of all members of the House of Assembly express our sorrow to His Grace Archbishop Penney, the leading Roman Catholic prelate in the Province, and our wishes for a speedy recovery.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, certainly on this side of the House we would like to join with the minister in expressing the shock, regrets, concern of everybody, everybody, I guess, throughout the world in this day of instant communications.

I think, Mr. Speaker, as well, since the minister has made reference to writing His Grace, Archbishop Penney, we should also wish to be associated with the public remarks made by His Grace in expressing his concerns about the kind of situation that allows this to happen and the reason that he used, and the compassion, consideration that he used in extending his own personal feelings. I think he has set a tone for an overall reaction to this kind of thing generally that we would all want to be associated with. And if the minister would agree, I would hope that he could include in his Resolution the instructions to the Speaker to include those comments as well in an effort that we all must make in politics, religion generally, to accept the facts of life that this is the kind of world in which we live. But it is not the kind of world that we have to continue to live in and if we all work together in the spirit expressed by His Grace the Archbishop, then maybe we can make at least Newfoundland and Labrador a haven for the kind of life everyone in this world would like to live.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Is it agreed the additional remarks be contained in the communication? Those in favour of the motion 'Aye', contrary, 'Nay', carried.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I have an important Ministerial Statement that I wish to make at this time.

PREMIER PECKFORD: It was announced in the Speech from the Throne that my government would be introducing measures to strengthen the safeguards surrounding the public interest and to inspire greater confidence in government. One aspect of the government's aims in this regard has been the development of a set of guidelines and regulations governing the conduct of ministers of the Crown and public service employees.

Following a period of extensive review and after consultation with interested parties, most notably with representatives of employee organizations, I am pleased to introduce today the conflict of interest ministers' guidelines and the conflict of interest public employees' regulations. This hon. House will be asked to approve certain amendments to the Conflict Of Interest Act, 1973 to give effect to the conflict of interest guidelines for ministers and the conflict of interest

PREMIER PECKFORD: regulations for public employees.
The major provisions of the conflict of interest ministers' guidelines, and the conflict of interest public employees' regulations are as follows: number one; ministers, their spouses and their minor children, as well as organizations in which they have financial interest, will require my personal approval before becoming eligible for any benefit from the Province or any agency of the Province. Similarly, public employees, the spouses and their minor children, as well as organizations in which they have a financial interest, will require Cabinet's approval before becoming eligible for any benefit administered by the department or agency for which the public employee works.

Examples of the benefits covered by these provisions include: contracts, land grants or leases and financial assistance for commercial purposes such as grants, loans, guarantees or subsidies. These provisions will remain in effect for one year after a minister of a public employee leaves government.

Number two, ministers will not be permitted to use the prerogatives of their offices to gain preferential access to benefits from government such as access to government premises, equipment or supplies other than for normal business use.

Number three, ministers will not be permitted to own shares or have an interest in any company, partnership or association that is engaged in exploration for oil, gas or minerals or that has as its primary purpose the business of land speculation or development within the Province if the Premier determines that such shares or interests create a conflict of interest for a minister. Ministers will also be required to report to me in writing any such interest held by their spouses or

PREMIER PECKFORD: minor children. Similarly, those senior public employees appointed by Order in Council, as well as other public employees designated by Cabinet, will not be permitted to hold such interests and will be required to report in writing to their department head any such interests held by their spouses or minor children.

Four, ministers and public employees will not be permitted to use confidential information acquired in the course of their official duties to benefit themselves or other persons.

Five, standards are set for the involvement of ministers and public employees in activities outside their official duties. From now on ministers and public employees may not hold any employment, office or position, including self employment, that conflicts with their official duties. Also, they will not be permitted to use their position or to use government facilities to further their interests in any outside employment, office or position.

Additionally, ministers and public employees will not be permitted to allow plans or offers of future employment to influence them in the performance of their official duties. In this respect, ministers will be required to inform me of any applications or employment offers that conflict

PREMIER PECKFORD: with their duties, while public employees will be required to give similar notification to their department heads.

Number six, standards are also set for the conduct of ministers and public employees in situations where they might be able to benefit their relatives. Ministers and public employees will now be forbidden from granting preferential treatment to relatives or to organizations in which they or their relatives have a financial or other interest. Additionally, they are required to disqualify themselves from participating in public service appointments or promotions if a relative is involved in the competition for the position under consideration.

Furthermore, they will be required to disqualify themselves from exercising regulatory inspection or discretionary powers in matters that involve themselves or their relatives.

Seven, ministers will be required to declare their active association with any private interest groups or voluntary agencies. Additionally, ministers will be required to disqualify themselves from participating in any government decisions concerning these groups or agencies. Public employees will be required to disclose their involvement in voluntary agencies and may be required to disqualify themselves from participating in government activities respecting such interest groups or voluntary agencies.

Eight, ministers will not be permitted to accept gifts, favours or services from any person who has dealings with the government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Ministers will still be permitted to engage in the exchange of normal hospitality between persons

PREMIER PECKFORD: doing business together and to exchange gifts and tokens -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - as part of protocol or at public functions. A similar provision applies to public employees in that they will be forbidden from accepting gifts, favours or services from persons who deal with the department or agency which employs them.

Number, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Number nine, under the guidelines for ministers, I, as Premier, shall have the right to determine whether any situation creates a conflict of interest for a minister and I shall have the power to take any such actions necessary to resolve situations which I consider to be conflict of interest.

It is the Premier who determines the composition of Cabinet and appoints ministers to Cabinet. Therefore it is appropriate that the Premier should exercise the powers of review and adjudication with respect to the conflict of interest ministers' guidelines.

The Conflict Of Interest Act, 1973, will therefore be amended to empower the Premier to enforce these guidelines. Examples of the kinds of actions I might take include requiring ministers, their spouses or their minor children to divest themselves of any interests or assets that create a conflict of interest, or to place the assets or interests in trust.

Ten, under the regulations for public employees, department heads, that is Deputy Ministers or the heads of various government agencies, will have the power to

PREMIER PECKFORD: determine whether an employee is in a conflict of interest and will be empowered to require the employee to take the necessary action to resolve such conflicts. Under these regulations, public employees will also have the right to a special appeal process which will be in addition to any appeal procedures they may have under the various collective agreements negotiated between government and the unions.

Currently, the Conflict Of Interest Act requires ministers and certain public employees to disclose in writing the various assets and interests which they have. These guidelines and regulations which I am releasing today are in addition to the existing provisions of the Conflict Of Interest Act. As such,

PREMIER PECKFORD: they reflect my personal commitment and the commitment of my government to ensure that the highest standards of ethical conduct are maintained at the centre of government.

Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I have a document here which I will distribute this afternoon which includes the Ministerial Statement which I just read, which includes -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, may I -

MR. S. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - which then includes a copy of notice which will be given on the legislation that has to be amended to allow these guidelines to go into effect, to allow these regulations to go into effect. And then I also have here the guidelines for the ministers, which are consistent with the regulations for the public employees and the other people designated to come under the regulations, so that a comprehensive look at the whole ambit of what I am announcing today can be fully ascertained.

I apologize to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) that I could not get it to him an hour or so before. We had trouble down in the Printing Services Division and I did not get a copy of the totality of the thing until I came into the House. But I wanted to do it today and, of course, we will have an opportunity to discuss these matters.

I indicated in the Ministerial Statement, of course, that the guidelines apply to the ministers, the regulations apply to public employees who are appointed by Orders-in-Council, plus others who will be designated soon who have an interest and who are involved in government matters of such a consequence that they should be

PREMIER PECKFORD: covered. And I indicated it would apply also to agencies of government.

So obviously we are talking about all the - the schedule would include all the departments of government plus the Newfoundland Public Service Commission, the Newfoundland Liquor Commission, the Newfoundland Liquor Licensing Board, the Farm Development Loan Board, the Newfoundland Marketing Board, the Newfoundland Egg Marketing Board, the Newfoundland Farm Products Corporation, the Fisheries Loan Board of Newfoundland, Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro Electric Corporation, the Public Libraries Board, the Rural Development Authority, the Newfoundland Medical Care Commission, the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, Gander Development Corporation, the Harmun Corporation, St. John's Metropolitan Area Board, Office of the Parliamentary Commissioner (Ombudsman), Workers' Compensation Board, the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities, the Newfoundland Industrial Development Corporation, the Human Rights Commission, the Newfoundland Municipal Financing Corporation, Provincial Planning Board, the Residential Tenancies Board under the Landlord and Tenant (Residential Tenancies) Act.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, let me say that besides this being done

PREMIER PECKFORD: this way, the other point that should be kept in mind is that we have in the process of doing this over the last seven or eight months, done a review -

AN HON. MEMBER: Why about you?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am trying to finish off my statement and yet I still hear people interrupting me from the other side.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: During the last six or seven months we have done a fairly extensive review of what is happening in other provinces of Canada and in the federal government and these regulations and guidelines are in the forefront of the kind of thing that is being done in other places.

It was just a couple of years ago, for example, that the Prime Minister of Canada had taken certain measures as it relates to guidelines for ministers. There is not perhaps throughout Canada the same comprehensiveness both to the guidelines and to the regulations for public employees that this particular announcement contains.

Thank you very much,

Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the Opposition has about six minutes.

MR. FLIGHT: Six?

MR. STIRLING: Six minutes out of twenty.

MR. SPEAKER: No. The hon. Premier made a statement at 3:08, finished at 3:20, twelve minutes.

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

MR. STIRLING: It is not surprising that we got that kind of a delivery today from a man who in an interview said, "I am the only honest man."

MR. WARREN: A miracle.

MR. STIRLING: "I know that politicians have been taking this place since 1890 and they will do it again after I leave."

MR. NEARY: What about the letter he wrote to Mr. Newman.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, the arrogance, the unbelievable arrogance, who says that, "I am setting out a set of guidelines for all of these ministers that I cannot trust and I personally will be the only one to judge their conduct."

MR. FLIGHT: Unbelievable.

MR. WARREN: Hear, hear! Untrue.

MR. STIRLING: It is not surprising, Mr. Speaker -

MR. FLIGHT: King Brian.

MR. STIRLING: - it is unbelievable but not surprising because of this kind of mentality that says, "I cannot trust my ministers," this kind of mentality that says, "Let us couple it with all the civil servants "-do you understand, Mr. Speaker, that he is now creating a group of people who must disassociate themselves from everything that is important in this Province of Newfoundland and Labrador?"

MR. WARREN: A mafia.

MR. STIRLING: The idea that a civil servant cannot be involved in a voluntary organization, how paranoid has the man become? And then to talk in terms of apoligizing to the Leader of the Opposition. Mr. Speaker, this is consistent with the pure political moves that this Premier has made, and up until now I have tried to co-operate. And we saw yesterday when we brought in a resolution, Mr. Speaker, on pure

MR. STIRLING: pure politics -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): - that this Premier decided to act. And, Mr. Speaker, he has not been telling the whole story -

AN HON. MEMBER: You are against (inaudible),

MR. STIRLING: - when he had the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, when he had the opportunity.

MR. MOORES: Yes, we are against it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: There are seven people in this House of Assembly for whom he has no respect.

MR. WARREN: John Crosbie is one.

MR. STIRLING: Seven people, four on that side, three on this side, of the Public Accounts Committee examined into exactly this kind of thing and found that

MR. STIRLING: a minister sitting in his Cabinet had contravened the Public Tendering Act in the judgement of his peers- a higher court than the judge; members of this House of Assembly- this Premier decided that in his personal judgement, after looking at all of the various parts, in his personal judgement he decided to give him absolution. Now he has the gall to bring this in and say to the Cabinet ministers - it is an insult, Mr. Speaker. I have the highest regard -

MR. THOMS: (Inaudible) does not know it.

MR. STIRLING: - for the Cabinet ministers in this -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STIRLING: Let there be no doubt. I have no doubt about the Premier's honesty, I have no doubt about the honesty of the members in that Cabinet, and it is an insult.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, it has been said before that you cannot legislate common sense and good morals, and the Premier is attempting to do it by personal decree. Mr. Speaker, do you realize what he has said to the ministers and the senior public servants? 'If you get a job offer you had better come and tell me about it,' and to the senior public servants that 'You have - just imagine, Mr. Speaker! I will give you an example. I happened to meet the Premier when he was running for the leadership of his party in Halifax and I said, 'Eoy, it looks like you are going to do very well.' And he said, 'Yes, just as I got a real good job offer.' Now that means under this legislation he would have to go to the hon. Frank Moores, who has been called a dead loss by this Premier would he bring in the same regulation to be administered by Frank Moores? If he cannot

MR. STIRLING: bring in the regulation to be administered by any other Premier, then he should not bring in the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, it is one thing for the members of Cabinet to put themselves in that kind of a position. What he has said for pure politics to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador is 'I, King Brian, am going to judge all of these crooks.' Now, the Mahoney Commission said that the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) had forced through the Public Tendering legislation and now even the President of the Council is not going to be absolved from this. Every time he takes a client downtown he is going to have to call the Premier and say, 'Is it alright for me to take on this additional client?'

MR. WARREN: Yes, that is right.

MR. STIRLING: Now, it is one thing for the Cabinet to accept that like a bunch of schoolchildren that have had aspersions cast on them, saying that 'You do not have the capacity, you do not have the honesty, the integrity to set your own standards.' And, Mr. Speaker, I believe they do. I believe it is an insult to the Cabinet. And then for the Premier to have the gall to say he will decide the personal standard! What -

MR. FLIGHT: Arrogance.

