



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND**

Volume 4

4th. Session

Number 28

VERBATIM REPORT

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 9, 1975

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE M. JAMES RUSSELL

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

It is a pleasure for me to welcome two groups to the galleries today; from the Glovertown Regional High School, fifty-two Grade IX students, with Mr. Austin Stewart and Miss Eliza Feltham and from Seal Cove Vocational School, seven shorthand-typing students, with Miss Squires, Mrs. Abbott and Mr. Rowe.

On behalf of all honourable members, I welcome you to the galleries today and trust that your visit here is most interesting.

PETITIONS:

MR. S. A. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Rural Development has a petition to present on behalf of the residents of Whitbourne, because I have a copy of it, and I am wondering if the minister -

AN HON. MEMBER: Point of order, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

HON. B. PECKFORD (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing): The honourable gentleman is out of order. He is asking a question. The question period has not been called yet, and he is only supposed to present petitions, as I understand it, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

That is correct. The Hon. Member for Bell Island I am sure is aware that the question period has not commenced yet. If any honourable member has a petition he is to stand in his place and then present it.

MR. NEARY: Well, is it in order to present a copy of a petition?

MR. SPEAKER: This is not the question period.

MR. NEARY: No, Is it in order to present a copy of a petition, Sir?

AN HON. MEMBER: No way.

ORAL QUESTIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Social Service, Sir, could inform the House if the minister is yet in a position to make a public statement concerning financial assistance to Teach-A-Tot or to make a public statement on the government's day care centre programme?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister of Social Services:

HON. A. J. MURPHY (Hon. Minister of Social Services): Well unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, not at this time. We are trying to see if we can get up a few dollars to help Teach-A-Tot continue. As far as day care centres are concerned, I think that is quite another matter. I think we have something like nine or ten requests from all across the Province, and it runs into a considerable amount of money. We have great sympathy for Teach-A-Tot, which has been operating for three years. We are seeing if we can help them at least continue as they are going now. But at the present time, Sir, I am really not in a position to make a statement. We are dealing with the principals concerned with Teach-A-Tot. We are on a regular communication basis with them. And until that time comes, Sir, I am afraid that I will have no statement to make.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation. Would the minister care to inform the House if the government have taken a decision, of the minister's department, or the minister has taken a decision to put a freeze on any financial assistance for the summer games here in St. John's in 1977?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation.

HON. T. DOYLE (Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation): Mr. Speaker, as I said in this House last week, I am quite prepared to give the full details of government's participation in the 1977

Canada Summer Games at the time that I do my estimates in this House. If, for some reason, through the delaying tactics of the Opposition I do not get a chance to do my estimates, I will make a statement on the fact at that time.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister care to indicate to the House whether or not the facilities that are planned at Memorial University will go ahead, the swimming pool will be built there, or if the city council or those responsible for the summer games are looking for an alternative site for the swimming pool and the other facilities? No answer? No answer? No?

MR. DOYLE: No!

MR. NEARY: No what? No, it is not so or no answer?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

HON. E. M. ROBERTS (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question initially is for the Acting Premier, the Minister of Justice. Could the minister indicate to the House what representations the government made with respect to the decision by Eastern Provincial Airways to locate their new training facility at Halifax, please?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I understand the honourable gentleman is taking it as notice. Would he also undertake to find out, Sir, what representations the government made other than in writing? If we have gone as far as we can with the minister on that for the time being, Sir, would the Minister of Transportation and Communications indicate to the House please, Sir, what the government's position is with respect to the Dalton Commission Report's recommendation with respect to ferry stops on the Burin Peninsula?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

HON. J. ROUSSEAU (Minister of Transportation and Communications): Yes, I just have the report from the division this morning. It is on my desk, and I will have it in the next day or two when I have a chance to read it. My Director of Transportation, Mr. O'Brien has just completed the background. I only had it this morning, and I have not had a chance to get hold to it. I had a number of delegations in, but I will have something within the next day or two.

MR. ROBERTS: I appreciate that. We will have a go at it in a day or so, but a supplementary, then, growing out of it. Would the minister indicate whether the government - and I think the answer to this one is no, but I want to hear the minister tell us - whether the government have taken a position with respect to this report?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Within a day or two when the statement is made on the other thing, I will indicate to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition the answer to that question as well.

MR. ROBERTS: I am only asking what has been done?

MR. ROUSSEAU: I am just telling you that I will do it altogether.

MR. ROBERTS: All right. Okay.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing is yet in a position to make his long-awaited

statement concerning financial assistance to the town of Wabana so that they can continue with the essential services and replace old worn-out water lines on the island?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. PECKFORD: No, Mr. Speaker, I am not. This is being considered by the Executive Council now. When a decision is made I will be informing the town of Wabana as well as the member for the area.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the same minister, Sir, could inform the House if a meeting has yet taken place with the members of the town council in the town of Wabana concerning the accumulated fund that is to be turned over to the people of Bell Island as a result of the DOSCO assets, the surplus from the DOSCO assets?

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I have instructed the Chairman of the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation to immediately expedite the matter with the Department of Mines and Energy, and my department, through him, to have that meeting and get those assets, whatever they are, dispensed to the appropriate authorities on Bell Island. I am extremely frustrated with the fact that it has not been done up to now, and I have asked, as of yesterday, to have the thing expedited and whatever funds are due over there for them to be, you know, dispensed with and given to the appropriate authorities. So I have done that about seven days ago and again yesterday when it came to my mind here in the House, as a matter of fact during the question period, and I instructed them to get on with it so that we can get the money dispensed. I will ensure that that is done within the next week, to have a meeting called or something so that we can get something moving on it.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Tourism in his capacity as the minister responsible for wildlife. Would he indicate what action has been taken by him or by his officials to look into published reports of some very unusual events in connection

with the awarding of licences to hunt the moose and caribou, including the report that licences have been issued to people who are blind?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Tourism.

HON. T. V. HICKEY (Minister of Tourism): Mr. Speaker, I discussed this matter with my staff this morning, and I am informed that there is no such incident where, at least to their knowledge, licences have been issued to blind persons or indeed to persons, Mr. Speaker, who have any disability. Licences are issued by means of two processes; one by personal contact with the department where they pick up their licences and the other is, of course, through the mail. Now whether or not there is such an incident which occurred by means of the mailing of a licence, I am not aware of, but I have discussed it with my officials. It is certainly something which is very serious, and we are looking at it along those lines. But I have absolutely no knowledge of ever such an incident taking place.

MR. ROBERTS: I thank the minister.

Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question.

Is there any requirement in the regulations, I assume the wildlife regulations, that a person must be sighted before that person can receive a licence?

Now it is not the place to debate - obviously blind people should not be denied a chance, if they can get somebody to take a gun and go shoot for them, but obviously, equally, a blind person cannot use it. But is there a requirement in the licencing regulations?

MR. HICKEY: No, Mr. Speaker. To the best of my knowledge there is no such requirement with regard to a visual test or anything of that nature. I think it is fair to say that the whole issue of licencing and the use of firearms with regard to wildlife is one which is due for some investigation at this time, and indeed some improvement. It is one of the areas which we have not been able to make the necessary changes in. I certainly am prepared now to say that there is a need for it, and we intend to do something about it, to tighten up some of the loopholes which are existing and, of course, one of the areas where we have already taken action and which we view as the possible solution to a good many problems is the hunter-training programme.

The other question is how quick we can get this into operation to such an extent to have the desired effect. I think it is fair to say to be objective about it that this will not take place for at least a couple of years. We have two staff members at the moment working at it, and they are making good progress. The other thing is to find an agency or to find a system whereby this quick check can be made on people who are issued licences to ensure that indeed they are familiar with the use of firearms or that they are responsible enough and capable of handling them. I am prepared to admit that it is an area which certainly needs attention, and we are looking at it. What the answer is I am not in a position to say at this point in time.

MR. ROBERTS: I appreciate the minister's dilemma, Mr. Speaker.

A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is there any requirement in the regulations that would prohibit or that would prevent a second licence being issued to the same family unit before - you know, we now have a computer system, as I understand it - is there anything to prevent a second licence being issued to the same family before every family has one?

MR. HICKEY: No, there is not, Mr. Speaker. This is one of the problems with the present system. However, my staff tell me, and I have discussed this whole area of the issuing of licences through the computer system in detail on many an occasion, my staff inform me that the first year was expected to be, or at least was expected to show some incidents of this. But I am informed that the majority of the people who received, if in fact not all the people who received licences last year will not this year get licences. And I am also told that the chance of this happening the second and third year is very, very remote. Now I am not in possession of the facts as to why this is but I can certainly find out in detail. But this is what I am informed. I am assured that what happened last year there is a very slim chance of a recurrence this year. I can say in answer to the honourable member's question with regard to any section or regulation which prevents a second licence to a family, no, there are no regulations to prevent it. And the reason for that is because we feel that the only way that this can be done is to identify who, in fact, a hunter is. We believe that a second licence to a family is as legitimate as the first one if, in fact, that second person is of age, is a bona fide hunter that that person obviously has as much right, as a citizen, to a licence as his father or his brother, or whatever the case may be.

MR. ROBERTS: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. This is not the place to debate it, but we could have quite an argument over it, family units; I am not talking about an independent unit, but more than one licence under one roof. But that is another story. Is there any

consideration being given, Sir, by the minister to limiting the open season for our large game animals, the moose and the caribou, to a period in the month of December and at the same time throwing it open to sort of anybody? In other words, not just restricting it to the people who have been issued licences.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, this matter is under discussion at the present time. We have held a number of sessions on it. With regard to the possibility of opening a particular area during the month of December, this matter has been discussed. There is no final decision. I can inform the honourable member that

the result of the Winter season has been termed by my staff as being a fantastic success. A lot of the concerns as were expressed by some people certainly did not come to pass. There is no evidence of misuse of the snowmobile. There was one particular incident which is under investigation. There was no evidence of any unnecessary casualties in wildlife as a result of the hunting season. The take or the yield to the hunters was very good in two areas out of the three. In one areas it was not as good as we had expected. Generally speaking, it is the intention of my department to continue to have a winter season for at least another year.