MR. STIRLING: It is worse than arrogance.

MR. HODDER: Not the Supreme Court, the King.

MR. STIRLING: It would be the equivalent, we will see everything else in the dictatorship.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the same person does not see anything wrong with spending \$120,000 on his personal home. That is a judgment that is going to be done by these people.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh..

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

A point of order has been raised by the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: As I understand the Standing Orders and the various rules that govern this House, that an hon. member of this House, of the Opposition, is allowed to respond in a general way to the statements that are made by a minister in a Ministerial Statement. I do not think that gives the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) the licence to suddenly enter into, as he is starting to do now, my personal affairs and to make inaccurate statements -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - to the point that suddenly Mount Scio House has to enter the discussion, number one. And, number two, that suddenly it became my home when it belongs to the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

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

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HODDER: The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling), in replying to a conflict of interest type of statement, mentioned the Premier's home. Now the Premier's home is paid for by this Province and it has been improved by \$150,000 of taxpayers' money. Mr. Speaker, if that is not a conflict of interest I would like to know what is. And I think it is quite in order, Mr. Speaker, for the Leader of the Opposition to mention anything that has to do with a house. The only Premier in Canada, Mr. Speaker, who has his house paid for by the Public Treasury.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

With respect to the point of order, the Standing Orders are clear. The member in responding to a Ministerial Statement is entitled to make some comments, seek clarification or explanations, but in no way is entitled to debate the statement that has been made. The comments should at least adhere to the contents of what is found in the statement. In any event, the Leader of the Opposition's time now has expired.

MR. STIRLING: Further, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: I beg your pardon?

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker has ruled on that.

MR. SPEAKER: I just ruled on the point of order.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, in view of the tabling of this conflict of interest information which was worked on for seven months but was such a burning matter that it could not wait for a day to have us given the opportunity to take a look at it,

MR. STIRLING: What standard does the Premier intend to put in for himself and who will judge on his conduct and his conflict of interest and use of government property to which he has already referred, namely, Mount Scio House? What standard will apply for the Premier?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I have no qualms about indicating to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) either in this House or outside of it how or when and in what way I use Mount Scio House or any other things that I do as Premier. It is all open and aboveboard from start to finish. As a matter of fact, for the Leader of the Opposition's benefit, and I am sorry it has to come up here on the floor of the House like this, but for the Leader of the Opposition's benefit, and obviously he must be upset that we have brought in this another great reform to this House and to the Government of Newfoundland, obviously he is upset; I do not think he is upset so much with the

PREMIER PECKFORD:

fact that he did not have notice of it, because it is quite obvious what any government would have to bring in along these lines if you were going to bring in conduct regulations. It is quite obvious what areas you would have to govern. But just let me say to the Leader of the Opposition, if he wants to talk about Mount Scio House, that each year I pay in a range of \$4,000 to \$7,000 a year as income as a result of living in Mount Scio House, that because of the benefits that the government provides the First Minister of this Province it involves a payment by the Premier, by the first minister, of \$4,000 to \$7,000 a year as a result of that through the Income Tax Act system.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY:

It is a rent free house.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, because it is a rent

free house, Mr. Speaker, I have to pay somewhere in the order of \$4,000 to \$7,000 a year in that relationship. Now if the debate wants to be Mount Scio House, so the Opposition tries to camouflage the reforms that are brought in today, so be it, I do not mind or my own personal life or whatever. Let it come out on the floor of the House. I have nothing to hide and that is the story on it. If the Leader of the Opposition wants to stoop to that level, then I shall respond and I have nothing to hide as it relates to my personal life, as relates to Mount Scio House, my family or anything else. So I am free and open if the Leader of the Opposition so wants to do it.

MR. STIRLING:

A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

A supplementary. The hon.

Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING:

The Premier is so sensitive

about Mount Scio House that he answered that part of the question because I used it as an example. The real question,

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, is in view of the very high standards now being set for all of the Cabinet ministers, that he is going to sit as the judge - now relating it to Frank Moores, for example, a Premier that he knows well -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: - what standard is going to apply to the Premier and who is going to judge the Premier?

MR. NEARY: The people of the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, talking about people who admire other leaders, as I understand it the Leader of the Opposition admires the Prime Minister an awful lot and he did last week. Now as I understand what the Prime Minister of Canada has done, what the Premier of Ontario has done, and what the premiers of most of the other provinces have done is exactly what I have done here today as it relates to guidelines for ministers.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: I yield.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, in the public relations job that this Premier is doing, let it be noted that he would not answer that question, that he believes that he is above judgement and decided to go to somebody else. Could the Premier answer this question? He did not mention when he sent the information, and we still do not

May 14, 1981

Tape No. 1549

AH - 3

MR. STIRLING: have our copy of it; has he excluded specifically executive assistants and other assistants to the Premier, special assistants; have these people been excluded under this regulation?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well, when the hon. Leader of the Opposition gets the statement then he will indicate, and I have read it into the record, that appointments by Order-in-Council to various departments are covered, which will be deputy ministers, assistant deputy ministers, directors, and other people who will be designated later, who do have access to information, will be designated by their respective departments because it will vary widely, and then others that will be designated. So it is a matter to be decided, how many positions, what nature, what positions - whether it be special assistants, whether it be directors, whether it be assistant directors, whether it be, for example, expropriation officers in some of the departments who have a lot to do with land; these other positions will have to be designated under regulations.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, so we will know what we are dealing with here, I would like to - I do not know if this comes under the heading of a new question or a supplementary, but talking about political interference, would the hon. the Premier indicate if the type of thing he is now trying to correct is what he himself did back on August 3rd., 1979 on stationery from the Premier's Office, St. John's, when he wrote a letter to Mr. Melvern Newman of South Brook in connection with property that had been returned to the Crown after Gull Bridge Mine closed, wrote Mr. Melvern Newman, threatening him that his property would be taken away from him unless he made a deal with a gentleman who was a fund raiser for the Premier's own leadership campaign? Is that the sort of thing that the hon. gentleman is now trying to correct?

MR. S. NEARY: And I will table the letter if the hon. gentleman wants it. But I will just quote from a paragraph; 'I would suggest you consider settling your differences with Pelley Enterprises before the expropriation process is started. Once started, the process gives clear title to the Crown within ten days.' Trying to get this property for his fund raiser in the leadership convention, is that the type of thing he is now trying to correct?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, that is a scurrilous -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. L. STIRLING: He did not sign the letter.

MR. S. NEARY: You wrote the letter, I did not.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to respond to that. If the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary)

MR. STIRLING: Double standard.

PREMIER PECKFORD: If the member for LaPoile wants to deal with that issue, I will deal with that issue at a press conference at which the member for LaPoile and myself will attend. I will not deal with it under the situations that are here. There is no - you know, that is just a diversionary tactic. I am totally familiar with the situation there. If the member for LaPoile is trying to drag Pelley Enterprises and Cyril Pelley across the floor of this House as somehow having done something wrong, he can go right ahead and do it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: I will ask the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) and members of the Opposition to abide by the same guidelines over there as we are willing to abide by over here.

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

May 14, 1981

Tape No. 1550

DW - 3

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):
for LaPoile.

A supplementary, the hon. member

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am not trying to drag Mr. Pelley's name in, I am merely trying to get this matter straightened out. This property that reverted back to the Crown after Gull Bridge Mine pulled out, which was a choice piece of property, why did the Premier feel that he should personally get involved in the expropriation

MR. NEARY: threat that was made to Mr. Newman? Why did he not let it go through the proper channels? Why did the Premier's Office get directly involved in this and why did the Premier himself, jam himself in the middle of this, signing this letter to Mr. Newman threatening to take this property away and give it to Mr. Pelley who was one of the fund-raisers for the Premier for his leadership convention?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: The question of what Mr. Pelley was during my leadership convention has nothing to do with the situation.

MR. NEARY: Oh, I see.

PREMIER PECKFORD: The issue -

MR. NEARY: What is the date on this?

PREMIER PECKFORD: The issue, Mr. Speaker, has to do with a piece of land. By the way, if the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is so eager - that is why I want to, you know, get not just that letter out but I want to get that whole issue - if the member for LaPoile wants to get it out on the Table here or somewhere else so that it can be fully explained, is that Mr. Newman, if you want to get into the details of that particular issue to take time of the Question Period away from other things which are important, is that Mr. Newman never owned the land in the first place.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, 'After much discussion - just listen to this some senior government officials, it has been decided it would be in the public interest to have the industrial development proposed by Pelley's to go ahead. In this regard, government intends to expropriate the land in question.'

MR. NEARY: Now, why would government have to expropriate land from Mr. Newman if he did not own it or if he did not have title to it or the government did not think he had title to it? And the real question that I asked the hon. gentleman was why did he not allow this to go through the proper channels instead of coming to the rescue of Mr. Pelley?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, it went through proper channels. If the hon. member has all the correspondence and not part of the correspondence, it went through regular channels and there was a title of land back in 1890 or somewhere in the previous century, on which there were no clear-cut descendants to that land which allowed for the expropriation to be done in the legal manner. There is nothing -

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask if he would -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - I am going to table this letter.

I have all the correspondence, by the way, as far as Mr. Newman in concerned. I think the iron heel came down on Mr. Newman in this particular case.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: And, to me, Mr. Speaker, this is a blatant example of political interference by the Premier's Office.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: And I am going to ask the hon. gentleman again to tell us why -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - I want to ask the hon. gentleman how many letters like this he has sent out in connection with expropriation procedures? Is this the only one that was sent out from the Premier's Office, signed by the Premier or does the Premier send out and sign all letters of expropriation in this Province?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, that was a not a matter of expropriation. That was nothing of the sort. The letter was not a threat, and they can try to make what they like out of it, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: I asked the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) that if he has anything to charge against me, for him to lay it on the table of the House. That whole circumstance -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - is completely and absolutely aboveboard. I stand by everything and absolutely everything I did. But I also represent a constituency -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - the same as the hon. member for LaPoile. I will continue to do so, that everything there was covered over and aboveboard and the member for LaPoile can try to make what he likes out of it. If the member for LaPoile and the Liberal Opposition want to oppose this kind of reform that we are bringing in today by doing it through the backdoor, if they want to oppose other things that this government is trying to do, they can. But I will say to the member for LaPoile, he had better keep on digging because he will dig until he is an old man before he finds anything on me on this.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WARREN: I yield.

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

A supplementary, the hon.

member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman should know that it is merely questions. They may be penetrating questions I am asking the hon. gentleman but I am not making any charges or accusations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Good. Good.

MR. NEARY: I am merely looking for information and I am not getting the information.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Good for you.

MR. NEARY: Now let me ask the hon. gentleman - the letter when I table it will speak for itself. If the news media want to pick up a copy sobeit. I intend to table it. I already quoted from it. So would the hon. gentleman tell the House now whether or not when these new regulations into effect, if this sort of thing, this blatant political interference on the part of the Premier, this highhanded tactic used on Mr. Newman, if that will not be discontinued? And will ministers not permitted in the future to use this technique to threaten a man to make a deal with a buddy of his?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well, Mr. Speaker, that does not deserve an answer. That does not deserve an answer. Mr. Newman did not own the land. It was not blatant political interference. It was not highhanded. At the same time the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) carefully says he will not make an accusation -

MR. NEARY: That is right.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - or he will not make any kind of condemnation here; at the same time, through the backdoor, he tries to do it.

PREMIER PECKFORD: The member for LaPoile has got to work ten times harder than he has already worked, Mr. Speaker, on this one.

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer).

MR. FLIGHT: So much for conflict of interest.

MR. WARREN: Could the minister advise the House -

MR. STAGG: You agree with that, do you?

MR. WARREN: - if the Jury Act -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: I want to direct a question to the Minister of Justice, Mr. Speaker, and the question to the minister is could the Minister advise if the Jury Act contains any restrictions that do not permit an Indian or an Inuit sitting on a jury?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, there is no racial, ethnic aspect to the Jury Act at all. There are no distinctions with respect to ethnic background, religious background, any matters like that.

MR. WARREN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, if it is true what the minister just said, could the minister tell the House why, when an Indian or an Inuit is charged with an offence and has to appear before a judge and jury, that all the jury is comprised of individuals other than Indians or Inuit people?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, of course, as the hon. member knows, or should know, the appointment of the jury is a matter of the court, obviously not of the government or the Department of Justice, and the basic principle of trial by jury is that the jury is composed of fellow-citizens. If the person charged is a Roman Catholic, then it is not necessary for the court to make sure there is a Roman Catholic, or if the person is a Presbyterian, to make sure it is a Presbyterian, or if a person is Inuit, to make sure that there is a person of Inuit background, or if the person is of Swedish origin, to make sure that there is a person of Swedish origin, if the person is a Liberal, to make sure that there is a Liberal on the jury.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: There is no ethnic or racial or religious composition, you know, to a jury.

MR. WARREN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the minister would feel very much disappointed if he were sitting in a witness box and had to look across at ten or twelve Indians making a decision on his future through an interpreter. The reason I am asking this, Mr. Speaker, is that in the last criminal case in Labrador we noticed that there were ten or twelve on the jury making up the fate of this Indian person through an interpreter. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, that when aboriginal people of this Province are brought before justice, all kinds of people, Indian, Inuit and settlers should be given the opportunity.