MR. SPEAKER: Before I recognize the Hon. Member for Bell Island, although I am not sure if they are all in, I am not sure if there enough room at the moment. But we do have a majority, I think, of a group from the John Burke High School at Grand Bank numbering in total sixty-eight Grade IX and X students, with their teachers Mr. Snook and Mr. Noseworthy. And on behalf of all the honourable members I would certainly like to welcome these people to the galleries as well and trust that their visit here is also most interesting.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Recreation and Rehabilitation, Sir. Would the minister indicate to the House whether or not he has received any representations, either in writing or orally, from residents in the Placentia area to have a vacant gymnasium on the Base at Argentia turned over for the use of the residents in the Placentia area?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation.

MR. DOYLE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. About a month ago, I had a letter from the Placentia Area Development Association bringing to our attention the fact that there was a building on the Argentia Base that if we could get our hands on it, it would be an appropriate

building to use similar to the recreation centre we have at Torbay Airport and similar to the one we just recently have taken over and are now operating in Stephenville. Since that time I have had discussions with my colleague, the Hon. Minister of Industrial Development, who has been involved with negotiations with the Americans and with Ottawa over the transfer of the buildings in Argentia, and it would seem to me that if and when we are able to get our hands on that building that it would make an excellent facility to add to our ever-growing recreation facilities throughout the Province.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that the Placentia Area Development Association, who made the suggestion have been advised of what is going on, and I am keeping them up to date.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Provincial Affairs, Sir, who is responsible for Consumer Affairs. Would the minister care to tell the House what action the government or his department have taken on Recommendation No. 10 in the Food Prices Review Board Report of November, 1974 that consideration be given to the establishment of a separate ministry of Consumer Affairs in the provincial government?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Provincial Affairs and Environment.

HON. G. DAWE (Minister of Provincial Affairs and Environment): Mr. Speaker, this question, I believe, was asked once before. I give the same answer. It is not my prerogative to set up departments in this government. It is the prerogative of the Premier and his ministers. And now you can debate it at 5:30 P.M.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Would the minister care to indicate what action his government has taken on the other seven recommendations made in the Food Prices Review Report concerning the high cost of living in Newfoundland and Labrador?

MR. DAWE: I do not have a copy of that report before me, Mr. Speaker, and I have not memorized the recommendations. Some

of them we have already acted on. Where it calls upon the action of federal departments, we have asked these departments to conform with the recommendations made by the Food Prices Review Board.

If I had a copy of the report perhaps I could give him further information.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary. Would the minister indicate what recommendations have been acted on? Perhaps the page might like to take the minister over the report. What recommendations in this report have been acted on, that come under provincial jurisdiction?

MR. DAWE: I will take it under advisement, Mr. Speaker, and I will give a detailed answer at a later date.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Member for Labrador North.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Transportation and Communications. Can the minister inform the House when he will be circulating the white paper on snowmobile regulations?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Minister of Transportation and Communications.

HON. J.G.ROUSSEAU (Minister of Transportation and Communications): The paper is now prepared, as I understand it, if I can pass that to my colleague the honourable the Minister of Tourism who will be responsible for it, I am sure he will give you an up-to-date on it.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Minister of Tourism.

HON. T.V.HICKEY (Minister of Tourism): Mr. Speaker, the regulations pertaining to the motorized equipment, I think is probably the best way to put it, covering snowmobiles and all-terrain vehicles, is in the final stages of drafting. We have gone over them so many times in an effort to produce the best regulations that we can I do not want to give an exact date, but I would hope that within a matter of two weeks to be able to produce the white paper that we promised.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Member for Labrador North.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Recreation and Rehabilitation. I wonder if the minister can inform the House when the proposed Labrador Resources Development Corporation will be set up?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Minister of Recreation and Rehabilitation.

HON. T.M.DOYLE (Minister of Recreation and Rehabilitation): Mr. Speaker, I cannot give an exact date on it. All I can say at this point in time is that there is a tremendous amount of background work going within the building to come up with the appropriate terms of reference for the Corporation. That is about all I can say at this time. Perhaps the honourable the Minister of Industrial Development may wish to add something to that but I cannot give the exact date. Work is ongoing

all the time and it should be, as soon as the final terms of reference are drawn up, it should be off the ground.

MR. WOODWARD: A supplementary before the Minister of Industrial Development speaks. I wonder if the minister can inform the House if this Corporation will replace the Labrador Services Division of his department?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Minister of Industrial Development.

HON. W. C. DOODY (Minister of Industrial Development): The intention is, Mr. Speaker, that in areas of commercial activity and industrial activity, the Labrador Development Association or Development Corporation will replace the Labrador Services area. In terms of the service areas, the housing needs, water and sewerage, social services and so on, these will be handled by the line departments. This is the intention at the present time.

As my colleague indicated there is a tremendous amount of background work being done on this. The first draft terms of reference have been drawn up and they are now being examined by a group. We have invited some of the Native people on the Coast of Labrador to submit any thought they may have on the formation of such a corporation and indeed, we would welcome advice from all interested groups. It is a fairly substantial undertaking and we want to make certain that it gets off on the right foot before we commit ourselves to its birth. But as I say, if the honourable member or anybody else who is concerned with that particular area wants to give us any advice or any briefs or any papers or documents or whatever, we would be only too happy to consider them before we put the thing into actual operation.

MR. WOODWARD: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister can inform the House where the headquarters will be for the corporation?

MR. DOODY: No. There were two schools of thought. We have had two series of suggestions, One group suggested that Cartwright might be the appropriate place because it is felt that the Goose Bay-Happy Valley area has been too long associated as the headquarters, perhaps, of the Labrador Services. I do not know if that is a valid reason or

not. I does not sound like a particularly good reason. The group feel that it that it would be far more advantageous to have the headquarters in the Goose Bay-Happy Valley area where there are more amenities and more services available in terms of communication and in ease of administration. The final decision has not been made on whether it is Cartwright or Happy Valley-Goose but these are the two centres that are being considered most actively.

MR. WOODWARD: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is there a time frame when the Corporation will come into - will it come into being before this summer?

MR. DOODY: I honestly do not know. I would hope that it would. We are pushing ahead as quickly as we can on it, as I say. We would much prefer to have all the details ironed out and all the loopholes plugged before the Corporation is truly launched. It may be better if it took an extra month or so to do it properly than to rush in for the sake of appearances to put the thing in place prematurely. I would hope that it would be in operation, or at least the framework would be in operation by this summer. That is certainly the objective of the team who are working on its structure but I cannot guarantee it, obviously.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Rural Development. Is the minister yet in a position to table in the House a list of the receiving communities under the Community Consolidation Programme?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Rural Development.

HON. J. REID (Minister of Rural Development): Not at the present time, but very soon we will have it ready.

MR. ROBERTS: Right. I thank the honourable gentleman. Could he indicate to us when we might expect to have that tabled here?

MR. REID: Mr. Speaker, I do not know the exact date but I say probably within a week we should be able to have it ready.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Social Services, Sir, could inform the House if any babies for adoption from South Vietnam have arrived in the Province as yet or if the minister is expecting any babies to be placed in homes, to find adoptive parents and adoptive homes in Newfoundland?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Social Services.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge, Sir, there have been no babies arrived in Newfoundland yet. We have been going very extensively into the whole thing this past week. Our Mrs. Devine, who is the Assistant Director of Child Welfare, has everybody cued up. To my knowledge there were about forty representations made up to the weekend. I was rather amazed when she disclosed - and I have not had a chance yet - that there are some 200, I think, throughout the Province who are looking for them. We did receive a communication, in co-operation with the Minister of Health, from the Honourable Mr. Andras, Minister of Immigration, with reference to the health problems because, as everybody knows, adoptions follow pretty well the same pattern, but coming from outside the country, immigration has been the big thing and Mr. Andras has promised that

they are setting up a desk to clear this, and we did make a firm commitment - I think, was it yesterday, Doctor that telegram, or the day before - Monday that we would accept approximately forty immediately even, you know, without being placed into homes directly and that we would look after them until such time that they were placed. But the interest is tremendous. We are trying to follow it up and again now in between there are other reports emanating that they are putting a stop to this type thing. But actually we are working very closely with Mr. Andras, the Federal Minister, and please God, if we are asked, I think we can place a great number of them. And I think we are all very, very happy for it. And the Department of Health is working closely because all these children may not be as perfect, health-wise, as we would like so we would have to place them somewhere, possibly, for screening as to their health conditions.

But I am happy to report to the House, Sir, that we are working with all the other Provinces of Canada. And I want to thank those Newfoundland people who have responded to this in such a wonderfully generous way, Sir, and it shows that all is not over and that we still have people with hearts who want to do something for someone else.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Tourism, Sir. As we are all waiting with bated breath to find out whether or not the Norma and Gladys has passed her final inspection before sailing for Japan, would the minister care to give the House a progress report on whether she has had her trial runs and when she will be leaving for Tokyo?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. REID: A load of flippers yesterday.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman is as true to form, he never quits. I told him last week, Sir, that I am not in a position to confirm publicly that the vessel is going to Japan.

It would be wrong for me to say that it was. I can only say to him that things are looking very good and that within about seven days, somewhere around the fifteenth of this month, there will be a statement one way or the other on the whole issue. And with regard to the trial runs, I can tell him that there is a slight problem in Clarendville. I understand there is some ice that keeps us from taking the vessel out.

Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of work involved in this, and a lot of things that have to be completely tied together before any statement is made, and I am sure the honourable gentleman can appreciate that.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, before -

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, before Your Honour proceeds to orders, may I ask leave to move the adjournment of the House to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance. I have a copy of it here for Your Honour. Mr. Speaker, the matter which I wish to discuss, a definite matter of urgent public importance, is the failure of the government of this Province to support the efforts being made by other provinces to prevent an increase in the price of fuel and oil products to the consumers in those provinces, which failure by the government will result

in the people of Newfoundland and Labrador paying substantially higher prices for gasoline and for heating oil in the very near future, of which failure is a direct result of the government's refusal to stand up for the true interests of Newfoundland and of Canada as a whole.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I submit that that is not a motion that requires that the rules be suspended. There certainly is no urgency of debate. It is a mischievous motion, frivolous motion, a motion that is speculative. We await with confidence that the Honourable the Premier and his ministers who are in Ottawa will once again protect the interests of the people of this Province

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman is putting the best light on a very bad case. I have the Premier's statement here and if ever Newfoundland's interests were sold out by a Premier this represents it. Sir, there is no question of the urgency of this. There is no under head under which it can be discussed. Today is Private Members' Day in this House, a day when matters moved by private members can properly come up. This matter cannot be discussed under any other business before the House. The government have deliberately failed to call the estimates of the Department of Mines and Energy. They have refused to call the budget speech. They have refused to call the debate on the Address in Reply, any or all of which would be a fit subject. And I say, Sir, that this is urgent. It is of public importance. It affects every single Newfoundlander intimately, and I say that the government of this Province - the statement just delivered in Ottawa by the Premier is a complete sell-out of Newfoundland's interests. It should be debated in this House, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I am sure all honourable members are aware it is the urgency of debate that has to be ruled on and not whether or not

the subject itself is urgent. The Chair has read carefully the motion made by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and feels it does not warrant the adjournment of the ordinary business of this House for a debate on this subject at this time.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, with the utmost respect, may we appeal your ruling. Sir, there can be no matter more urgent than this. The conference is meeting this day in Ottawa. Let us divide the House, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.
Order please!

The motion is that the Speaker's ruling be upheld. Those in favour "aye." Those against "nay." It is the Chair's opinion that the "ays" have it.

MR. ROBERTS: Your Honour, we asked for a recorded division. The Sergeant-at-Arms so understood it. Could we go ahead and have a recorded division please?

MR. SPEAKER: Those in favour of the motion please stand:
The Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, the Hon. Minister of Health, the Hon. Minister of Social Services, the Hon. Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations, the Hon. Minister of Provincial Affairs and Environment, the Hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications, the Hon. Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation, the Hon. Minister of Education, the Hon. Minister of Justice, the Hon. Minister of Industrial Development, the Hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, the Hon. Minister of Tourism, the Hon. Minister of Rural Development, Mr. Stagg, Mr. Dunphy, Mr. Senior, Mr. Marshall and Mr. Evans.

Those against the motion please stand:

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Gillette, Mr. Woodward, Mr. Neary, Mr. Rowe and Mr. Simmons.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER: It being Private Members' Day, we will proceed with Motion No. 3 as it appears on today's Order Paper, moved by the

April 9, 1975

Tape no. 1203

Page 3 - mw

Hon. Member for Hermitage whom I think adjourned the debate the last day, and I wish to inform the honourable member that he has five minutes left to speak.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Due to the shortage of time, there are a number of items that I will not be able to get into. If you recall the last day I dealt at some length with the so-called Dobbin deal. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that it is just one of a number of such issues that my colleagues will be bringing to the attention of the House. I had intended to touch on them but, as I say, because of a shortage of time I shall pass over them for the time being. After saying once again that the Dobbin deal is just one of the issues that point up the absolute need for the appointment of the Select Committee which is provided for in my resolution, I would have wanted also to make some comments on the actions of the Member for St. John's East with respect to the Dobbin deal, But that will have to wait as well and perhaps my colleagues will have some reference to it. I would particularly want to talk about the government's record in terms of public tendering but again my colleagues, I hope, will deal with that matter. I would have wanted in particular to deal with the Trizec issue, and again time does not permit me, but I am sure my colleagues will be discussing that and raising some questions about it.

So, Mr. Speaker, in concluding the remarks which I began last day, just let me perhaps put it in perspective as I see it once again by raising a few questions that members on the government's side or other members participating in the debate might want to respond to.

Insofar as the issue involving Mr. Dobbin is concerned, the issue which is documented in part, only in part, Mr. Speaker - there are a lot of documents missing from this summary - but in part the issue, the deal as I call it, as has been documented here, there are a few questions. Was there really a deal? I would like to know the answer to that one, and I would like the people who speak on behalf of the government to respond to that. I would like to know whether the Premier was in a serious conflict of interest position because of his past, close, intimate association with Mr. Craig Dobbin? I would like to know, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HICKMAN: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The honourable gentleman from Hermitage is making the worst kind of innuendo in that type of questioning, is there any conflict of interest between the Honourable Premier and a gentleman named Dobbin because of past association. There is no evidence of any association, none at all, past association, present association or anything else. And I submit, Mr. Speaker, that that type of innuendo is totally unparliamentary.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, to the point of order. Mr. Speaker, in my comments last day I did introduce some evidence, if you like, some indication that the association has been fairly close. I have now raised the question, is there or is there not some conflict of interest in this particular matter? And it is a question I would like the Minister of Justice, among others, to respond to when it comes to his speaking time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: It has to be abundantly clear to any honourable gentleman in this House that no honourable member can get up and use all sorts of hearsay evidence and innuendo -

MR. F. ROWE: Hearsay!

MR. SIMMONS: Hearsay!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HICKMAN: - and having used hearsay evidence for an hour or an hour-and-a-half, having done that, Mr. Speaker, then turn around and say, now based on all these little petty rumours that you get, you know, in sewing circles and that sort of thing, old ladies sit around with their knitting needles and they gossip, having given an hour of gossip, now, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SIMMONS: Point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HICKMAN: - now, Mr. Speaker,

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

MR. SIMMONS: Point of privilege Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, if I may -

MR. SPEAKER: I recognize the Hon. Minister of Justice on a point of privilege.

MR. SIMMONS: I am rising on a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, may I conclude by saying -

MR. SIMMONS: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: A point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair has recognized the Hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. SIMMONS: I am rising on a matter of personal privilege.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, if I may conclude.

It ill-behooves any member to come before this House, use only gossip and then at the end of it, by innuendo, make -

MR. SIMMONS: It is a matter of personal privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HICKMAN: - a direct allegation.

MR. SPEAKER: There is already one point of personal privilege before this House, and it cannot consider two at the same time.

MR. HICKMAN: Right.

MR. SIMMONS: I understand the minister rose on a point of order.

MR. HICKMAN: A point of privilege of the whole House.

MR. SIMMONS: No, Sir.

The minister is deliberately filibustering so I cannot finish my comments.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: You have been deliberately filibustering.

MR. HICKMAN: You can finish your gossipy little comments if you want to, my dear friend, and go on for hours.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Okay, is that agreed?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Agreed? Okay, for an hour.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The Hon. Member for Hermitage may pose certain questions to which he would like answers but I submit that he should do it in terms of parliamentary language and not be using innuendo. The Chair feels that he was doing that. He may continue.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Well, I was not attempting to use any innuendo. I did not intend to use it. I merely raised the question about whether there was a conflict of interest position, and I would like the Minister of Justice to reply to that. I would also like the

minister and others to reply to another question I have: Whether the government public service and the government's service to the people of Newfoundland is suffering because of the lack of space which there is over the past year or so and which the Premier has evaded to come to grips with? He could have come to grips with it in terms of a public tender route a year or two ago. Is the public service and the service to the people of this Province suffering because of that neglect on the part of the Premier and his colleagues? Mr. Speaker, another question: Are we witnessing in the Dobbin deal the same sweep it under the carpet approach which the government used in other issues such as the Saunders' scandal, which we have talked about in this House?

MR. HICKEY: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS: Does the government -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HICKEY: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I do not know about any other -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I do not know about any other honourable member -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The Hon. Minister of Tourism has risen on a point of order, and I submit if the Chair is to hear his point of order then honourable members to my left and to my right should remain quiet.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I was about to say that I assume all honourable members feel as I do, but at least I will speak for myself.

I am not prepared to sit here, as a member of this government, firstly, and secondly, as a member of this honourable House, and have by inference or by innuendo this kind of - it is tantamount to a charge, Mr. Speaker, but it is cloaked in a way or by the use of an inference or innuendo, because someone is assumed to be a friend of another, there is a suggestion of conflict of interest. Now the word scandal is brought into this. I do not know if the honourable gentleman from Hermitage realizes or not, I do not know if his time in this House permits him to understand that the Law of Immunity which covers debate in this House can be stretched out of all proportion and that in fact in doing so, he himself is being dishonest with other members of the House by using such tactics and by making inferences or making charges under the cloak of innuendos. I, for one, am not prepared to sit here and take it, Your Honour, and I suggest that the honourable gentleman be made to retract his comments.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order. The member who raised the point of order, Sir, did not give the House any citation for his objection to this so-called unparliamentary language on the part of my colleague mentioned by the Minister of Tourism. I would submit, Sir, that my colleague is completely in order. My colleague has not used any unparliamentary language. My colleague has followed the tradition of the House. He has used language, Sir, that I have heard used on many occasions in debate in this honourable House, and I would submit that my colleague is completely in order and that he be permitted to carry on, Sir, and finish his address.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, is not the word scandal unparliamentary? Does it not imply certain things which certainly no one likes to hear, much less when they are not true?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The Hon. Member for Hermitage did use the word scandal perhaps in a context that is being very close to unparliamentary. It may depend .perhaps, on the context in which certain words are used at the time when they are used. Again I would remind the Hon. Member for Hermitage that if he wishes to continue in this debate, he should be a little more cautious of the context in which he uses certain words.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, of course, I would be quite willing to

withdraw any remarks which are unparliamentary. And if the word scandal is inappropriate well, of course, I can certainly rephrase the question and ask, Mr. Speaker, another. But before I do, I would like to bring another matter to the attention of the House on a point of order, and it is that the Hon. Minister of Tourism, in speaking to his point of order, used the word dishonest, and it is clearly spelled out as being one of the words which is unparliamentary, and I believe the minister ought to be asked to retract that particular word. There is no doubt about it. I am looking at Citation 155 on page 130 of Beauchesne and the word dishonest is particularly mentioned as one which is unparliamentary, and I would hope he would see fit to retract it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I relish the opportunity to apologize to the honourable gentleman if, in fact, he interpreted my comment to mean that he was dishonest. I simply said that if he is going to use the Rule of Immunity of the House to make charges under the cloak of innuendo and inference, then he would be dishonest with all honourable members in this House, much less the electorate and the public of this Province. That is all I said.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The matter now being discussed between the Hon. Member for Hermitage and the Hon. Minister of Tourism, perhaps, if it continues, and even at present, is at best a difference of opinion between two honourable members. Certainly the word dishonest, again perhaps depending on the context in which it is used, is certainly unparliamentary.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and my thanks to the Minister of Transportation.