My last supplementary, Mr. Speaker, is to the minister. Would he instruct the courts to revise their Labrador jury lists which, for some reason, are leaving out the Indian and the Inuit population?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I should point out to the hon. gentleman first that obviously if a person, you know, is before the court and before a jury, then obviously it is that defendant's lawyer who has the obligation and the duty to, you know, challenge the jury if and when the lawyer so wishes. I would make a comment too. The hon. gentleman said to me that if I were to face a jury and they were all Indian or they were all Inuit,

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I really do not think that, you know, ethnic composition would be a factor as far as I am concerned. If some citizens have been inadvertently left off a jury list, then certainly they should be on it and that is an administrative matter and I will have that looked into. You know, I repeat, two things that are very important; one is that it is a person's lawyer obviously who has a responsibility and the duty and the right to challenge the composition of a jury.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is correct.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Right. If that person's counsel does not feel that the jury is properly composed or there is bias or prejudice or that kind of thing. And I will repeat also quite strongly that it is certainly not my view that the ethnic composition of a jury is an important factor, you know, If we get into an area where people are tried by those of the same racial background, you know, would a Jewish person have to be tried by Jewish people -

MR. WARREN: Wrong assumption.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: - or if there is an Inuit does there have to be an Inuit, or if there is a person of Lebanese blood does there have to be a Lebanese? I am not sure that would be - as a matter of fact I am not sure, I really do not think that that would be a necessarily healthy development to have -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) interpreters.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: We are not talking about interpreters. The hon. gentleman can ask his questions and I can understand them without his colleague interpreting them. The hon. gentleman for Torngat (Mr. Warren) does not need an interpreter.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: He can ask his own questions.

But the ethnic element is not a factor which to date has, you know, been implicit in juries in Newfoundland.

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

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, in the continued absence of the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Dawe), I would like to ask the Premier - a couple of days ago we were talking about DREE agreements and DREE roads - I would like to ask the Premier in view of the fact that three years ago when Senator Doody was Minister of Transportation and Communications, he thought it was a good idea for me to write asking that the Southwest Arm road be included in DREE. He invited me to do that, and I did it. I want to ask the Premier is the Southwest Arm road that is out in the district of Bellevue, as the Premier knows I am sure, is that road included in the DREE agreement?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, there seems to be some confusion on the other side of the House because the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) is talking about is that included in the DREE agreement, and the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is always talking about that there is not any DREE agreements or any DREE proposals -

MR. NEARY: DREE proposals.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - in from here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Proposals.

PREMIER PECKFORD: So I do not know if they are talking on the same line or not. But your other member is saying there are no proposals.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: If the Opposition would get their house in order I may be able to answer some questions that are consistently put from day to day.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: We agree to recess the House until the Opposition had a caucus to determine what their procedure is going to be for Question Period, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. CALLAN: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Order, please!

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, assuming that that road which should be - and the minister at the time, Mr. Doody, agreed that it should be in a DREE proposal because

MR. CALLAN: millions of pounds of fish and so on that is trucked over there and all that sort of thing - assuming that it is not on the list in the DREE package, the DREE proposal, would the Premier indicate that that road at least will get some additional paving - it got two miles last year - and will there be any additional paving for that road this year especially in view of the fact that a month ago the people down there overwhelmingly supported the government in their efforts to try and get that section of road paved?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, it is good to see that the hon. member has acknowledged that last year we did do some work on that road -

MR. CALLAN: It was an Opposition member, by the way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CALLAN: Two miles with an Opposition member.

PREMIER PECKFORD: With an Opposition member. The Opposition are always saying we do not do any road work in their districts and here is a good example, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - here is a member indicating that we spent \$200,000 or \$300,000 last year in one part of his district now on roads. I think that that speaks well of the government and the hon. member can be assured that we will continue to spend money in districts that are now in the hands of the Liberal Opposition momentarily. We will continue to serve all Newfoundlanders all over the Province and try to do what we can to ensure that services are provided everywhere and in all places around the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) and it relates to a film that was done a couple of years ago and there was a great deal

MR. WHITE: of controversy about it and that was the film on the Norma and Gladys. And I wonder if the minister could tell the House whether or not this has been resolved and what the resolution of that problem is?

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

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, I have had very little involvement with it.

MR. NEARY: The previous administration.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. WINDSOR: If you could control your colleagues I would try to answer the question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. DINN: I am sure the Speaker does not need to be insulted either.

MR. WINDSOR: I have had very little involvement with it, Mr. Speaker, since taking responsibility for this portfolio except to direct my officials to a further matter through the Department of Justice and so I am advised that there is very little likelihood that any resolution can be found by dealing directly with the company.

MR. WHITE: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, the hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: I will ask a supplementary to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) in a moment, but before I do I would like to ask the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) about the Norma and Gladys and what the plans are and schedules are for the Norma and Gladys this year and how much more money are we going to spend this year on that vessel?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Development.

MR. WINDSOR: I refer that to my colleague who is responsible, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Tourism. I am

May 14, 1981

Tape No. 1555

SD - 3

MR. WINDSOR: not responsible for the Norma and Gladys.

MR. NEARY: Who is responsible?

MR. WINDSOR: It is historic resources. The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is continually getting these departments mixed up.

MR. WHITE: Well, Mr. Speaker, could the -

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

MR. WHITE: - Minister of Recreation, Culture and Youth (Mr. Andrews) tell the House what is going to happen to the Norma and Gladys this year?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Recreation, Culture and Youth.

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, I do not have the schedule at hand, but generally speaking I could say the Norma and Gladys will be operating with a crew for approximately three months. The budget estimate, I think, is \$115,000 this year. She is in Grand Bank right now where she over-wintered. She will be in the St. John's area for a couple of weeks, then she will be going to the Burin Peninsula and then she will be sailing to the West Coast, to Corner Brook, for the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the City of Corner Brook. Then she will be returning back along the South Coast, up St. Mary's Bay area through the Burin Peninsula again to over-winter. That is approximately the schedule.

MR. WHITE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, could the minister tell the House whether or not the boat has been looked at recently in terms of sea-worthiness and whether or not any additional work has to be done on the vessel to make sure that she is safe to put out to sea this year?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Recreation, Culture and Youth.

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, the Norma and Gladys is inspected every year by the Canadian Steamship Inspection Service, C.S.I. She has a certificate given her every year; if she did not she would not sail.

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

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

MR. WHITE: My final supplementary is for the Minister of Justice. I wonder if the minister could tell the House whether or not he has any information related to the Norma and Gladys film which the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) just said was referred to the minister's department?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I have no -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: If the hon. gentleman would be more specific. The film on the Norma and Gladys is not of high priority with the Department of Justice.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. member yield?

MR. HISCOCK: I yield, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, did the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) indicate whether civil or criminal action will be taken against Mr. George McLean, the gentleman who ripped off this Province for millions of dollars, and made his escape? Will action be taken against him to recover the money spent on this film which was of a very low quality? The Minister of Tourism would not accept the film it was of such low quality. Now, what is the Minister of Justice doing about that?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that there is any evidence to indicate criminal prosecution against Mr. McLean. The hon. gentleman can refer matters to the Department of Justice. Numerous things are referred to the

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Department of Justice.

Hon. members think that just to mention the Department of Justice, all of a sudden, you know, everybody is charged with criminal offence.

To my knowledge there is no evidence arising from the Norma and Gladys film -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: - requiring any criminal charges whatsoever. It may not be a good film. You would have to complain to the Board of Cinema Photography or some such thing.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Justice indicate to the House why it was necessary for his colleague to refer this film? Did he refer it with a recommendation of the possibility of crimes being committed? Is that being looked at? Did he refer it to the minister to look at the possibility of recovering the money by taking civil action? Why did the Minister of Tourism (Mr. Windsor) refer the matter to the Justice Department? What was the reason for it?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, numerous referrals are made to the Justice Department. Numerous referrals are made to all departments. The mere fact that there is a referral to the Justice Department does not mean that there is going to be a prosecution. There are numerous referrals. I am not aware of any evidence suggesting any prosecution arising out of the film made on the Norma and Gladys. I am not aware of civil action either. No, the Norma and Gladys film has not required any legal action on the part of the Department of Justice.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we have a strange situation going here. Now, the Minister of Tourism (Mr. Windsor) told us on a couple of occasions in the House that they were not satisfied with the film. Now, the minister responsible for Tourism tells us the matter was referred to the Justice Department, obviously he was not satisfied with the film or some aspect of it, there was something he was not satisfied with, to send it to the Justice Department. Is the Minister of Justice (G. Ottenheimer) now telling us that the matter is closed,

MR. NEARY: that the bill is being paid, that the government is satisfied with the film, it is a closed book? Is that what the hon. gentleman is telling us?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, what I am telling the hon. gentleman is that, you know, whatever the merits or demerits of that film on the Norma and Gladys, whatever excellence it may have or may not have, however rotten it might be from a cinemagraphic point of view or a photographic point of view or any other point of view, to my knowledge there is nothing with respect to that film which requires action on the part of the Department of Justice, whatever other action it might require on anybody else's part. But it is not a matter which requires any action by the Department of Justice. The mere fact that a matter is referred -

MR. NEARY: Then why was it?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: - the hon. member could refer any amount of garbage to the Department of Justice -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: - and his lip is going all the time. He would not get a chance to refer anything because he has a perpetual jaw. He will not even listen to what anybody is saying. The mere fact that the hon. gentlemen would refer matters, the hon. gentleman opposite or anybody else, does not mean that charges are going to be laid, does it?

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have to go back now to the Minister of Tourism again (Mr. Windsor) to find out

MR. NEARY: - he was the one that told us in the first place that the matter had been referred to the Justice Department. Is he now satisfied -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - with the information given by the Minister of Justice (G,Ottenheimer) to the House, that this matter is closed? Has the minister been advised by the Justice Department that the matter has been dealt with and has it been dealt with to the satisfaction of the minister?

May 14, 1981

Tape No. 1558

AH-1

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. Minister of

Development.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, I think the

Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) has answered the question very, very well.

SOME HON. MEMBER:

Oh, oh!

MR. WINDSOR:

It is simply a matter that

is done perhaps a hundred times every day, where one department would refer a matter to the Department of Justice for advice as to what action, if any, can be taken to either collect the amount or obtain the film or whatever the case may be. I am not aware of any response yet that has come from the Department of Justice. Discussions are probably still ongoing between my officials and the officials of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer).

MR. NEARY:

A final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

The time for Oral Questions

has expired.

MR. WINDSOR:

I hate to disappoint the

hon. member.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The time

for Oral Questions has expired.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Motion, second reading of
a bill, "An Act To Amend The Workers' Compensation Act,"
(Bill No. 47)

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Labour

and Manpower.

MR. DINN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, when I

concluded the other day I was just closing my remarks on the bill, second reading, and I was attempting to answer some of the questions. I did not have time at that time, Mr. Speaker,

MR. DINN: to answer all the questions posed by hon. members opposite -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): You are closing debate, are you?

MR. DINN: - I am closing the debate, yes, Mr. Speaker - posed by hon. members opposite but just with respect to the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), I was disappointed to hear that the hon. member did not think that this was a good amendment to the Workers' Compensation legislation. What we are attempting to do here is cover students in our trades college, community colleges, etc., throughout the Island during work periods or when working on industrial equipment, protect them and put them under the Workers' Compensation in the Province. They now have an insurance policy which we did not feel was adequate and we felt that if one of these students became injured that he should be fully covered by Workers' Compensation. Some hon. members asked who would pay the assessment or who would pay the compensation. Well, the Workers' Compensation would pay the compensation to the person injured as they normally would do and the government of the Province of Newfoundland would reimburse the Workers' Compensation. There would be no then need for assessments, Mr. Speaker, in that case.

With respect to dust studies in Western Labrador, that has something to do with Workers' Compensation in that there is an involvement there. It does not have much to do directly with the bill. But I would like to bring hon. members up to date, or take an opportunity to do that. What we are doing down in Western Labrador is probably the most comprehensive dust study ever undertaken by any government in North America to determine what effects dust has with respect to silicosis,

MR. J. DINN: asbestosis, pneumoconiosis and all the dust-related diseases. The study is a seven point programme that was outlined by me last year. The study is approximately one-half completed now, the remainder of the study will be completed this year and should conclude early in 1982. And it may give us - there is an indication that it would; that coupled with the study that has been approved by the Workers' Compensation Board out in Baie Verte, those studies may give us some insight into some of the illnesses suffered by miners in the past and indeed we may be able to use the information from those studies to assist people who have mining diseases and have not been recognized to this point in time by Workers' Compensation, indeed by any Workers' Compensation Board or group throughout Canada.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) - of course, I sat here and listened to the hon. member and I wilted under the vicious attack that that hon. member made on me. It was a vicious onslaught. He talked about many things but he did not talk about the legislation that we were proposing here. He wondered if this legislation would cover, whether Workers' Compensation would cover people going to the university who are on work term or Canada Employment or Canada Works. Youth employment programmes are generally covered through those programmes and thus there was no request from the university to cover students in these areas. So we did not have a request from the university, we had a request from, or discussions with the College of Trades and the community colleges, etcetera, throughout the Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that just about covers all the questions posed, all the important questions, all questions posed that were of any significance to this legislation. The hon. member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) participated and as usual said nothing.

MR. J. DINN: So with that, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Workers' Compensation Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No. 47)

Order 15, Bill No. 41

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Public Libraries Act" (Bill No. 35).

MR. W. MARSHALL: No.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): No.

MR. W. MARSHALL: I am awfully sorry, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I have the wrong Order Paper.