Let me ask the question another way. Are we witnessing in the so-called Dobbin deal the same sweep it under the carpet approach which the government has used in the Saunders' issue?

Does the Dobbin deal, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I would like to inform the Hon. Member for Hermitage, except by leave of the House, that his time has expired.

MR. NEARY: By leave, Sir?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No!

MR. SIMMONS: May I have a moment to clue up?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: May I have a moment to clue up in view of the interruptions?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: May I have a moment to clue up in view of the interruptions?

MR. NEARY: By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: By leave?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Does the Hon. Member for Hermitage have leave to continue?

AN HON. MEMBER: By leave, Sir?

AN HON. MEMBER: No way.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair gathers that there is not unanimity so the honourable member does not have leave to continue.

MR. SIMMONS: The filibuster paid off, eh?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: The filibuster paid off.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: He is afraid to hear it. You are afraid to hear it.

MR. HICKEY: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Are we going to allow this kind of thing? The honourable gentleman -

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Tourism on a point of order.

MR. HICKEY: - is now suggesting that we filibustered

because we were afraid to hear what he had to say. I am prepared

to move a motion, if someone will second it, that the honourable

gentleman be given three weeks. What bloody -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. EVANS: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Opinions being expressed across the House

between two honourable members are merely a matter of opinion.

The Chair recognizes the Hon. Member for St. Barbe North.

MR. F. ROWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

First of all, Sir, I would like to congratulate my colleague from the district of Hermitage for introducing this particular motion. Sir, it is indeed sad in this day and age, with so-called legislation, public tendering legislation introduced in this House, it is sad indeed for any member on any side of this House of Assembly to ask or move that a Select Committee be appointed to enquire into and to report upon all circumstances surrounding any decision or decisions by the government to acquire any office space or other accommodation by rental, purchase or otherwise since January 1, 1973 or any proposals so to acquire office or other accommodation and that this Committee, Sir, be given the power to send for papers and documents and to require the attendance of witnesses to testify under oath; the Committee to have power to sit in session or out; and the Committee to carry out their work as expeditiously as possible, to submit an interim report to the House within thirty days of their appointment, and to submit their final report within ninety days of their appointment.

Now, Sir, to have any member of this House of Assembly stand up after the promises and the proclamations and the announcements of this government having to do with patronage and the

necessity for calling public tenders is quite unbelievable. It is quite unbelievable, Sir, that this kind of a motion has to be introduced into this House of Assembly after these many P. C. promises that they will forever end any patronage in this Province and that public tenders would be called for the smallest kind of a project. There would be no patronage. This was the promise, Sir, of this government. This was the action, in print, of this government.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: This was the action, in print, of the P. C. Government, Sir. But it certainly was not the real action of this government, because in spite of their legislation, my colleague from Hermitage, through his analysis of this green paper, has shown beyond any shadow of a doubt, beyond all reasonable doubt or beyond any shadow of doubt, Sir, that there is certainly reason for the people of this Province to question what did go on in the calling of proposals for 400,000 square feet of office space for use by the government? What did go on, Sir? We know that Lundrigans were asked to make a proposal. We know that the Crosbie group of companies -

MR. HICKMAN: Andrew Crosbie was the campaign manager for -

MR. F. ROWE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I will not be distracted.

- were asked to make a proposal. We know that Seaboard was asked to make a proposal, and we know that Mr. Craig Dobbin's company - I cannot remember the name of it now - was asked to make a proposal and to make it within two weeks, Sir, make it within two weeks. My colleague has pointed out that one of these four companies was unable to submit a proposal, because they did not have the time.

MR. HICKMAN: (Inaudible).

MR. F. ROWE: Now, Mr. Speaker, I am quite happy to sit down in silence and listen to the Hon. Minister of Justice if and when he

speaks on this, but I will not tolerate the babblings of the minister when I am trying to get a point across.

MR. HICKMAN: Oh, my! I will not babble any more. Babbling is out.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: Do not insult your constituents.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order, Sir. I hate to interrupt my colleague, Sir, but we are discussing a matter of grave, urgent, public importance, and the government members, Sir, do not seem to want to stay in their seats for some reason or other. We may have to get seat belts for them. But we do need fourteen members in order to constitute a quorum in the House so we can discuss the business of the House. I am calling a quorum, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the clerk count the House, please?

There is a quorum.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, may I on a point of order?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. ROUSSEAU: While it is not a rule of the House, I think the Hon. Member for Bell Island is quite aware while the Fisheries Select Committee is out of the House there will be no quorum calls. Further, the Hon. Member for Bell Island knows quite well that there are not fourteen people in this House, there are fourteen people within hearing distance. I would think that he would have the courtesy of abiding by, at least, a mutual understanding that we had arrived at from both sides of the House in respect to the sittings outside the House of a Select Committee and the fact that nobody is not out of this House not listening. We can all hear it in the common room. The honourable member knows well that we can.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

The quorum was called by the Opposition. The Opposition must obviously realize that this is Private Members' Day. If they are going to call a quorum on the complaint that there are not enough members in the House, in the Chamber, then surely all members of the Opposition, who are present, should be in their seats. Really they are calling a quorum, Mr. Speaker, against themselves.

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

Your Honour is well aware that the Standing Rules of order of this House, Sir, clearly state that at all times there must be fourteen members in the honourable House before we can debate the public business in this honourable House.

MR. HICKEY: That applies to the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Now, Sir, the Minister of Transportation said there was an agreement. I want to point out to the House that there is no agreement.

MR. ROUSSEAU: There is.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, there is no agreement. The Leader of the Opposition the other day -

MR. ROUSSEAU: There was an understanding.

MR. NEARY: There might have been an understanding between a couple of members. But, Sir, the point I want to make is this that whether there was an understanding or whether there was not an understanding, if there are members on the ninth floor, Sir, and we are not going to have a quorum call every couple of minutes while the Select Committee on the Inshore Fishery is travelling, but if the members are on the ninth floor, Sir, their place is in the seat of this House and Your Honour does not have any choice under the Standing Rules -

AN HON. MEMBER: You were not in yourself.

MR. NEARY: I was the one who called the quorum call.
- and Your Honour has no choice but to recognize the fact that there is no quorum, and if we do not get a quorum within three minutes Your Honour has to adjourn the House until the next day.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The Chair is well aware of the rules with regard to a quorum call. And whether or not there was any mutual agreement made, perhaps, is not a concern of the Chair. If the fact is brought to the attention of the Chair that there is not a quorum present, then the Chair has no choice but to follow whatever procedure is laid down.

The Hon. Member for St. Barbe North.

MR. F. ROWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I hardly know where I was, Sir. I think the point that I was making, Sir, is that four companies were asked to make proposals for the provision of 400,000 square feet of office space, and they were asked to do so within two weeks which was openly admitted by one company was impossible to do. And, therefore, in a letter to

the government they said that they were unable to make a proposal to the government.

MR. HICKEY: How many?

MR. F. ROWE: Two companies, Sir, two companies.

One company asked for further information before they could make their proposal to government. That is the second company. And a third company, Sir, made a proposal which, in essence, was an extension of something they were already planning as an extension to a building in the city. The fourth company, Sir, for some strange reason, as documented in this green paper, the fourth company, namely the company owned by Mr. Craig Dobbin, was able to make a very detailed proposal on the due date.

MR. HICKEY: On 100,000 square feet.

MR. F. ROWE: On however many feet there were involved.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. F. ROWE: If I slipped up - you know, on the proposal.

This company was able to make a very detailed proposal.

MR. HICKEY: (Inaudible).

MR. F. ROWE: Sir, am I going to be heard? Am I going to be given the courtesy of being heard in silence, or what?

MR. HICKEY: (Inaudible).

MR. F. ROWE: Sir, if the minister has a question he can ask a question or he can raise the point when he gets up to speak. Now I have had to contend with the Hon. Minister of Justice. Now do I have to contend with another honourable babbling minister?

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

All honourable members know the rule that the member speaking does have the right to be heard in silence. However, on occasion, honourable members invite comments from their colleagues, either on their own side or to their left or right of them. I do not think this is the occasion here, however. The interjection of the Minister of Tourism appeared to be completely gratuitous and uncalled for and accordingly is out of order.

MR. F. ROWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. F. ROWE: Boy, oh boy! Oh boy!

MR. HICKEY: You invited it.

MR. F. ROWE: No, I will not. No. I have had enough time wasted by honourable members opposite now, Sir, and the honourable minister will have an opportunity to speak in this debate.

Now, Sir, getting back to the point. My colleague, in speaking on last Wednesday, documented or analyzed the documents in this green paper extremely well. And, Sir, he laid out a case which raises very serious questions as to whether or not this government had in fact broken its own rule, its own legislation. It had certainly broken its own promises. It raises very serious questions that the government was acting in bad faith with a possibility that the government was acting in bad faith in relation to their promises of no patronage in this Province. And, Sir, this is why we have this particular motion before us today to investigate and to enquire into these circumstances surrounding the decision or decisions of the government to acquire any office space whether it is rental or leasing or what have you. Now the questions have been raised through an analysis of this documentation.

Now, Sir, there is one - and the member for Hermitage did a very good job on that, and I am not going to repeat it, there is no necessity to repeat it. But, Sir, I have to point out something, and I think it is incumbent on members on this side of the House, since they had to move this bill or make this motion and since the name of an individual Newfoundlander has come up, I think it is incumbent upon us to protect the name, reputation, integrity

and honesty and everything else of Mr. Craig Dobbin. Now, Sir, I think that is very important. My colleague for Hermitage is not attacking that firm. He has not attacked Craig Dobbin. My colleagues have not and will not attack Craig Dobbin. He is an unfortunate victim, Sir, of this government's bungling with respect to inviting proposals to lease a building or rent a building or have a building built. He is an innocent victim. Sir, Craig Dobbin is a Newfoundlander, a young Newfoundlander. He comes from, I understand, a very large family, I believe eleven or so brothers and sisters.

Sir, he started off as an ordinary diver. And then he got into building a few small homes. Then he got into building apartments. And then he got into shopping centres. Sir, if the Chair is wondering whether I am relevant or not, I am very relevant, because the reputation of a Newfoundlander is at stake in consideration of this motion, and I wish to set the record straight in that regard, if I may. I think that is most important. He went from building homes to apartment buildings, Sir, to building shopping centres. He was President of the Home Builders' Association for a couple of years. Sir, he went far afield. He built shopping centres in Kingston, in Ottawa, Quebec, Maryland and in Virginia, and he has been in the construction business in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. Sir, Mr. Craig Dobbin has been a very highly successful Newfoundlander, just like some colleagues here in the House. My colleague from Labrador North, Sir, came out of a very small community, and has become a great success, and he has contributed greatly to the economy of this Province as has -

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

If the honourable member is going to pursue this line of reasoning he can run through a great many successful men in the Province, and I think he is being irrelevant now.

MR. F. ROWE: Okay, Mr. Speaker, I will stop with one example.

Sir, Mr. Dobbin has been a tremendous success, because he has taken some courageous steps. He has risked capital. He has obviously worked for tireless hours. Sir, he has made proposals. He has talked it out with financiers, financial houses, lawyers, politicians, Sir, in Newfoundland and on the mainland. Sir, he is a salt of the earth Newfoundlander who has made a success. And, Sir now he has moved back to this Province to set up his operations. And, Sir, he will contribute to the economy of this Province by that very move. He will be employing Newfoundlanders. He will be circulating money within this Province. Now, Sir, why have I stood up and -

AN HON. MEMBER: Why?

MR. F. ROWE: Yes, the honourable member is wondering why I get up and defend a man whom I do not even know.

AN HON. MEMBER: You sound like you want to give him a lease.

MR. F. ROWE: No, I do not want to give him a lease.

Sir, I am defending a Newfoundlander, a great native son, because his reputation, integrity, character, honesty and everything else have been subjected now to public scrutiny and questioning and no doubt - just one second now, Mr. Speaker - by the fact that honourable members on this side in order to protect the best interests of this Province have had to introduce a motion to find out what this government is doing beneath the table or on the eighth floor.

MR. HICKEY: You are on very thin ice.

MR. F. ROWE: The honourable Speaker will tell me when I am speaking on thin ice and when I go through it. Now, Mr. Speaker, I realize that they are sore on this one, Sir, because I predicted in my own little mind here that honourable members opposite would get up and say that we are attacking the integrity of a great Newfoundlander. Well, let the record speak for itself now, Sir. We are not attacking

any businessman in this Province. We are attacking and we are questioning and we are asking for this Select Committee to be set up in order to protect all Newfoundlanders, to ensure that this government's promises of calling public tenders and of ending patronage in this Province would be done away with. These were the only things that were heard of during the twenty-three years of Liberalism, we understand, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: Done away with.

MR. F. ROWE: It took the courage of a good, reputable P.C. cabinet minister and his resignation to bring this to the attention of the public of Newfoundland. It took a resignation of a good, reputable P. C. And there is nothing wrong with a good, reputable P. C. There is nothing wrong with it at all, Sir, but when that long standing P. C., in cabinet, resigned because his own government had broken a promise, a commitment to the Newfoundland people, and in fact broken their own laws, because the legislation did come through this House, this is a very serious matter. This government are not abiding by their own laws.

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

MR. HICKEY: No, that is not true.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Stagg): To indicate that a government or any group has broken the law is a rather serious allegation, and I would expect that the honourable member's interpretation of it would get into a question of interpretation of the law rather than the fact that it has been proved. So I interpret his remarks as being an opinion on the breaking or not breaking of the law. Accordingly, I will allow him to continue but if he pursues it too diligently, I will have to interrupt him again.

MR. F. ROWE: I appreciate your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

You know, to accuse somebody of breaking the law in the House of Assembly is not parliamentary. Probably I could rephrase it by simply saying that this administration did bring in legislation calling for public tendering.

Sir, very serious questions have arisen as to whether or not they are acting according to that particular act. Now if the Minister of Justice wants to use a loophole and say that this does not involve leasing or leasing is not covered under that particular act, why does not the Hon. Minister of Justice close that big loophole? Because we have a situation here now where, I understand, we could have had \$900,000 a year, I am going on memory, \$900,000 a year going out of the government, or other words out of the pockets of the people of this Province to a developer-for ten years is it - and at the end of that ten years the developer would own the property and not the government.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. F. ROWE: Now if that is not a wasteful abuse of the people's money I would like to know what is, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: The honourable member is keeping a watchful eye -

MR. F. ROWE: Sir, the Opposition is responsible for keeping a watchful eye on this honourable crowd, Sir, and we cannot find too many eyes over here to keep a watch on them with when you look at something like this.

So, Sir, let the record stand -

MR. NEARY: You got to have eyes in the back of your head to watch that crowd.

MR. F. ROWE: - let the record stand, Sir, that this Liberal Opposition, that this side of the House, regrets, in fact, any embarrassment or injury that might have been caused to a developer in this Province because of the actions of this government in not following the promises that they have made and the legislation that they have introduced.

Sir, public attention has probably been placed on Mr. Dobbin, and it should be placed on the fact that this administration is not acting according to their spoken convictions. It is an absolute shame that a man's name is being kicked around and has been printed

in the papers because of the action of this P. C. Administration. So I felt obliged, Sir, to make that point because it is a very important point. It is the actions of the government that we wish to investigate and not the actions of Mr. Lundrigan or any Mr. Crosbie or any Mr. Browne or any Mr. Dobbin. It is the actions of this government. It is as simple as that.

Now, Sir, there are a couple of other questions I would like to raise before sitting down. I had not intended to be quite this long. But, Sir, my understanding is now that tenders have been called and, you know, one wonders what steps are being used? What specifications are being used for the calling of these public tenders? I mean I would like for somebody, the Acting Minister of Public Works, to answer that question, because the reason for the question must be obvious. If the specifications are in anyway similar to, say, the original proposals by any one of the companies made that company would have a distinct advantage in submitting a tender on it, a bid on it. If, for instance, the specifications were close to the proposal made by the Lundrigan group of companies or the Crosbie group of companies, these two companies would have a distinct advantage in making their bid over the other two companies or any other companies that would want to submit a bid on this particular project. So I would like for somebody to

clarify that particular aspect of the calls for tenders when he gets up to speak.

Sir, we could ask questions and probably only ministers of the Crown can answer them. What happened to the extension of the Confederation Building? Where is that? Where does that stand now? Because it strikes me, Sir, with Newfoundlanders coming in from all over the Province and from Labrador, to have to run up to the Viking Building for Fisheries and to have to run down to the Philip Building for Mines and Energy or Industrial Development and to have to run to another building for another department seems, you know, to be a bit inefficient, to say the least. It seems to me that all departments of government should be as central as possible within the city. What has happened to Trizec and Atlantic Place and how does that tie into the calling of public tenders for this additional or so many square feet of office space which the Hon. Minister of Tourism seems to be upset about? I thought it was 400,000 square feet. I may be wrong, but there is obviously a certain amount of square feet involved. But, Sir, what has happened to these other proposals? A Mr. O'Brien, I think, or a Mr. O'Reilly of Trizec was terribly upset when he heard about the negotiations between the government and the Dobbin enterprises, because they thought they were negotiating for government office space. What has happened to Trizec? What is happening with Atlantic Place? What has happened with the extension to the Confederation Building? These are questions that I would like some responsible minister or some minister responsible that is for this type of thing to answer when he stands to speak in this debate.

But, Sir, just to clue up my short remarks, I would like to repeat that we regret and we are saddened by the fact that a young, enterprising, successful Newfoundland businessman, who can contribute greatly to the economy of this Province, we are

saddened by the fact that his name is dragged out into the open and questioned because of the strange activities and circumstances carried out by this administration in trying to get additional office space for the government. We deplore the action of the government, Sir. And I sincerely hope that the debate on this motion will be focused on the actions of this government relative to what they promised instead of the integrity of a young, enterprising Newfoundlander. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stagg): Is the House ready for the question?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I find it - is there nobody on the other side who wishes to speak on this motion? That is fine. I think that in itself is a commentary, Mr. Speaker. I think it is -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Well, would the honourable gentleman like to speak? I mean there have been two or three of us.