MR. W. MARSHALL: I am looking at the wrong Order Paper in my profuse confusion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

Order 16, Bill No. 41

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Financial Administration Act," (Bill No. 41)

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, this bill is before the House now and a motion before the House-and this is an adjourned debate-is that it be given a six month hoist. And Your Honour, will recall - I am not going to speak long but I just want to draw it to your attention, Your Honour-that this bill and its amendments have already been debated for how many hours? Not one hour, not two, not three but four; four and a half hours of debate this particular bill has consumed. And what does the bill do? We were castigated, Mr. Speaker, in this and the motion before the House is to give it a six month hoist. We were castigated on this because we were not complying with the recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee. The fact of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is that the main principles of

MR. W. MARSHALL: this bill, both of the main principles, embody recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee. So obviously it is another instance where accusations have been hurled at the government without the people really addressing themselves-or the people who are speaking really addressing themselves to the principle of the bill.

AN HON. MEMBER: What are we on?

MR. W. MARSHALL: We are on the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) because it is his bill. What we are on - yes, we are on the amendment for the six month hoist. We know, I tell the hon. Minister of Finance what we are on - we get up and we debate something. The hon. gentlemen there opposite the other day debated a whole afternoon and it was only towards the end of the afternoon

MR. MARSHALL: that they realized they were debating their own motion for a six month hoist.

So, Mr. Speaker, this bill I think has been debated fully. It has been debated amply. The government of course is going to vote against the six month hoist and then afterwards-I do not know whether there is any purpose in continuing further - I suggest that the matter has been debated ad infinitum and quite adequately and that it should go on past second reading.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Is the House ready for the question on the amendment? All those in favour "Aye", contrary, "Nay".

I declare the motion lost.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Financial Administration Act, 1973," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave. (Bill No. 41)

MR. MARSHALL: Order 7, Bill No. 24.
Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Repeal The Canada Bay Lumber Company Limited (Agreement) Act, 1974." (Bill No. 24)

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, this is a simple bill. It is, "An Act To Repeal The Canada Bay Lumber Company (Agreement) Act," and it is to repeal the act, Mr. Speaker, with effect from August 15th., 1980.

MR. HODDER: May I ask a question?

MR. MARSHALL: Oh yes, certainly.

MR. HODDER: I was under the impression that we were supposed to do the environment bill first.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is correct. I am sorry. I told the hon. gentleman we would do the environment after this one and then we would go down the Order Paper. But I jumped in on top of this one here. But this is just a routine one that we could let go through and I suggest then we will get to the environment act.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Repeal The Canada Bay Lumber Company Limited (Agreement) Act, 1974," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave. (Bill No. 24)

MR. MARSHALL: Now, Mr. Speaker, the environment act, I am looking for here on the Order Paper.

Order 11, Bill No. 4.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act Respecting The Department Of Environment." (Bill No. 4)

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

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, I believe this to be a very simple piece of legislation. What we are doing here is creating a single Department of the Environment. The creation of a single Department of the Environment last Summer reflects government's desire and intention to give the whole area of environmental protection in the Province an expanded role and a higher profile than it has had before. And in line with this renewed thrust there will be a more aggressive approach to regulatory enforcement activity, environmental problem investigation and inspection, and follow up monitoring of the environmental approval requirements within the Province.

With the exception of certain changes indicated in the explanatory notes in the bill, the bill would repeal and re-enact all the environmental and general administrative provisions that presently exist in the Department of Consumer Affairs and the Environment. There are some key environmental provisions to be re-enacted and they are as follows: Section 7A (1) and (2) gives the minister control over

MR. ANDREWS: all matters relating to the protection and enhancement of the quality of natural environment which includes air, water, and soil quality and further gives the minister responsibility for the conservation, development, control, improvement and proper utilization of the water resources of the Province.

Section 18(3) specifically denies anyone having water use rights conferred by statute or any other valid means, the right to pollute such waters to a degree beyond which is described by the regulations as constituting a polluted or unwholesome condition.

Mr. Speaker, most of the changes to the act are fairly perfunctory, I would imagine, and unless the hon. members of the Opposition want to debate them

MR. ANDREWS: I think that this piece of legislation should pass fairly quickly.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act Respecting The Department of Environment". (Bill No. 4).

The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if it is the will of the Opposition that this bill pass very quickly. I am sure it will not be unduly delayed. But, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words on the environment bill, and what we are doing we are creating a Department of the Environment, finally, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if anything in this Province for this past 400 or 500 years has been abused it has been the environment of Newfoundland. This Province is getting smaller by the day, Mr. Speaker. We can go back and we can look at the abuses over the years and there is no recourse, Mr. Speaker. Anyone who wanted to do anything in this Province did so knowing that they would answer to nobody. In recent history, so people will remember, the original Bay d'Espoir Hydro Development did irreplaceable damage, Mr. Speaker. It was criminal. There are provinces, there are countries, there are states in the United States where there would still be legal cases going on if they ever tried what was tried in Bay d'Espoir.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is not to say that I am opposed to the generation of power in Bay d'Espoir.

MR. ANDREWS: Who did it?

MR. FLIGHT: I know who did it, Mr. Speaker. I am concerned about the environment, the total environment of this Province and what is happening to it and what this minister by his action this past few days is going to allow to continue to happen.

MR. FLIGHT: And I intend to build a few minutes speech on it, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we will start with the original Bay d'Espoir hydro project. Nobody could oppose the project, Mr. Speaker. We needed electricity, Bay d'Espoir had to be developed, but certainly, Mr. Speaker, the people of this Province had a right to believe that that project would be undertaken in a way that would minimize the damage to the environment. Mr. Speaker, it was undertaken in a way to maximize the damage to the environment. And hundreds of acres of land, Mr. Speaker, moose populations by the thousands, caribou migration routes, fur bearing animals were sacrificed, Mr. Speaker. The project could have been approached in a way that could have left that real estate, left it, Mr. Speaker, so that the damage that was done could have been minimized, Mr. Speaker. Today, even twenty years later, you can go into that particular area and you can see what happens when there is no environmental protection in this Province.

To take it a bit further, Mr. Speaker, we have, for example, the American Smelting and Refinery Company, for fifty years dumping tailings into Red Indian Lake. It almost polluted Red Indian Lake, Mr. Speaker. No control, no legislation to stop them. The paper companies, Mr. Speaker, for this past fifty years, I suppose, doing what they like as far as the environment is concerned. Cutting the wood, Mr. Speaker, yes, but in the process destroying the environment of the areas they worked in. One day, Mr. Speaker, the companies will be long gone - they are long gone in some of the areas they

MR. FLIGHT: are working now - and the environment, Mr. Speaker, is not fit to look at. We have lost what was worth protected.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a dangerous atmosphere in this Province right now; if one questions anything, then one is anti; if one questions the government's -

MR. STAGG: Federal government.

MR. FLIGHT: - approach to offshore then one is anti-government, anti-Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: If one questions technically or otherwise, Mr. Speaker, the Cat Arm project, then one is anti the Cat Arm development. One cannot any more -and that is a very dangerous environment.

MR. ANDREWS: Would you do it or would you not do it?

MR. FLIGHT: Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of mentality that we have coming from them. This minister is setting himself up to get a hard time in this House, Mr. Speaker. Now the minister is a great communicator. Well I can tell the minister, Mr. Speaker, that if I decide -

MR. ANDREWS: Who said that?

MR. FLIGHT: - and two or three other members on this side of the House decide to make life miserable for that minister, that he will regret the day he went into Environment because if there is one department, Mr. Speaker, that has been abused and apparently will continually to be abused it is his department.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the minister

MR. FLIGHT: that he would stop making the kinds of comments that he is, because all he is going to do is he is going to draw attention, Mr. Speaker, to his own inability to deal with that department. Because we have seen in the past few days - and I will get up to it, Mr. Speaker - we have seen how useless, Mr. Speaker, that minister has permitted himself to be when he has to deal with something like the Minister of Mines and Energy or the Premier. If ever there was any aspect of life in Newfoundland that needed a strong minister with some backbone, it is the minister who is going to try to protect the environment of this Province, Mr. Speaker. So, Mr. Speaker, the minister would do well to keep quiet.

Mr. Speaker, we went up to last year, 1980, with no legislation in this Province to protect the environment. Any company, any individual, could go do what they like to the environment. Price (Nfld.) did it for years, ASARCO did it for years, Newfoundland Hydro did it for years, individuals did it for years with immunity, Mr. Speaker. They were not concerned about any legislation, there was none. And last year, Mr. Speaker, the government brought in a bill, a piece of legislation, the Environmental Assessment Act, 1980, an excellent piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker. It was supported totally by the members on this side of the House. Finally we were going to have legislation, statutes, in this Province that would make it illegal or difficult for people to do any more damage to the environment of this Province than has already been done.

I think, Mr. Speaker, the only objection to the legislation raised by this side was that there were instances where there were too many 'mays' used: 'The minister may do this' and 'may do that' and 'The minister may' do something else, and we were suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that if the legislation were to have any teeth, the 'mays'

MR. FLIGHT: should be changed to 'must' or 'shall' - 'The minister will' do this. There was too much discretion left, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. That was the only objection from this side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I have mixed emotions on this, because there was never any doubt that if ever this Province needed a piece of legislation, this was the legislation. And we had it, Mr. Speaker, and it came too late. It came too late, Mr. Speaker, to protect the environment that had already been ruined and wiped out. And I can go on, Mr. Speaker, As I pointed out before, the original Bay d'Espoir project, the properties owned and controlled by the paper companies in this Province, the mine tailings in this Province, the lakes that were wiped out by mine tailings, the quarrying we have seen around, Mr. Speaker, that was wiping out - there was no discretion used, Mr. Speaker. If someone wanted to use a D-8 they knocked everything down as they went. That legislation came too late, Mr. Speaker, to protect that, and we had to accept it. We even had to accept, Mr. Speaker, that the Upper Salmon, a project with unbelievable potential for environmental damage, irreplaceable, Mr. Speaker - a report here done for the Department of Environment said, 'There will be irreplaceable loss of habitat and irretrievable losses to wildlife and wildlife habitat.' And we had to accept, Mr. Speaker, that even though the legislation came in the same year, that the Upper Salmon would be exempt from that legislation because it was an ongoing project.

Mr. Speaker, if ever anyone were to lose confidence, if ever any person had a reason to lose confidence in a government or in a minister or in their intentions, Mr. Speaker, it was when we found out that the hydro-electrical development proposed for Cat Arm would not be required to go ahead under the regulations in this legislation, that by and large, Mr. Speaker, the

MR. FLIGHT: Cat Arm project would be exempt from the Environmental Assessment Act. Why, Mr. Speaker, is the Cat Arm exempt? What purpose can the Environmental Assessment Act serve in this Province if we are going to exempt from it the type of project such as that of Cat Arm?

It was pointed out, Mr. Speaker, earlier that Hydro - we must face the facts, Mr. Speaker. Back in 1974 there was a proposed hydro-electrical development in this Province; it was known as the Lloyds Lake diversion. And, Mr. Speaker, Hydro was prepared and ready to do that diversion. And they lied, Mr. Speaker. Hydro and its officials lied through their teeth to the people when they were asking questions about that project.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) is not a man who will back down in the face of a little bit of opposition, and I have too much respect for that man to feel that he will back off simply because somebody wrote three or four letters to the paper, or simply because a few people are getting upset or even a hundred people getting upset. But, Mr. Speaker, Newfoundland Hydro was

MR. FLIGHT: ready to move on Lloyds Lake. And it was recognized, Mr. Speaker, as a result of some people getting involved, that the potential for damage of the environment was devastating, that they might have wiped out whole inland waterways of Central Newfoundland. And the minister agreed and said that because we do not have the data to prove these people wrong, we will not go ahead with the Upper Salmon, there is the potential for environmental damage.

Now Hydro had not done a thing—no impact study, no nothing—but they had tried to convince the people of Central Newfoundland that there was no environmental damage. The minister accepted the facts as they were and said, 'We will stop!' Hydro then made a statement, because they had to look at other projects, and they said so as not to get caught in a bind, so as not to be faced with the same thing we were faced with on Lloyds Lake, we will prepare an impact study on the Cat Arm. That is why they did it, Mr. Speaker, they were prepared so as to not get caught in the bind they got caught in on the Lloyds Lake project.

And, Mr. Speaker, the people of this Province had a right to believe when this legislation was enacted in 1980 that any major project, any project that had unbelievable potential for environmental damage in this Province, there will be irreplaceable damage, there will be loss of habitat to the last and the best moose population of this Province. The salmon run in the Cat Arm River will be gone, Mr. Speaker; caribou migration routes will be flooded, Mr. Speaker; fur bearing animals will lose their habitat. Now, Mr. Speaker, that in itself, whether that is grounds to stop Cat Arm I do not know. I say it is not, maybe, it is not grounds.

MR. FLIGHT: It is not grounds, but certainly, Mr. Speaker, if the minister has any decency in him at all -

AN HON. MEMBER: If he cared about the forests!

MR. FLIGHT: - if he keeps making comments like he is making, I am beginning to wonder if he does.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: Certainly the minister owes it to the people of Newfoundland not to accept carte blanche what Hydro tells them - they have a vested interest - but to appoint, like he is supposed to do, Mr. Speaker, appoint as the legislation gives him authority to do, an environmental assessment board made up of individual people with no loyalties to Hydro, with no loyalties to the government, with no loyalties to any level of government to identify, to look at and hold public hearing and to determine in an unbiased way just what environmental damage will come as a result of the development of the Cat Arm.