AN HON. MEMBER: I would only like to ask a question -

MR. ROBERTS: Well perhaps the honourable gentleman would like to speak because then we will move an amendment and then we will have another go at it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Go ahead.

MR. ROBERTS: Okay.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it is symptomatic and very revealing that nobody on the government's side has chosen as yet to speak to this motion. The Hon. Member for Hermitage made an excellent presentation on Wednesday last when he introduced his motion, and he, I thought, made some very good points today. I find it amazing. There cannot have been another motion in the history of this House in which the Opposition have raised questions of as serious a nature as have been raised and on evidence as sound as has been set out by honourable gentlemen on this side and nobody from the government's side has risen to defend the government's actions. I find that

I can only draw one conclusion, either that honourable gentlemen opposite are contemptuous of the subject and of the House or they have something to hide, and they are hoping that the entire matter will go ahead, will be swept under the carpet and will not be subjected to public scrutiny. Honourable gentlemen opposite - I had expected, for example, the Hon. Member for St. John's East to say a few words on this. I hope he will. He has not. I had expected him, and I still expect him, and I hope I can infer from his intervention just now, Mr. Speaker, that he will.

Now, Sir, people throughout the Province will draw conclusions from what is said by honourable gentlemen opposite. The conclusions should be drawn on the basis of what honourable gentlemen say. But they will be drawn whether honourable gentlemen say ought or nought. People will not fail to comment on the fact that the minister responsible, and I say responsible in the constitutional sense only, since not even that minister's worst political enemies would feel that he is responsible for this miasma, this incredibly unsavoury, this incredibly - I have to be careful Your Honour, Your Honour has quite properly got section 155 of Beauchesne open - let me call it a most unsavoury mess that has been exposed.

Now, Sir, let me begin by referring to a few notes which I have, notes which were made with reference to the documents which the honourable gentleman opposite tabled after considerable duress and considerable pressure, documents which, as my colleague the gentleman from Hermitage has revealed, are not complete. Let me begin though by reading from some notes which I have made with reference to the documents that were tabled, as incomplete as they are.

Now, Sir, my review is based on documents as tabled, and I take the tenders in the chronological order, the order set forth in the documents. The first tender, in chronological order, was

the first tender from Mr. Dobbin, dated October 7, 1974. The second tender was the tender from Mr. Lundgrian of the Lundrigan Organization, dated October 11, 1974. The third document or the third tender is the one from Mr. Crosbie or the Crosbie Organization, dated October 11, 1974. The fourth tender is the second bite which Mr. Dobbin took out of the apple, namely, the one dated November 13, 1974. The fifth tender bears no date, but is the draft agreement proposed to be entered into between Mr. Dobbin. In fact it has been signed by Mr. Dobbin or what appears to be his signature. It is witnessed by somebody whose name I, for one, do not know and cannot read. I might know it if I could read it. It has not been executed by anybody in behalf of the government. But this is the final document in the tabled document. It bears no date. But it is this agreement to rent made this ___ day of ___ anno domini, 197___. This is a very interesting document, as a matter of fact. Your Honour would be interested to know that this is almost a carbon copy of the draft lease which proposes to be entered into between the government on the one hand and Trized on the other. And I shall refer to the Trizec deal, a deal which makes this one look like a piker's breakfast. But interesting enough that tender document, which I called the third tender from Mr. Dobbin, is almost a carbon copy - changes in the amount of space, changes in the amount of rent - but a carbon copy of the deal which was made, even if it has not been consummated, a deal which was made between the government on the one hand and the Trizec Corporation or one of its subsidiaries on the other. And what I have to say about

Mr. Dobbin's third tender, the draft lease, would apply equally to the Trizec deal. And I say to the minister that if he - I do not think the minister was fully aware of this, I think he came into office - unfortunately the Minister of Public Works and Services is not well and, therefore, is not with us. I hope he will be back and the sooner the better. He is a pleasant fellow, and I would very much like to see him back in good health and back in the House. But the minister, I suspect, found that he was in a situation, the present minister, the minister acting, and does not quite know what it is all about or does not quite know all the background. I can accept that, I can see where a minister coming into a portfolio might not know everything and might not have time to look up all the background. He is carrying another very heavy portfolio. But, Sir, I tell the minister that there is in existence a draft lease of a deal between the government and Trizec for approximately 270,000 square feet. If the minister has not got it or does not know about it, I can arrange to get it for him. I know where there are copies. And I say to the minister that I will not accept any denial of the existence of such a document unless he is prepared to authorize me and in turn to get Mr. Trizec, the Trizec Corporation to authorize the release of any documents that are in certain hands that I, for one, cannot get although I may have seen. But I say that because this motion, Sir, does not refer only to the dealings between the government and Mr. Dobbin. It refers to all decision or decisions by the government to acquire any office or other accommodations by rental, purchase or otherwise since January 1, 1973 or any proposals so to acquire office or other accommodations.

The Dobbin deal is merely the one which has been exposed. It is one which the gentleman from St. John's East felt compelled to leave the cabinet over and in so doing he properly and inevitably - I know from his point of view, regrettably - had to

expose. He fought it in the cabinet and then when the cabinet, when he could not carry his point, he did the honourable thing, he felt it was too large an issue for a man to accept, he resigned. The Premier, of course, attempts to pretend and effects to maintain that the minister, as he then was, the gentleman from St. John's East, was dismissed. I do not believe that. I think the honourable member for St. John's East resigned not over a matter of conscience, in the term in which that is generally used, but on a matter of principle He objected to a very real principle in the conduct of public business. I find it significant that nobody else in the cabinet resigned. Other honourable gentlemen were expected to resign, not expected by me, but other honourable, the press had it, and indeed I heard a tape from the minister's very own voice, a lengthy tape which he gave for broadcast to a radio station in St. John's, and they broadcast most of it, and I heard parts of it in addition to those that were broadcast in which he predicted that other members might join him. Well, nobody else did so we are to assume in the normal conventions of constitutional government that every member of the cabinet now wholeheartedly supports the government's course of action with respect to these dealings.

Now, Sir, having referred to the five separate tender documents, and I have outlined what they are, let me attempt an analysis of them and in so doing, let me say that I am not sure that I am able to make that full analysis. The ministers have been less than forthcoming on the questions. They have not answered questions in the House. They have not called the Department of Public Works and Services estimates and allow the matter to be discussed there. They have tabled some documents which are not complete. They have not provided the House nor the people of Newfoundland with the information which would enable them to make a complete comparison. Sir, I have tried to make the comparison on the information which I have, the information which was tabled by the minister and information which has come to me from other sources,

including the statements made by the member for St. John's East during the furor which arose following his resignation.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, I would be delighted to, Sir.

The first tender is Dobbin tender one. Now it is too bad we have to use names, but I mean Mr. Dobbin personally signed the tender. It was not the corporation. That is the one dated October 7. The Lundrigan tender, dated October 11, the Crosbie tender, dated also October 11. I believe that was the final day that tenders could be submitted under the minister's proposal.

AN HON. MEMBER: October 14.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry?

AN HON. MEMBER: October 14.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, those two were dated October 11. Whatever the reason they were so dated, I mean that is the day they were dated.

The 'Dobbin tender two, dated November 13, 1974 and finally the Dobbin tender three which is the lease which Mr. Dobbin signed. Now I have not seen a proof of Mr. Dobbin's signature but it seems to be the same as that which is on the letter. We have been supplied, of course, with photostatic reproductions. Apparently it was executed by Mr. Dobbin. Apparently that third tender represented a consummated deal, at least, in Mr. Dobbin's mind, because all of that third document, the one which was not dated, the draft lease, the final document in the papers tabled, the one with the four appendices, all that document required

to become binding on the people of this Province was the signature of the Minister of Public Works, a witness to that signature and a seal in the normal legal fashion, together with an Order-in-Council authorizing that minister to sign. We have the word of the minister, as he then was, the member for St. John's East that such an Order-in-Council was issued, authorizing the Minister of Public Works and Services to enter into an arrangement. The Premier fiddled and faddled on that point. The Order-in-Council has not been tabled as it should have been. It has been deliberately withheld. It was a deliberate decision not to table it, for what reasons I do not know. I assume because it reveals something that the government do not wish to have revealed. But we have the word of the member for St. John's East and I, for one, accept that Sir. He and I have had some very nasty arguments politically and we will doubtless have others, Sir, because he is in the very difficult position of - he is going to have to be more Tory than the Tories from now on in to prove that he is still a good Tory.

But anyway the third Dobbin tender is the executed document, and if the gentleman from Humber East had signed that and somebody had witnessed his signature, we would have been bound. That document purports to be, and is in fact I am told by legal counsel, a binding agreement given the fact that the Order-in-Council was issued, and I have heard no denial of that. And as I have said, I am prepared to accept the honourable gentleman's word. The member for St. John's East and I have had some very nasty political arguments. We will probably have others, but I never, for one, doubted his word on a question like that.

Now, Sir, let me, in launching into an analysis, put up a caveat because I am operating under a handicap. I do not have all the information. It is one of the reasons I support this motion. It is one of the reasons I intend to vote for it. That is one of the reasons I hope the government will vote for it, because if

they have nothing to hide, then they will vote to bring everything out in the open. If they do not vote for it, Sir, there are those in this Province who will infer that they have something to hide, whatever that may be.