AN HON. MEMBER: Only five Tory members.

MR. FLIGHT: And, Mr. Speaker, having identified the potential dangers, having identified the damages that will be done then, Mr. Speaker, he can go to Hydro and say, 'Look, we have identified these dangers and there are certain things you must do.' Already Hydro has called a contract, Mr. Speaker, the announcement was made the day before yesterday and a contract let. You talk about moving before public opinion can be brought to bear on them! The minister announced the Upper Salmon two or three days ago; today in the paper there is a contract, a tender call, for twenty-three kilometers of road.

The minister, Mr. Speaker, is responsible for the environment of this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: If you want a break I will call a quorum call.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, the minister is responsible for the protection of the environment of this Province. This House of Assembly gave the minister the

MR. FLIGHT: enabling legislation, and if he does not have the backbone to enforce that legislation he should resign, Mr. Speaker, if he does not have the backbone to enforce that legislation he should not have accepted the position in the first place.

And, Mr. Speaker, the minister is refusing, standing up, Mr. Speaker, making foolish remarks like you are opposed to the Cat Arm development, like you are opposed to this. I am opposed, Mr. Speaker, to a minister who is prepared to bluff the people of this Province. What project, Mr. Speaker, is the minister going to apply his great legislation to? The environment bill, Mr. Speaker, the one the government said, this is the greatest bill we have brought in this year, this is flagship legislation, this is a great reform. Now, Mr. Speaker, is it going to apply it to some man who goes out and wants to dig a well in his backyard? Is he going to apply it to somebody who uses an all-terrain vehicle going across a bog to go fishing? Is that the way the bill is going to be used to protect the environment? This Province is getting smaller, Mr. Speaker. You do not have to kill every moose in Newfoundland to eliminate moose;

MR. FLIGHT: you do not have to kill every caribou to eliminate the caribou. You only have to allow enough habitat to be wiped out and slowly but surely, Mr. Speaker, they will go. And there is a lot of concern in this Province, Mr. Speaker. That is not to say you are opposed to the Cat Arm. Most provinces would be delighted to have that kind of a resource to develop, but certainly they are entitled to have it developed in a way that will leave the local environment and the local ecology protected as well as it could have possibly been protected.

And, Mr. Speaker, listen to this: Let the minister answer this when he stands up. In 1976, Dr. Barnes, the most noted environmentalist in this Province, Dr. David Barnes recommended this, specifically as it refers to the Cat Arm. 'I encourage in 1976' - I wish the minister would go out, Mr. Speaker, and find some more petitions to sign. Go out and find his first cousin and his uncle and have a talk to them and see if he can mend fences with them. And keep his mouth shut.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT: So, Mr. Speaker, the minister should go get together with some other ministers and see if they are going to sign some more petitions.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT: He laughs like any fool who would do what he did. His laugh should have given him away a long time ago.

Now, Mr. Speaker, here is what the man responsible for the environmental protection of the Province said in 1976. "We should encourage legislation for the protection of" - and this is re Cat Arm, this is not anywhere else in Newfoundland. "We should encourage legislation for the

MR. FLIGHT: protection of critical wilderness and environment areas. This includes protection of the caribou calving grounds at Lake Michael and at Island Lake, North of the Upper Cat Arm watershed."

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me ask the minister; are any of the recommendations from 1976 in legislation to make sure that project goes ahead in a way that minimizes the damage to the environment? Was Dr. Barnes being listened to when he said in 1976 that we should take special precautions on the Upper Salmon? Have Hydro indicated to the minister that they are going to take special precautions? We know they are going into an area, Mr. Speaker, that contains the biggest, highest moose count in Newfoundland today.

MR. ANDREWS: It is overpopulated.

MR. FLIGHT: That is the irresponsible answer we get from the minister, overpopulated. Overpopulated, Mr. Speaker, the minister says. Now, Mr. Speaker, they are going into the area that has the highest percentage of moose population in Newfoundland today. This report, Mr. Speaker, points out that the habitat will be destroyed, totally and completely destroyed.

MR. ANDREWS: How many square miles?

MR. FLIGHT: Twenty-one square miles. That is a lot of land when you are talking about habitat, wintering grounds of the moose. Can the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Andrews) tell me what is the Winter range of the moose? How far does the moose travel in the Winter? What is the natural -

MR. ANDREWS: 8.37 miles.

MR. FLIGHT: 8.37 miles. Is it seven or eight miles. She is way down, it is seven or eight miles according to Wildlife. Well, Mr. Speaker, there are twenty-one square miles being flooded. Now, what precautions are going to be taken?

MR. FLIGHT:

Well, Mr. Speaker,

if nothing else comes from this debate, it will be too bad if the people of Newfoundland realize that we have a piece of legislation that they believed would be used to protect the environment of this Province from the kind of ravages that we have seen in the past fifty years or five hundred years.

So, Mr. Speaker, when the minister gets up now,

MR. FLIGHT: gets up to close the debate, he is going to have to tell us about the contradictions. I am bringing up the Cat Arm and I am bringing it up to point out the contradictions between Hydro's impact statement and a report, Mr. Speaker, that was made on the Cat Arm in 1976. Hydro says there are twenty salmon in Cat Arm River and the report in 1976 says there are anywhere from 200 to 300 smolts per year in the Cat Arm. They also say, Mr. Speaker, that the Cat Arm River could carry thousands of salmon. Now, I will point out, if the minister wants me to, point out the passages in the report that he should be familiar with, Mr. Speaker, the minister should be familiar with. The contradictions themselves, Mr. Speaker, should have alerted the minister and he should have said, 'Now hold on, we will develop the Cat Arm and we intend to develop the Cat Arm but we intend to develop it in a way that will minimize the damage to the environment of that area'. Why did he not do that, Mr. Speaker? Why did he not use the legislation that this House enacted and why did he not tell Newfoundland Hydro that we accept your impact study but we are not going to accept it alone, we are not going to follow it verbatim, you have a vested interest. The business community, Mr. Speaker, the engineers who want to get their hands on everything and see what engineering miracles they can perform, they want to develop Cat Arm and we need Cat Arm developed, possibly. The economics of the Cat Arm, re the economics of oil fired - is something else, Mr. Speaker, that can bear debate too. If one accepts the theory, Mr. Speaker, that the Lower Churchill, we will have an in feed of Churchill Falls power in the next five or six years, if one believes that, then one would have to ask the question would we not be better off increasing Holyrood, increasing the generation capacity of Holyrood by 150 megawatts,

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker? The long-term price we are going to pay for the Cat Arm, the long, long long, the hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of years, it will be gone, one of the last reserves on this Island, Mr. Speaker, will be gone. Maybe the people of Newfoundland will decide that they prefer to pay ten or twelve or fifteen dollars a month extra on their hydro

MR. FLIGHT:

bills to protect that forever for themselves and their families for five years.

MR. ANDREWS: Do you recommend that?

MR. FLIGHT: I never said I am recommending anything.

Do not ever underestimate - let the minister not ever underestimate, Mr. Speaker, the concern of the Province, and right in this city, for the environment of this Province and let him not ever underestimate the concern a lot of people are having for what they are seeing happening around them. And never let him underestimate the sacrifices that they may be prepared to make to protect what is left of this environment, Mr. Speaker. If the minister is going to go around this Province and have himself accepted as a credible Minister of Environment (H. Andrews) who is sensitive to the environment, he had better not make the kind of comments around this Province that he has been making in this House the past two or three days, Mr. Speaker. He had better show a little more compassion for the environment, for the total environment, Mr. Speaker, than he has shown in this House the past few days.

Mr. Speaker, let the minister stand up in St. John's sometime and he might be forced to do it before this is over, let him stand up, Mr. Speaker, and in defending his attitude on the Cat Arm let him use the same kind of statements that he has used in this House.

MR. HODDER: An undistinguished backbencher and an undistinguished minister

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, the minister had it in his hands. And it is in no way opposing the Cat Arm development, no way, we are entitled to have this environment protected, Mr. Speaker. And after five hundred years a government brought in a piece of legislation, probably the best piece of legislation we have had here yet, that was ever brought

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): I am sorry, the hon. member has thirty-five minutes.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, every proponent, every individual -

MR. STAGG: Do you mean we have to listen to him for another thirty-five minutes?

MR. FLIGHT: No, you can talk.

MR. STAGG: He is making a pretty good speech but I do not think can (inaudible).

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, let me point out to the hon. the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) the illogic that they apply here. Under the legislation, Mr. Speaker, under the Environmental Assessment Act, every proponent who proposes to do anything in this Province that will affect the local environment must submit to the minister an impact statement.

MR. ANDREWS: If you want to dig a well -

MR. FLIGHT: Well, alright, any undertaking that will affect the environment in any way.

MR. ANDREWS: (Inaudible).

MR. FLIGHT: Well, the minister says no. I am not sure he has read the act. I am not too sure if he understands the act, Mr. Speaker. My understanding of that act is that any undertaking in this Province -

MR. HODDER: If that is not true, the act, you may as well throw it out through the window and let (inaudible).

MR. FLIGHT: Any major - well, alright, major. Well, what is Cat Arm? Would the minister consider Cat Arm major?

MR. ANDREWS: Yes, certainly.

MR. FLIGHT: Would the minister consider in Cat Arm, pushing in an access road over five miles, major?

MR. FLIGHT: Well, every proponent, every person in this Province, who wants to do something that will affect the environment in any kind of significant way must submit an impact statement.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is all that has happened here. Newfoundland Hydro presented an impact statement. So every other proponent - if somebody comes in tomorrow and wants to push a road across fifteen or twenty miles of wilderness they only have to submit an impact statement. And if they have the money, Mr. Speaker, to do something as impressive as this is, if they can do something that is so impressive, what is the minister going to do? Is he going to accept the impact statement per se? That is what he has done in this case. He has accepted carte blanche, Mr. Speaker, Hydro's impact statement. He has denied the people of Newfoundland, he has denied Dr. Barnes, he has ignored Dr. Barnes' recommendations, Mr. Speaker, that there should be special legislation brought in to guarantee that Hydro will do things in certain ways. So, Mr. Speaker, what does the minister see now? The only act

MR. FLIGHT: the minister has got to administer of any significance is the Environment Act. So what is he going to do next week, or next month, or a year from now? If he sees fit not to make the Cat Arm hydro electric project apply to Cat Arm, then on what grounds is he going to see fit to make any other project subject to the Act?

MR. ANDREWS: (Inaudible).

MR. FLIGHT: Why?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: Why is it, Mr. Speaker? The evidence in this - even as shaded, Mr. Speaker, as shaded as that Hydro impact study is, there is enough in there, Mr. Speaker, to frighten a Minister of Environment to death inasfar as the potential for damage to the environment is concerned.

Now, faced with the fact of the kind of environmental damage that is going to be done in that Cat Arm, why is he refusing to appoint an Environmental Assessment Board? Why? It will not delay the project, Mr. Speaker, it will only take a month. They can have the meetings and their hearings. So, Mr. Speaker, why is he refusing to appoint the Board?

Did the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) tell him not to appoint the Board? Did the Premier tell him not to appoint the Board? Well, will the minister tell us why? I will yield for the minister to tell us why he will not appoint the Board. Why will the minister refuse to appoint the Board?

AN HON. MEMBER: Sit down until he closes the debate.

MR. FLIGHT: He would not tell us yesterday in the Question Period.

MR. FLIGHT: So, Mr. Speaker, I am running out of time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, we have a Minister of Environment so sensitive and so knowledgeable about the environment that he accepts from Newfoundland Hydro a fact - Newfoundland Hydro told the minister that there were twenty salmon, twenty fish -

MR. HODDER: It went up in December.

MR. FLIGHT: - in the Cat Arm River, twenty fish in the Cat Arm River.

AN HON. MEMBER: What a joke!

MR. FLIGHT: He counted there, Mr. Speaker, Newfoundland Hydro did such an indepth study that they counted the salmon. Now, they counted and there are twenty salmon out - let the word go out to all of Newfoundland that there are twenty salmon in the Cat Arm River.

AN HON. MEMBER: Twenty? Twenty?

MR. FLIGHT: Twenty. That is all that is there, according to Newfoundland Hydro. Cousin Vic signed that.

AN HON. MEMBER: Easy now.

MR. FLIGHT: Twenty salmon, Mr. Speaker.
Now should not that alone

MR. G. FLIGHT: give the minister a cause to say, 'hang on now, if there are twenty salmon in it, how do you determine this?' There was no salmon count done by Newfoundland Hydro. I will tell you what Newfoundland Hydro did, they took the report that was done six years ago, five years ago, and misread it and put it in that impact study, Mr. Speaker. The contradictions in that report, Mr. Speaker, are unbelievable. We are dealing with the last known game reserve in this Province, the area with the highest moose population in Newfoundland, an area, Mr. Speaker, that the whole Northern caribou herd uses to migrate through, an area that is rich in fur-bearing animals, beaver, muskrat. And we are told, Mr. Speaker, we are told in no uncertain terms that it is going to be wiped out. We are told that if care is taken, if the project is done with some environmental concern, if Newfoundland Hydro is, by regulations - if we identify the dangers, then we can minimize that damage. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Environment (Mr. Andrews) in this Province, the minister of a department being created by a piece of legislation today, the man who is going to be responsible for the protection of the environment in this Province, the man who is going to protect the environment, the ecology, our rivers, our streams, our wildlife, our game, our moose, our bears, weasels, muskrats, the man who is going to do that, Mr. Speaker, the man who is going to do all that is not even prepared to have his legislation - the only piece of legislation that he is asked to administer - apply to the Cat Arm project. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is what we are up against, those are the hands that the environment of the people of this Province is into.

MR. ANDREWS: How do the local people (inaudible).

MR. FLIGHT: The local people - I am glad the minister asked. I am glad the minister asked how the local people feel about that.

MR. ANDREWS: (Inaudible).

MR. FLIGHT: Yes, there was.

AN HON. MEMBER: Well, why do you not tell us about it?

MR. FLIGHT: Oh, yes, there were questions asked, too. Does the minister want to know the questions?

MR. ANDREWS: I can really (inaudible).

MR. FLIGHT: Well, I will read them again now.

MR. ANDREWS: Okay.

MR. FLIGHT: We should read them into the record, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Did you give the answers (inaudible).

MR. FLIGHT: I will read the questions.

They asked how many jobs. One of the questions was how many jobs would there be as a result of Cat Arm? And I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, Hydro officials answered the question of how many jobs would be involved during the construction stages -

MR. WHITE: How many after?

MR. FLIGHT: - but I will tell you what Newfoundland Hydro did not address themselves to, they did not tell the people of Sop's Arm and Jackson's Arm -

MR. WHITE: Will there be a hundred?

MR. FLIGHT: - a hundred? How many jobs, Mr. Speaker, permanent jobs, would members of the House of Assembly believe will come as a result of the Cat Arm development? How many?

MR. WHITE: At least a hundred, I would say.

MR. HODDER: Oh, yes, definitely a hundred.

MR. FLIGHT: How many? Six jobs, Mr. Speaker, six jobs, six jobs, six permanent jobs. We are going to spend \$287 million and if there is any over, well, we might as well say \$300 million - you know, what is \$13 million among -

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible).

MR. FLIGHT: - what is \$13 million among friends, Mr. Speaker? - like the man said.

MR. FLIGHT:

We may say \$300 million to generate 120 megawatts of electricity and create six jobs - six jobs, Mr. Speaker, \$287 million. Now, Mr. Speaker, we could generate the same amount of electricity for half the capital cost by increasing the generating capacity of Holyrood. We are being told, Mr. Speaker - we are being brainwashed - we are being told that in the next five or six years there will be an in feed of power from Labrador, we will have electricity coming out of our ears, we will be able to close down Holyrood. In spite of that, Mr. Speaker, for the short-term as a stopgap measure, we are going to spend \$300 million and we are going to wipe out, Mr. Speaker, the last game reserve left in this Province; we are going to wipe out a salmon river.

MR. GOUDIE: What about the 200,000.

MR. FLIGHT: Well, let the minister get into the debate. I stand up to defend what I believe in, and I say, let the minister stand up and defend what he believes in. And I believe two things, Mr. Speaker, that number one, it may be a wrong financial decision to develop Cat Arm. Let the people of Newfoundland decide whether or not they would rather pay high-cost electricity for five years if by making that extra contribution for five or six years would assure forever more the kinds of game populations we have in the Cat Arm Basin. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the minister from Labrador cannot justify why it is that the Environmental Assessment Act should not rule why the Cat Arm development should be exempt from that legislation. It is exempt from the most important clauses in that legislation. The minister accepts carte blanche the impact statement. That part of the legislation is accepted. But the minister refuses to appoint - he accepts carte blanche everything Hydro says and he refuses to

MR. FLIGHT: appoint an environmental assessment board. Why?

MR. ANDREWS: (Inaudible).

MR. FLIGHT: You answer mine. Why?

MR. DINN: Because he is charged with the authority to do it.

MR. FLIGHT: He is abusing his authority, Mr. Speaker. He is not acting in the better interests of Newfoundland, he is acting in the worst interests of Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, when I saw that bill coming in last year, I had some confidence that for once, finally after 500 years, we are going to address ourselves to what we have seen happening in this Province to the environment. As I said, Mr. Speaker, we have watched mining companies desecrate this Province, we have seen paper companies desecrate this Province, we have seen hydro companies desecrate this Province. We have wiped out most of the habitat of our big game, we have destroyed rivers, Mr. Speaker; we have seen rivers wiped out, Mr. Speaker. And finally, somebody had the good sense to bring in a piece of legislation that would stop that kind of thing.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) brought that in.

MR. FLIGHT: The hon. the minister who is now Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook), brought in the bill. But if this government is going to be judged, Mr. Speaker, on its legislation, if this government is going to be judged on the way it backs up its legislation - what is the point of bringing in a piece of legislation and then allowing, Mr. Speaker, everything under the legislation, everything that the legislation is supposed to protect, allow those projects to be exempt from the legislation?

May 14, 1981

Tape 1570

EC - 3

MR. FLIGHT:

I guarantee the minister that he is going to be asked to address himself to this issue outside of this House of Assembly where he will not be able to

MR. FLIGHT: weasel out the way he has weaseled out in the Question Period and where he will not be able to use the kind of comments that he used in this House of Assembly. And I will guarantee you that the minister will find himself in a forum, Mr. Speaker, where he will have to address himself to why it is that he is prepared to slough off the Cat Arm, why he is prepared to ignore the environmental damage to the Cat Arm, why he is not prepared to stand up and force the Cat Arm - force Newfoundland Hydro, to live by the legislation, and why he will not use his prerogative to see that the legislation is lived by and in the process, Mr. Speaker, protect the environment to the point it can be in Cat Arm. If we have got to destroy it certainly we should save what we can of it, certainly we should go with the project in a way that will minimize the dangers, the threats, the risks and the damages to the environment up there, Mr. Speaker.

Three years work and six permanent jobs, Mr. Speaker. The minister should go up and tell the people of Jackson's Arm, if he is going to trade off the environment for the jobs. At the rate of employment in this Province today I can understand the people of Sop's Arm and Jackson's Arm saying, you know, 'Well, if it is going to create jobs then let us go with the project'. Seven hundred jobs he talks about. Go up and tell the people in Sop's Arm how many of those 700 jobs they will get. Tell them about his own experience on the Upper Salmon. Tell them how hard he has tried to get people from the head of the bay, people from Bay d'Espoir involved on the Upper Salmon. Does the minister want to take a guess, out of the 700 people, how many from Sop's Arm and Jackson's Arm will work on that project? I will tell the minister how many will work if he is prepared to tell me how many labour jobs there are. When we find out how many jobs there are in

MR. FLIGHT: the labour, janitors and labour, that is how many people from Jackson's Arm and Sop's Arm will work and no one else. They will bring in their own, Mr. Speaker, their skilled people from all over the Island, which they have a right to do. I guarantee you, Mr. Speaker, the preferential hiring will not apply on the Cat Arm project.

Now, Mr. Speaker, is the minister going to appoint an Environmental Assessment Board? Is the minister going to ask any question, Mr. Speaker, as a result of the contradictions in the report presented by Mr. Barnes - what is his title? - because he is still around, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. FLIGHT: In this case, Mr. Speaker, this report went to the hon. A.J. Murphy, Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment. "Attention: Mr. David Barnes." He was then Chairman to the Power Development Advisory Committee. Total contradictions - an Environmental Impact Assessment, 1976, Dr. David Barnes, totally and completely contradicts an Environmental Impact Statement by Newfoundland Hydro. And, Mr. Speaker, as a result of this being brought to his attention is the minister going to have second thoughts? Is the minister going to take the actions that have to be taken to protect the environment to the point it can be protected? Is he? Is the minister not concerned about the fact that there are all kinds of contradictions in these two reports, that Newfoundland Hydro have shaded it, that Newfoundland Hydro has come as close, Mr. Speaker, to misleading as they can possibly come? Is the minister not going to do that? The minister, Mr. Speaker, is not going to do anything because the Premier and the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) have said to him, 'That project

MR. FLIGHT: goes'. There is no concern for the environment, no concern for the -

MR. HODDER: He is a puppet who was set up by the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) and the Premier.

MR. WARREN: A public relations puppet.

DR. COLLINS: Are you giving a totally unbiased (inaudible)?

MR. FLIGHT: I am giving a totally unbiased -

MR. HODDER: Well, certainly Hydro, certainly Hydro is not (inaudible) unbiased (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT): Order, please! Order, please! The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) has the floor.

MR. HODDER: Hydro is the greatest destroyer of the environment that this Province has ever seen.

MR. FLIGHT: And, Mr. Speaker, we have a piece of legislation -

AN HON. MEMBER: They made an impact study and the government accepted it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT: We have the legislation, Mr. Speaker, that could rein Hydro in, we have the legislation passed unanimously in this House, Mr. Speaker, not opposed, the first piece of legislation in 500 years that would have had any effect on protecting the environment, that would have forced people like Hydro and the mining companies and the paper companies and the speculators to go about their business in a way that

MR. FLIGHT: go about their business in a way that will protect the environment of this Province. And, Mr. Speaker, what do we find? The government, the ministry, Mr. Speaker, does not have the backbone to enforce their own legislation. They do not have the backbone, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WARREN: It hurts their (inaudible).

MR. FLIGHT: They are not prepared to enforce their own legislation. They are letting the Cat Arm hydro project go the same as it would have gone twenty-five years ago. There is no difference now, Mr. Speaker, in the way Hydro will develop Cat Arm than they would have twenty-years ago after this House coming in here, and this government bringing in a piece of legislation, debating it for weeks, making it law, and now we see it being laughed at. Now we see it being ignored.

MR. WARREN: Shame! Shame! Shame!

DR. COLLINS: How many environmental studies have they done? They did thirteen environmental studies.

MR. FLIGHT: They did not do either environmental study. They bluffed you. They have bluffed you .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: Hydro is calling the shots, Hydro did the environmental study, Hydro wanted to do -- and you take Hydro's words as though it were gospel,

MR. HODDER: And ignore Dr. David Barnes.

MR. FLIGHT: - and ignore Dr. David Barnes and ignore everyone else who wants to have something to say about the environment.

DR. COLLINS: (Inaudible).

MR. HOLLETT: Tell him to shut up if he is not in his own seat.

Mr. Flight: And you refuse - and you need not worry about what we believe about Hydro, Hydro is not the issue here. We have legislation. What is the point of creating a department, Mr. Speaker, if the minister of that department is not going to see that the legislation that he administers is carried out, in this Province? If this were some person, some small company trying to make a living in this Province, Mr. Speaker, if this were some person who is running an all-terrain vehicle in across the bog like we see Mr. Ray Simmons writing about lots of times, Mr. Speaker, then the minister would take the legislation and he would say how this applies and he would screw him into the ground, Mr. Speaker. But he is not going to screw Hydro into the ground.

DR. COLLINS: They could not put forth the environmental study-

MR. FLIGHT: He is not going to screw Hydro into the ground. Hydro is going to run roughshod over that minister the way they have run roughshod over every other minister and the way they have run roughshod over the people of this Province. And now, Mr. Speaker, we look to the minister for protection. We have enabled them, we gave them the enabling legislation, we brought in a piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker, that if administered properly would protect the environment of this Province. Before we made him minister, Mr. Speaker, to make sure he was not a lame duck minister, we enacted the legislation under which he could protect the environment. We did not wait and make him a minister and then create the department, before we created the department we enacted the legislation that would put him in a position, Mr. Speaker, to protect the environment. And what happened, Mr. Speaker?

MR. WARREN: Shame, boy! Shame!

MR. FLIGHT: He comes in as a minister - I would be ashamed, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you, I would be ashamed to bring in a piece of legislation into this House today that was going to make me a minister of a department over which I had no control.

MR. WARREN: He does not know a duck from a seal.

MR. FLIGHT: I would like to see the leader, Mr. Speaker, or the Premier or the Minister of Finance who would force me to accept a Cabinet post, Mr. Speaker, and then tell me I could not administer the legislation, the only piece of legislation he is going to have to administer anyway.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is going to make me?

MR. FLIGHT: Shameful, Mr. Speaker.

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

I apologize for interrupting the hon. member. It being 5:00 P.M. I can inform the House that I have received notice of a motion for debate at 5:30 when a motion to adjourn will be deemed to be before the House, notice given by the hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) arising out of a question asked the hon. the Premier and the subject matter is the paving of the Southwest Arm road in the district of Bellevue.

The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, while the minister is out polluting the environment, polluting the local environment, Mr. Speaker, -

AN HON. MEMBER: Member of GASP.

MR. HODDER: Do not worry about that being here, there are more than fifty there.

MR. WARREN: Five hundred.

MR. FLIGHT: Now, Mr. Speaker, there are other people who want to speak in the debate, but is the die-cast, is it fait accompli, is Upper Salmon going to be developed with no more concern than we have seen? Is the Cat Arm River in view of all of the environmental risks, in view of what we are going to lose - and remember, Mr. Speaker, once it is gone it is gone forever, we cannot replace it. We can shut down Holyrood. If the ministry, if the Premier is being truthful to the people of Newfoundland, and if we are going to get a Labrador in feed in five or six or seven years, now if he is being truthful, then we can shut down Holyrood. We cannot start up Cat Arm. Cat Arm - once the habitat, Mr. Speaker, of the caribou, and the moose is wiped out, it is gone forever.

MR. STAGG: What about a decline?

MR. FLIGHT: We cannot restart it.