But I have analyzed those documents as best I could on the information which I have. It must be realized, Mr. Speaker, that my attempt is an attempt to compare five tenders for five different facilities under different conditions. There is no proper tender in here at all in any sense in which that word has ever been used. And it is made without a full knowledge of all the documents. I do not have all the documents. The ministry have many documents that they have hidden, that they will not and have not produced with respect to this whole subject. But their refusal to produce documents, their cover-up you might call it and accurately call it, cannot deter us from trying to do our best. But, Sir, my comparison does serve a useful purpose. Because taking these conditions into mind it shows what the tendering parties were up to, and should make their stratagems more obvious and thus enable us to make a detailed and a careful study of the key sections of the approximately forty pages of documentation which were tabled in this House two or three weeks ago.

Let me begin, Sir, with some general comments and by saying that I have compared these tenders in four different ways. The first is the quoted cost to the government. In other words the quoted rate as set forth in the document plus the cost as calculated would have to be paid by the tenant. The second is the possible quoted cost to the government, taking into account possible increases accruing to the landlord borne by the tenant because of the wording of the various tender documents. The third is an attempt to estimate the sort of income which might accrue to the landlord under the first set of cost calculations. The fourth would be the estimated net income to the landlord under the second set of cost calculations, the ones taking into account the increases, and that is important, Sir, because as I shall show, one or two of these tenders are deceiving in the extreme because they are not what they appear to be. These tenders when analyzed, Sir, have exceedingly substantial escalation clauses in them.

Indeed, Sir, the one person whom I showed these documents went so far as to say that the figures in some of these tender documents are no more binding than would be an attempt by this House to legislate the height to which the tide shall rise. It is a wide-open deal. And I do not blame the gentleman from St. John's East for objecting and then when his objections were over-ruled by his colleagues in the cabinet, when he did not carry his point in the cabinet for saying I cannot accept this, I am leaving and then the Premier attempting to demean him by saying, he did not leave, he was fired. We had that ridiculous scene on the Here and Now over at CBC television where the gentleman from St. John's East made a statement and appearance, a very good statement, and then the camera - it was good journalism, I guess - the camera sort of went blank for a moment and then the next scene we saw was our Premier in person all set to have a little chat about the issue and there,

of course, the Premier - we all saw it. Anybody interested in politics was watching that evening. The Here and Now show can be exceptionally good in that type of problem, that type of issue. And we all saw the Premier attempt to demean the minister, as he then was, or the former minister, the gentleman from St. John's East to say, no he did not resign, there was no difference of opinion, he was just given the flick out of the cabinet on general principles, a little bit of re-organization.

Now, Sir, the first tender, the one dated October 7, 1974. But before I go into that, let me say a word or two about the minister's letter inviting tenders. It was dated September 30. It was sent to four parties only. I do not know why these four were selected. I think it might be fair to say that these are probably the only four companies in Newfoundland that might be in a position to build on this type of basis a building this large. That might be a possible position for a person to take. It is a somewhat unusual position from a government that spoke with such fervor of public tenders, because there may be many companies that would like to participate in this. There may be some in Newfoundland that we do not know of. We would like to go into it because, of course, Your Honour, a lease from the government for ten years with this type of rental, any of us, Your Honour, if Your Honour possessed that lease Your Honour could go to the bank and the bank would fall over themselves putting up the money to finance the building. There is no risk involved. It is a licence to print money.

Anybody could build a building and rent to the government under these conditions. You do not have to be a big rich construction company or even a big rich individual. Any individual in Newfoundland who had that lease could go and hire a construction company, and they would build the building in return for being paid their price for building it and could then finance it on a long-term deal. In any event the government for whatever reason chose to send this letter to only four companies, Mr. Craig Dobbin, the Seaboard Construction Company, the Crosbie Company and Lundrigans Limited, four companies, all of them well-known, all of them very reputable and very fine public spirited capitalist enterprises in Newfoundland, all of them operating here for a number of years, all of them operating reputably and above board. There is no suggestion of anything of the like of Mr. George McLean here. For once this administration have not become involved in that type of cesspool.

Now, Sir, on September 30 the minister wrote, and he asked for tenders for a building in the range of 75,000 to 100,000 square feet. It is a big building, Sir. That is a big building. I have a file with some information in it, but as I recall it the Confederation Building is only about 250,000 square feet. It is a very large building, Your Honour. I do not suppose there are more than a half dozen office buildings in all Newfoundland that are as large as this one. I suppose the Royal Trust Building downtown here is larger than this. The Atlantic Place Building will be larger than this. The university, I guess, has some office buildings this large. I doubt if the Sir Humphrey Gilbert Building is 100,000 square feet of space. It is a very large building indeed. And they asked these gentlemen, these four companies to submit proposals. As the minister has said, they were given two weeks to the day to do it.

Your Honour, one of the four companies the correspondence reveals, the Seaboard Company, I believe, speaking through Mr. Leonard Brown, but the letter is here somewhere -

MR. EVANS: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry?

MR. EVANS: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: The gentleman from Burgeo is bringing his expertise to bear again on the subject.

Mr. L. M. Brown, that is Mr. Leonard Brown, the Seaboard Construction Company replied thanking the minister for his invitation. The minister had gone out of office. The minister who sent the document was not the minister who received it. I know not what to make of that. There had been a change in portfolios. But Mr. Brown, who has done a lot of construction work, got a lot of work on tender from the present administration. He said in his letter, dated October 15: "The considerable amount of work which would have been required to prepare such a proposal and the large amount of information which would have been necessary to obtain from the government to make any proposal meaningful just could not be fitted into the two weeks which was allocated." It is a quotation from Mr. Brown's letter. It is the second paragraph in toto. His third and concluding paragraph: "As we are, therefore, unable to tender on your requirement at this time, we nevertheless appreciate being considered for this project."

Sir, I find that revealing because that supports in a very dramatic way the point I am about to make that this was not a fair and an honest attempt to submit or to obtain proposals. This was an attempt at covering up an arrangement which had already been made. That is what it was. Mr. Brown did not say that, but he did say that in two weeks it was impossible to put together a meaningful bid. The two other companies, Lundrigans and Crosbies tried, but as the documents make clear, indeed Mr. Crosbie, acting for the Crosbie companies, had to write

to ask for further information before he could submit his proposal. He sent a letter dated October 1 to the minister asking for some further information. The letter is set forth in the document.

So right from the start, Sir, this whole enterprise was tainted, tainted with the smell of corruption, tainted with the smell of improper dealings. Tainted is the word I use. The suspicion is there. A government that has been talking for some time about their need for space and, Your Honour, we could find if we searched the Hansards many, many references by ministers opposite to their need for more space, the Premier himself has honoured us on occasion with observations to that effect.

And so after months of this, after a study by Ottawa, which revealed, although the minister has not tabled it, which revealed that by far the best option for the government was either to build a building out in front of this building and connect it or to build one near this building in the lands to the East or to the West of it and connect it by a tunnel arrangement or a housed-in arrangement with this building, despite that, despite their - and if the minister is looking quizzical I say to him, table the document, and we will see.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: The minister is not looking quizzical. Well I say to the minister, table the document or I stand by what I say. And if he wants to prove me wrong, and I do not think I am wrong, but let him try to prove me wrong, but he will have to produce evidence. The government after months, put out a tender "with two weeks to reply to it." So I say, Sir, that any fair-minded or reasonable person is more than justified in feeling that there is a taint of corruption, a stench about this entire proceeding. There can be no other reasonable interpretation. Despite that the Crosbie companies who have a large building going up on the Waterfront, the Atlantic Place complex, put in a bid, and the Lundrigan companies put in a bid. I believe theirs was to add on to the Imperial Oil

Building over here which they have owned for - they bought it, I guess, from the bankrupt trustee or the trustees in bankruptcy of Mr. Rose or F. M. Rose Limited, was it? Anyway that company bought it from Imperial Oil and Imperial Oil moved out of Newfoundland, for those purposes, sold their office space to that Rose Company and the Rose Company went into a liquidation process, whether voluntary or at request of creditors, and then I believe the Lundrigan Company bought it. That was years ago, five, six, seven or eight years ago.

I do not know if the Lundrigans and Crosbie enterprises sent in their proposals with any hope of getting the work, getting the project. I do not know that. I assume they did. Perhaps they did not know that Mr. Dobbin's plans quite openly, and there is nothing improper about it, for a building had been made months before in Wedgewood Park. He or his agents had made approaches properly and appropriately. There is nothing the least bit improper. There is no corruption involving Mr. Craig Dobbin. Let me make that clear. The stench of corruption has settled about the government, not about Mr. Craig Dobbin or Mr. Andrew Crosbie or Mr. Harold Lundrigan. Let that be clear. No, it is Mr. William Lundrigan, W. A. Lundrigan for H. W. Lundrigan, for Mr. Harold Lundrigan. There is no stench of corruption about those men. It has settled about, like a cloud, about the heads of the government. The government have done nothing to dispell it. Mr. Dobbin quite openly months before this came out was in at Wedgewood Park, or his agents, his associates, his assistants, outlining proposals to build a very large building in there, negotiating to get the water, because that local improvement district does not an adequate water supply. It was in the papers. There was no secret about it. You could go down around town and you would find that building supply dealers were asked to contract a tender on parts of the building, the supply of the windows, for argument's sake. The project was well-advanced. I do not know who Mr. Dobbin intended to

rent it to. That is not my concern. That is his concern. There is nothing wrong with building office space. He may even have taken a shrewd guess that the government would need space and been prepared to hazard the thousands of dollars that would be necessary in getting plans drawn up and specifications and preliminary work. Even before you did a hole in the ground, as Your Honour knows, even before that is done, thousands and thousands of dollars are laid out by the promoters and by the construction companies, the builders of these buildings.