So, Mr. Speaker, if he is telling the truth, then I would suggest, Mr. Speaker,

MR. FLIGHT:

that the people of Newfoundland will be prepared to say, 'Let us bear the extra cost for the electricity that we develop'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT:

We have \$100 million, \$150 million that is the difference in capital cost, \$150 million the difference in capital cost, Mr. Speaker. Now, we can take that \$150 million and we can apply it against the extra cost in oil for the next five or six years while we are waiting for the Lower Churchill. If the people of Deer Lake, I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the people of the hon. Minister of Health's (Mr. House) constituency had a chance to look at the ramifications of what is going to happen and had a chance to say, 'Well, look, we may be prepared to pay a few more bucks for our hydro because we think it is worth that to preserve the Cat Arm area; to preserve it for all Newfoundlanders for the next thousand years', what would they do, I wonder. I wonder what would the minister's constituents say to him? The minister's constituents would say, 'Go ahead with it'. We may find out, we may find out what the minister's constituents would think of that. So, Mr. Speaker, as I said, is this the end? Is it a fait accompli? Is the minister going to permit the Upper Salmon to go not knowing what the environmental damages are?

MR. HOLLETT:

Cat Arm.

MR. FLIGHT:

Cat Arm it is, yes.

Is the minister going to permit that? Is the minister going to call in Hydro and say, 'Look, cool it for a month, it is going to take us a month to have a board, to have an environmental assessment board appointed and have the public hearings so we can satisfy the people that we mean business, so we can satisfy the people of this Province

MR. FLIGHT: that there is some strength in this legislation, so we can satisfy the people that I am going to do what I have a mandate to do'? Is the minister prepared to call up Vic Young tomorrow and tell Vic Young, say, 'Mr. Young, I want you to curtail any operations in the Cat Arm until I have proven to the people of Newfoundland that we brought in that act in good faith'? Is he going to do that? Is he going to call Vic Young tomorrow and say, 'Vic, do not allow any work to start until we have gone through the process that I feel we have to go through under this legislation, till I have proved to the people of Newfoundland that we brought the legislation in in good faith'? Is he going to do that or is he going to sit and let her go and destroy, destroy, Mr. Speaker, as surely as he ever did anything in his life - not only will he destroy the environment of Cat Arm but he will destroy the faith of the people in this bill, in this department and in this minister. And, Mr. Speaker, I will do everything I can do, everything that I can do to destroy the credibility of the government from an environmental point of view. I will guarantee you will have one voice in the wilderness. I will take my chances, I will take my chances in my constituency, I will take my chances in the L.S.P.U. Hall in St. John's or at any public meeting you want to call in St. John's and defend the environment. I will not oppose Cat Arm. I do not have to oppose the hydro-electric development of Cat Arm to defend the environment of this Province because, Mr. Speaker, if the rest of the environment does not get the protection of this act any more than Cat Arm is getting, then forget it. You are a bunch of bluffs. Mr. Speaker, you brought the bill in knowing that you were not going to enforce it, knowing that you did not intend to apply it and you will continue to ignore the environment, and the bill means nothing. In that context, the department means nothing and the minister means nothing. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will, every chance I get, wherever it is -

MR. WHITE: We are going to start a new program now, 'Collect a minister'.

MR. FLIGHT: Collect a minister.

MR. WARREN: Collect a wreck, collect a wreck.

MR. FLIGHT: Collect it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will use every chance, every option I get, every chance I get, Mr. Speaker, I will use to talk about the environmental bill. I know people all around this Province, Mr. Speaker, of all political stripe, who stood up and clapped when this government brought in that bill. They stood up and clapped and said, 'Finally, finally we have a bill that will stop ASARCO from polluting Red Indian Lake, that will stop Price (Nfld.) from wiping out everything that falls ahead of them -

MR. WHITE: Raping the forests.

MR. FLIGHT: - raping the country, wiping out the river banks for their own profit, that will stop the Iron Ore Company of Canada from wiping out the whole environment up there, that will stop the mining companies on the Baie Verte Peninsula from ruining the environment. Finally we have a bill.' And they might have gone further. They might have said, 'Finally we have a government with a social conscience'. Now, Mr. Speaker, 'Finally we have a government that is prepared to bring in a bill', but they lost a little faith last Summer. They lost a little faith last Summer, Mr. Speaker, when they saw

MR. G. FLIGHT: this government allowing the Upper Salmon project to go without the benefit of this environmental bill. They lost a little faith but they said 'Oh, well, we can excuse them because after all the project was started. But now, Mr. Speaker, now they are going to say - and, Mr. Speaker, we will find enough people and write enough letters - watch the letters to the editors now, in the next three weeks. We will just find enough people to question the government, the minister -

AN HON. MEMBER: Do not be so silly.

MR. FLIGHT: Did he say do not be so silly?

MR. WARREN: Yes, he said do not be so silly.

MR. FLIGHT: We will see, Mr. Speaker, we will find enough people to question now.

AN HON. MEMBER: He does not know what integrity is.

MR. FLIGHT: - the integrity of this government, the concern that this government has for the environment. We will see.

AN HON. MEMBER: How many people are working on the Upper Salmon?

MR. FLIGHT: How many people are working on the Upper Salmon?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HODDER: Does that matter?

MR. HOLLETT: Oh, it matters to that crowd, that is all they know.

MR. HODDER: Does it bother you guys that if you wipe out something forever,-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. HODDER: - forever for short-term gain - does that bother the ministers?

May 14, 1981

Tape No. 1574

RA - 2

MR. SPEAKER(Baird): Order, please!

MR. HOLLETT: They do not expect to be around long enough to (inaudible)

MR. FLIGHT: One of the biggest concerns in this Province, Mr. Speaker, today -

MR. WARREN: The shamed minister. Oh boy!

MR. FLIGHT: - one of the biggest concerns in this Province, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. WARREN: He will never get to Labrador no more.

MR. FLIGHT: - is the environment of this Province.

And the people had a right to believe and they did believe that when this piece of legislation was introduced that finally after five hundred years we would have the environment of this Province -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) your hour.

MR. FLIGHT: Yes, and it is too bad. If I had three hours I would be here three hours. Talk about a filibuster I am concerned enough about this particular issue, Mr. Speaker, to talk from now to daylight. So, Mr. Speaker, what is it? Is it a fait accompli? Is the minister prepared to stand up in a few minutes and say that is it, when he closes the debate? Is he prepared to stand up, Mr. Speaker, and tell the people of Newfoundland that the legislation was a bluff, that the government has no social conscience, they are not prepared to back up their legislation? He will be a useless minister, Mr. Speaker. Is he prepared to say that? Or is he prepared to stand up and say there is finally in this Province a minister who has some concern about what happens.

MR. HOLLETT: 'Graham', tell them they are hypocrites.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, what hypocrites.

MR. BARRY: That is right pure unadulterated hypocrites.

MR. FLIGHT: What unadulterated hypocrites that would bring in a bill, that would bring into this House, Mr. Speaker, a bill designed to protect the environment. What hypocrites.

MR. POWER: That is unparliamentary.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is parliamentary and good English too.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Forestry would be well advised to stay out of this.

MR. WARREN: Yes, stay out of it boy.

MR. FLIGHT: Stay out of it. When the minister recognizes what he is allowing to go on in the Department of Forestry inasfar as ravishing of the environment, then he should keep quiet, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER(Saird): Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT: Now, Mr. Speaker, are we going to -

MR. WARREN: You are in trouble, 'Charlie'.

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible)

MR. FLIGHT: Never mind about that, every now and again I get an new idea.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: Now, Mr. Speaker, what about it? Did we waste the time of this House last fall when we brought this bill in? I remember the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) speaking on this bill. Yes, the member for Stephenville spoke and he spoke in great high praise, as he should have, of this legislation. Now, I am wondering if the member for Stephenville now will now stand up and agree that that project should go. It has been exempted from this legislation, should the Cat Arm- the member got a conscience on this issue -

MR. STAGG: Yes, I have a conscience, the hon. member yesterday (inaudible).

May 14, 1981

Tape No. 1574

RA - 4

MR. FLIGHT: Now, Mr. Speaker, there is no question; I will vote for the bill, of course I will vote for the bill Mr. Speaker. Why should I not vote for the bill, Mr. Speaker?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: But I will continue to point out the hypocrisy, Mr. Speaker, hypocrisy that permeates that other side. A government that would bring in that kind of a bill lead people to believe that they are prepared to do whatever had to be done to protect the environment of this Province, and then exempt the one project that the bill was designed to protect, the one part of Newfoundland the one area that the bill was designed to protect -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please! Order, please! Is the member winding up his speech?

MR. FLIGHT: Yes, Mr. Speaker the member is winding up his speech. Now, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible)

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, what else can one man say? What else can you say? What can one do? What can one do, Mr. Speaker, to appeal to the sense, to appeal to the decency and the sense of the ministry, Mr. Speaker? All they have to do is to tell Hydro to delay, desist and delay and not to continue any work on the Upper Salmon until the Upper Salmon has measured up under this legislation, until this legislation has been applied to the Upper Salmon. That is all they have to do. In one month it can be all over, you will have met your responsibilities under the legislation. If no environmental damages surface that can be substantiated, then you will have met the spirit and the law of the legislation and you will have proved to the people of Newfoundland that you were sincere in the first place. Mr. Speaker, there are other members ready to speak who will raise other issues with regard

MR. FLIGHT: regard to the establishment of a Department of Environment.

I took my whole hour, Mr. Speaker, on Cat Arm, on my disappointment that the government that brought in a bill - Mr. Speaker, after 500 years we got a bill in Newfoundland that would protect the environment.

One of the biggest concerns in the Province today, Mr. Speaker, whether you live in St. John's or you live in Corner Brook, Stephenville, Buchans, wherever you live in rural Newfoundland - most Newfoundlanders in Toronto today, Mr. Speaker, are pining to come home. The reason they want to come home is not because of the climate or the money they can make, Mr. Speaker, it is because we still have a decent environment. And, Mr. Speaker, we are about now to entrust the protection of that environment to the hands of the present minister. We have brought in a piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker, that would defend and protect that environment and make sure it was an environment that the people who live in Toronto could come home to. Now, what do we find? We find a minister, Mr. Speaker, who is prepared to allow his legislation to be ignored, who is allowing Hydro to run roughshod over him.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

I would ask the hon. member to wind up his remarks. He is well over time.

MR. FLIGHT: With that, Mr. Speaker, I rest my case and I am sure that other members will have something to say on other aspects of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Environment. If the hon. the minister speaks he will close the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): On a point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: By way of clarification, Mr. Speaker, the hon. the minister, of course, as Your Honour knows can really only close the debate after everybody has spoken.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HISCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. THOMS: For the past two or three weeks he has been trying to muzzle the Opposition.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, I only have fifteen minutes and it is one of the major bills that was brought into this House.

I totally concur with the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) that this is a major piece of legislation. And we did want, here in this Province, to make sure that this legislation had teeth and we welcomed it when it was brought in, Mr. Speaker. But what do we find? We basically find a government which when it gets into a tight corner, a ticklish issue, it completely ignores the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I will not deal with the Hydro part because I think that was dealt with in itself, but with regard to Newfoundland Hydro today wanting a rate increase, one of the questions that the Federation of Mayors and Municipalities raised was that they wanted the Public Utilities Board to provide an independent financial expert to question Newfoundland Hydro instead of the Board letting everybody else accept what Hydro has stated.

So here we have a report that was done by Newfoundland Hydro. And I think it is extremely dangerous that we, as a government here, wait for the companies

MR. HISCOCK: to do their own environmental studies and then we accept it carte blanche.

Mr. Speaker, I am also concerned that the Upper Salmon was not included under this, and now Cat Arm. My question will be and is, What is the sense of having this legislation if in the future, Mr. Speaker, any legislation that is brought in - great publicity jobs, Mr. Speaker, just like the superport in Harbour Grace, just like the Lower Churchill was going to take place and the tunnel across the Strait of Belle Isle. Well, where is that?

So here we have pieces of legislation being brought in only for cosmetics, only for the purpose of convincing the public that this government has a social conscience budget, has social conscience legislation. But when it comes down to the base line and to the test, after the publicity is gone and after the press conferences are finished and the legislation has to come into place on a day to day operation, what happens, Mr. Speaker? It is completely ignored.

We hear in St. John's that the only people who are qualified and trained to deal with offshore blowouts and oil spills are the twenty-four longshoremen here in St. John's, and they, Mr. Speaker, have withdrawn their services from Mobil because Mobil will not pay anything for stand-by. As a result, in this Province now, if we ever had a blowout at the well or drilling problems, we would not have one person, Mr. Speaker, in this Province, qualified. These twenty-four are the only people qualified to look after this and trained. And here is all the equipment shipped down to Pleasantville, put in storage, no testing done whatsoever to see if the pumps are in operation, to see if the booms

May 14, 1981

Tape 1575

EC - 4

MR. HISCOCK: are working, to see if any
other form of precautionary testing is done. And I would
say, Mr. Speaker, it is not good

MR. HISCOCK:

enough. In the committee that was done under this, Social Services, the Minister of the Environment came, his answer Mr. Speaker, was that we have to depend upon the companies themselves to follow the government regulations.

MR. ANDREWS:

Depending upon the companies.

MR. HISCOCK:

The companies, the oil companies have to follow the regulations. Here is one that represents Mobil Oil saying, 'Well, with the twenty-four people who have withdrawn their services, we really do not need them because we have three people on each of the rigs'. What are three people or nine people or twenty-four people going to do with our fishery on the Grand Bank and the Northern cod? And here we have, Mr. Speaker, a piece of legislation giving some teeth and raising the hopes and expectations of our people. And as government, minister after minister, member after member on the government side and the Premier were making the better environment for our children and our grandchildren and for the generations to come. Well, Mr. Speaker, the people in Jackson's Arm want this development to go ahead and the member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) wants this legislation to go ahead. Why, Mr. Speaker? Only for jobs, Mr. Speaker.

And I would say, Mr.

Speaker, as I said to the Minister of Environment (Mr. Andrews) and he said that was a Liberal attitude, I stated there and I am correct now, I stated that when it ever came to the environment in Newfoundland, whether the Liberals were in power or the Conservatives were in power or any other government, we always put it by the board, we always put the environment by the board. Whether this was the mine in St. Lawrence-- the only law was the law of survival. With regard to the mine on Bell Island, with regard to the dust level

MR. HISCOCK: in Labrador City, whether it was the condition for the loggers in the woods, whether it was the condition for the sealers, any of the conditions in the past, Mr. Speaker, we have always let the environment go by the board because we were a poor Province. Even before we were a Province we were a poor country and we let it go by the board because we needed the jobs. And now, Mr. Speaker, we were thinking that being in a new advanced age with the environment, this administration is following the Reagan administration and the Conservative administration that is in Great Britian, of Mrs. Thatcher, and that basically is, throw the environment, throw it out through the door, get rid of your gas nozzles that saves the environment from pollution. It is another anti-environment attitude and it is great for the cosmetics to bring it in. But, Mr. Speaker, when it comes down to reality they are not doing it. And this is the Conservative administration that basically say they have a social conscience. But when it comes to it, Mr. Speaker, what are they doing?

But, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned from the point of view that if we ever do have an oil spill, if we do have companies coming into this Province, they have got to have teeth, their legislation has to have teeth. And the minister himself states just like the Premier said a few minutes ago with the conflict of legislation, the Premier will decide. Now the minister will decide. Why is it, Mr. Speaker, any piece of legislation that has come into this House, into this administration, not the former administration but any piece of legislation that has come in, I have heard time and time and time again that it is the prerogative of the minister. There is so much prerogative for a minister, Mr. Speaker, that we can actually just as well close down this Province and run this

MR. HISCOCK:
Council.

Province by Order-in-

We have land out by the airport, we have agricultural land. It can be removed by the power of the minister. We have here the Environmental Assessment Act. It can be removed by the power of the minister. Everything, Mr. Speaker, comes to the power of the minister. And I would say, Mr. Speaker, it is not good enough. It is taking away the rights of this Legislature and taking the rights away from this Province.

But another point, Mr. Speaker, that I am a little bit surprised - and I am sure the people in St. John's will be rather surprised when Windsor Lake becomes a cesspool - and that is that this government, this minister has the rules and has the right and has the prerogative to allow swimming, to allow boating and to allow fishing or any other recreational facility in Windsor Lake, Mr. Speaker. These are the people in St. John's, Mr. Speaker, who would not allow

MR. HISCOCK:

the Department of Transportation to put lights in a floating dock in Windsor Lake so they could help St. John's airport. And, Mr. Speaker, when the minister is satisfied upon the advice of his officials that the nature and the size of the public supply is sufficiently large to preclude any pollution by any person, the minister may define and prescribe a section or sections of the public water supply to be used by persons for swimming, fishing or any other activities prescribed by the regulations. And I would say, Mr. Speaker, when the people in St. John's realize this, not only here in St. John's, but in other areas, Mr. Speaker, that one of the things is that we claim, and the United Nations claims in this world now - safe drinking water in this world is shrinking and shrinking all the time and here, Mr. Speaker, we have to spend millions of dollars on Bay Bulls Big Pond through the federal government in co-operation with our provincial government. We have now the largest supply of water, Windsor Lake, and what are we going to do? - open it up for recreation. We have enough recreation at Octagon Pond or other ponds around this Province, Mr. Speaker, without allowing recreation, as much as the people would like to have this. Sure, you would like to be able to use your water facilities next-door to you, but when it is a water supply, Mr. Speaker, then we cannot give in and we will not give in. And I would say, Mr. Speaker, that this minister again will permit people to go troutng and to go swimming, and before you know it, garbage is going to be dumped into it among other things. Because once the doors are open, Mr. Speaker, then they are going to be opened even more - the flood-gates.

MR. NEARY:

That is right.

MR. HISCOCK: But, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned from the point of view of the environment here that we are not following the rule and the spirit of this legislation. And I hope that the media in this Province that talks about the great potential of the oil in this Province - that we, as a government, do not have any nerve centre here to control - the federal Department of Environment, to let them know what the Department of Fisheries is doing, the Department of Development or any of them. We do not have anybody here in this government by way of the Department of Environment to co-ordinate an oil spill or have any planning, Mr. Speaker. And I would say, Mr. Speaker, it is not good enough at all for this administration to bring in legislation and once they have the legislation, Mr. Speaker, to completely ignore it. This is what is being done. And I hope that the media in this Province do give it attention. We are one of the few - the Minister of Tourism and also the present Minister of Environment (Mr. Andrews)-in historical sites - one of the main tourist attractions we have in this Province is our environment. And what are we doing with the environment, Mr. Speaker? We had places where you could go and follow Cormack's trail, can you follow it now, Mr. Speaker? No. You did have other areas on this Island where you could get into canoeing and great areas of wilderness and all of them, Mr. Speaker, are now being dammed for hydro projects. And, Mr. Speaker, it is only being done for one reason. This government nationalized BRINCO back in 1972. If they had not nationalized BRINCO back in 1972, we would have had the Lower Churchill now. It was only \$1.5 billion, now it is gone up to \$4.5 billion and since then those stopgap measures - what have we had? - expansion to the Holyrood thermal plant; we have seen the Hinds Lake development take place; we have seen the Upper Salmon take place, and now we are seeing

MR. HISCOCK: Cat Arm. All these industries, Mr. Speaker, will be done away with, will become redundant when the Lower Churchill comes onstream.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. HISCOCK: And, Mr. Speaker, if this government would only get rid of its confrontation attitude, we would not have need to get on with Cat Arm or the Upper Salmon, Mr. Speaker. The Premier and the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) are responsible. We should have had the Lower Churchill onstream now or at least close to onstream, Mr. Speaker. And I totally agree with the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) who said that our people here in this Province would be quite prepared, if they knew we were going to keep parts of our environment forever, to tighten their belts a bit for another while until we brought it down. But we have to wait - and people are saying, Mr. Speaker, maybe in five or six years; I would say we will have no part of the Lower Churchill or Muskrat Falls in this Province for another ten years. Within another two or three years we will see an expansion

MR. HISCOCK: we will see an expansion of the thermal plant in Holyrood and you will see other ones, Mr. Speaker, taking place. Because this government itself has turned around and basically have not got the power, not only the power but have not got the nerve to go ahead and try to settle the thing.

So, Mr. Speaker, in

concluding -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS):

Order, please! Order!

MR. HISCOCK:

- this piece of legislation

is an excellent piece of legislation but it has been abused deliberately and it has been abused, Mr. Speaker, from the point of view of making us, the people of this Province, the residents - of taking away part of our birthright. And the minister talks about culture and talks about the Newfoundland way of life. It is just as well for us, Mr. Speaker, to move to New York or move to any other pollution center in the world by what this government is doing to our environment.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the hon. member wish

to adjourn the debate now?

MR. HISCOCK:

I adjourn the debate,

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

It being five-thirty -

AN HON. MEMBER:

A quarter after five.

MR. SPEAKER:

Call it five thirty.

- a motion to adjourn is deemed to be before the House. The only matter for debate today raised by the hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) is the paving of the Southwest Arm Road in the district of Bellevue.

The hon. member for

Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk for two or three minutes. It is not my intention to be nasty or anything of the sort. I still believe that you can catch more flies with honey than you can with vinegar. But I want to, in two or three minutes, remind the Premier of his responsibility and the debt that he owes to the people of Southwest Arm. Now, I want to first of all quote from this letter which I will table and I will just quote one line. It is on the Premier's stationery, not the Leader of the P.C. Party but it is on the Premier's stationery. April 8, 1981, my challenge to you. And here the Premier is saying to the people in the Southwest Arm area, he is saying, "Vote for a chance or vote for little or nothing". Well, the people in Southwest Arm, Mr. Speaker, they voted for a chance. They voted two to one, Mr. Speaker, in favour of the Premier, in favour of the government and naturally in favour of a chance. Communities, Mr. Speaker, like Hodge's Cove, 217 votes for the Premier and the chance and just twenty-two for the Opposition. In Caplin Cove we had forty-nine votes for a chance, forty-nine votes for a chance in Caplin Cove compared to fourteen against a chance. In Little Heart's Ease a strong Liberal stronghold, always has been, Little Heart's Ease they voted for the Premier and they voted for the promise that he made not only in this letter but also the promise that he made when he was there in the Little Heart's Ease high school, the only high school in Southwest Arm. And the Premier said then, 'If you vote for the man on the government side, in other words, if you vote for me, if you vote for my government then the next time I come back I will drive over blacktop'. Well, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the people in Southwest Arm do not really care whether the Premier comes back or not but they do care about their blacktop and I hope that the

MR. CALLAN: Premier - the Premier has an obligation, there is no question about it, he has an obligation on two counts, to live up to the promise that he made to the people in Southwest Arm. The fourteen communities down there, Mr. Speaker, the fourteen towns and villages down there went two to one in favour of the government. The Premier asked them to elect a government member and they tried their utmost. They voted two to one.

MR. WARREN: Little Heart's Ease, what was that?

MR. CALLAN: Little Heart's Ease 197 votes for the government and for the Premier and fifty-one against. Overwhelmingly they voted for what the Premier said in the high school down there and for what he had in his letter. Gooseberry Cove, always a strong Liberal town, sixty for the P.C. Party and the Premier and forty-eight against. Southport -

AN HON. MEMBER: How did he lose?

MR. CALLAN: It is not the fault, Mr. Speaker, of the people of Southwest Arm, the fourteen towns down there, it is not their fault that towns like Long Cove and Norman's Cove and Arnold's Cove and Come By Chance and Swift Current and Whitebourne and so on, it is not their fault that these people voted against the government and voted Liberal. It is not their fault and therefore they should not be punished. The Premier has an obligation on two counts to do what he said he would do, and that is give these people pavement.

Mr. Speaker, there are thirty-five miles, approximately, of unpaved road down there, thirty-five miles of unpaved road. I am sure, I am confident that the people in Southwest Arm do not expect thirty-five miles of pavement this year but they expect some. And on the two counts that

MR. CALLAN: that I mentioned, the Premier, number one, because they listened to him and they voted for him, he owes it to them for that reason but, of course, the other reason is an obvious one, that unless the Premier does deliver - he says in his letter, 'There will not be a general election for another eighteen to twenty-four months' - so he has two construction seasons to deliver at least some, if not all, at least some pavement to these people. The road is ready, the road is upgraded, it is ready for paving, and unless the Premier lives up to his obligation on the second count, of course, the people in the whole Province will know the empty promise that he made. I hope that it is not an empty promise. I hope that the Premier lives up to his obligation.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, first of all, as the hon. member knows, the reference in the letter dealing with 'little or nothing' was a spoof and a take-off upon the statements of the Liberal members over the years who kept telling their constituents when they wrote the member, 'I can do little or nothing -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - I can do little or nothing'.

Now, that was an admission by -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - that was an admission by a Liberal member of how well he thought he could do for his district and, so, the idea was simply to remind some of the Liberal candidates and Liberal members that they had admitted that they could do little or nothing for their districts. Now, you know, that is what they said and that is what people told me in Bellevue, and that is all I can say on that, that that reference of

PREMIER PECKFORD: 'little or nothing', that reference to 'little or nothing' was quoting directly what a number of the Liberal candidates and Liberal organizers were saying in the district. We will not go into, as somebody yesterday started to go into, what the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) said when he was out in Bellevue district. We will not dare talk about the kinds of statements he made. We will just limit it to 'little or nothing'.

Now, Mr. Speaker, on the matter of the Southwest Arm Road, there are wonderful people in Southwest Arm. There is no question about that, Mr. Speaker, they are fantastic people. The people of Southwest Arm have seen the light and we recognize that they have a highway there that goes down that shore, that there is a good, new highway there, a good PC highway by the way, Mr. Speaker. That is a good PC highway. We reconstructed it. The Liberal highway there was twisty and turny and meandering and the PC highway is straight and reconstructed. Wow, what a difference! There is the difference between the Liberal party and the PC party in Southwest Arm, a twisty, meandering party or a straight, well-founded party. That is the difference, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: And to show our commitment that we do not only reconstruct, we have started to pave that road. We have started to put pavement on that road in Southwest Arm. We have decided to do it, a fantastic achievement that we have done in Southwest Arm. Of course, those people who have seen the light, you know, around this Province like the people of Southwest Arm, as the hon. member himself admits, have also seen a lot of construction over the years and, no doubt, over the next several years they will see a lot more construction so that we will see a highway down to Southwest Arm. The next time it will not be two-to-one, it will be about ten-to-one for the PC party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

May 14, 1981

Tape No. 1579

GS - 3

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

The motion is that this House do
now adjourn. Those in favour 'aye', contrary 'nay', carried.
This House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, at ten
o'clock.