Mr. Dobbin may well have been prepared. He is a shrewd man, a shrewd businessman, a very enterprising man, a man who has got vast interests here in Newfoundland. He may have decided to take that risk, a little risk capital in the expectation that the government would come out. In any event he struck oil. Because sure enough the government did come out, not six months, not even the two months they have allowed now, when they were shamed into calling public tenders, when they were driven into it, forced into it by the political suicide, temporarily at least, for the gentleman from St. John's East. So we had a two week- a cover-up. It could not be called a legitimate and honest attempt to solicit tenders. It could not, it cannot and it should not. I predict it will be. And in came the documents. Now let us look at them, Sir, against that curious background. And it should always be borne in mind, Sir, that curious background. You do not ask for a tender of this sort in two weeks. You might put out a two week tender, if you are going to buy a car or two or if you are going to buy a thousand glasses to bring water around to the members of the House of Assembly in, but you do not, Mr. Speaker, put out a tender with fourteen days notice on it to put up a building of this sort, to finance it. It would take a man or a company a month or two just to work out what it would cost to build such a building. The tender was so openly, patently, an attempt to cover up that it did not even specify the term of the lease. Mr. Crosbie had to write to ask what term the lease was, and it was not even a clever cover-up. It was not nearly as good as Mr. Nixon and Mr. Halderman and Mr. Mitchell tried in the States. It was not anything like that. It was an amateurish one.

In any event they got five responses to it, five substantive ones and the decision communicated by Mr. Brown in his letter to the minister not to go ahead at all. Let me give Your Honour a quick analysis of them. The first tender, the one dated October 7, 1974, it was a good, big but a very unsophisticated, crude and open escape clause for increasing the rent due to construction costs over two years. There

was no detail on any sort of parking and that may have just been a careless bid or it may have been an attempt to cover-up a possible dramatic increase. One could even call it a possible rip-off in time to come. There was no mention at all of parking.

The Lundrigan tender, dated October 11, it is a very good straightforward tender with no apparent tricks in the wording. It is a very fair price for the first five years but a very open and obvious opportunity to increase parking rates dramatically after the first twelve months. For the first five years, apart from the parking cost problem, which is open-ended and could be anything the government would agree to, anything the tenant and the landlord, the government and the developer would agree to, anything, other than that for the first five years it is a good bid, but for the remaining fifteen years of the twenty year term there is an opportunity for a very dramatic increase in the return to the owner. It is a fair chance taken by the developer. It is attractive for the first five years, taking it at face value. There do not seem, Mr. Speaker, to be any other hidden complex advantages to the landlord on my examination of the documents. There may be many documents I do not have but on the documents that I do have, these, that seems to be the situation.

The Crosbie tender is a fair and open bid with inadequate parking facilities. It seems to be simple and straightforward but the weakness is that the property tax situation, which will be borne by the government, does change after ten years. Indeed, Sir, the municipal council in St. John's have had to increase taxes two or three times in the last two or three or four years and certainly I do not think anybody on the council would be willing to give any form of guarantee that taxes may not have to go up again next year or the year after or, you know, in the very immediate future. There is no quarrel on that point.

The second Dobbin tender, now just let me comment on that, the one dated November 13. I find it, to say the least, absolutely amazing.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Not that Mr. Dobbin would send in a second tender - that is any man's right - but that the government would deal with it. The tender closed on October 14 and Mr. Dobbin sent in a proposal dated October 7, and well and good. That is his proposal. It has certain merits and it has certain weaknesses. Mr. Dobbin was extended, not the privilege of sending in a second one - I presume Mr. Lundrigan or Mr. Crosbie or Mr. Anybody could have sent in another document if he had wished dated November 13 or any time after the tender had closed. Mr. Dobbin's proposal apparently was considered. He did not get a letter back as he should have from the minister saying, Dear Mr. Dobbin, Thank you very much for your letter dated November 13 with your second proposal. We already have a proposal from you. The tender date closed on October 14 and, therefore, we are not able to pay any attention to your tender. If we decide to call tenders again for some reason, you will have the opportunity, and we will be pleased to receive a further bid submitted by you. But that was not done, Sir. With that fact, added to the haste with which the original tenders were called, the haste with which they were called just in itself, and the haste with which they were called viewed against the fact that this government have been prating for two or three years about the need for more space, as if somehow that were the important problem facing a Province that has 45,000 people out of work. They are talking about more office space as if somehow that is their priority. But no, Sir, that was not rejected. It was accepted and dealt with. We have no indication of anything else. Anyway, that is the second tender, Sir.

A little later I will deal with the possible revenue from this and as will be seen then, Sir, this second tender has dramatically increased revenue to the developer. That is a coincidence, is it not? The second one is immensely better for the

developer than the first one. It is no coincidence from the developer's point of view. Obviously the developer found that the first one was not to his liking, obviously, Mr. Speaker, so he did the sensible thing. I would have done it in his shoes, and Your Honour would have done it. Anybody would have done it. The minister would have done it, sent in a second one. Sir, it dramatically increases his revenue. It has also increased his costs and let that be recorded. Because on this one, the provision is made for 150 indoor parking spaces and 150 outdoor parking spaces. It is not required by the government's proposal but other developers had made proposals in respect to parking as well. Nonetheless it is still a very crude tender. And I do not use crude in the sense of uncouth, but it is crude in the way in which the costs are calculated. It is pegged to the Canadian construction index construction cost and this allows the basic rent to increase by any - well, really by anything.

From the point of view of the proposer, the developer, it is a very good bid, because it takes up all the slack possible in revenue, but on the other hand it presents a, or it seems to present a highly competitive tender while at the same time, as I say, taking up all the possible slack in the revenue. The parking I am told is a very strong plus. Because, of course, people who work in a building are going to drive to work and that means that their cars must be parked. That puts that second Dobbin proposal well up on the Crosbie proposal. But why a second bid? Why were not Mr. Crosbie and Mr. Lundrigan, who had indicated their interest in bidding, why were they not told, look, if you want to send in a second bid, we are open to them, boys. You do not have to, but just to let you know that we were kidding about October 14. Just because the minister wrote you and said that your proposal must be submitted and must be in the hands of the minister not later than five o'clock in the afternoon of Monday, October 14 - the eleventh, by the way, was the last full working day before Monday, October 14 and I assume that is why they were dated October 11 and not October 14.

The twelfth would be Saturday and the thirteenth would have been Sunday - but just despite the fact that we said that in our letter to you, Mr. Crosbie and Mr. Lundrigan, we were kidding. We did not mean that. If you would like to take a second bite at the apple, come ahead. And if you are not a little happy, if you would like probably to get a little more money out of it, up your price a little, well, we are open on it. We are still dealing, we are still wheeling. No, Sir, that was not done.

Now we come to the kernel of this whole rotten affair. It is undated, the third tender, the draft lease, the copy of the Trizec lease. It is obviously some time after December 6, 1974, because there is attached to it a plan showing the site location of the building done by a surveyor, it looks like Mr. W. J. Ryan, but I am no judge, you know, anyone can judge for himself here. It is done by Ryan and Hayden Limited. That is the firm who did it. It is dated December 6, 1974. So I think it is obvious that we can conclude that this document which was sent in, there is no covering letter for it, which was sent in - well, at least, I will not say that there is no covering letter, there is no covering letter that we have seen - which was sent in well after both other tenders that this represents the results of a negotiated deal. There can be no other reasonable conclusion attached to this. I say to any honourable member who is fair-minded that he can come to no other conclusion. Proposal one comes in followed a month or so later, one month after tenders close almost to the day, thirty days after with a second proposal with much more money in it and then some time, at least three or four weeks after that a draft lease, a draft lease ready for signature, a draft lease which the developer has executed. All it needs is the imposition of his seal, and it is a personal thing. - it is not even a corporation - his personal seal, a little red stickum could do it, lawyers' seals, the signature of the Minister of Public Works, a witness, a seal, an Order-in-Council, done, signed, sealed and delivered.

No wonder the gentleman from St. John's East was down there fighting. I can imagine the sort of fight he must have had. He probably did not know that this lease - obviously negotiations had been going on. At the same time apparently, according to the Hon. Premier, he had been assured, or he had assured the honourable gentleman that no project would not go ahead, and yet a lease had been negotiated, Sir. Surveyors had been retained to draw a site plan. And there it is. And a meets and bounds description had been prepared and is attached as appendix A. Architects had been hired, Project Planning and Engineering Limited, Omega Investments Limited, draw little drawings, beautiful little drawings of the proposed office building in Wedgewood Park. There is no date on those. There is another lovely little proposed drawing, Wedgewood Park, again no date on it.

There is a letter from Mr. Dobbin saying what kind of building he would build, attached as an appendix, again no date on it. Another appendix providing some further details, again no date. The only date in the whole kit and caboodle, Mr. Speaker, is that one of December 6. So it is fair to assume, and it cannot be denied in fact, and I challenge the minister to deny it, that this lease was prepared as the result of negotiations between the government on the one hand and the developer on the other. It was prepared with the thought and the intention of carrying it into practice. And I say to the minister that there is in existence an Order-in-Council authorizing the Minister of Public Works and Services to enter into an arrangement and that this is the arrangement which was intended to be entered into, the final deal. It was not consummated. We all know why, but it was not consummated. And yet Mr. Dobbin, openly, with no impropriety, not even a taint of impropriety - I wished Mr. Dobbin had used a corporate name because then we would call it corporation limited, but apparently he has chosen to make these approaches and offers in his own name and that is, of course, his right -

Mr. Dobbin prepared to do his share. Nothing wrong at all, but everything wrong from the government's point of view, everything that could possibly be wrong, a deal which the government entered into hastily, every appearance of a cover up, every suspicion of the stench of corruption rising about this, every single thing from the government's point of view and that is why we want it investigated.

Now, Sir, let me look at this undated tender, the one which was prepared after December 6, 1974, the one which is based on the draft lease between Trizec and the government.

We are now getting into the big time, Sir. It is a very sophisticated document. I have had a number of property lawyers who have practiced Downtown look at this. They tell me that it is a very sophisticated document, prepared by somebody with brains, a little bit of imagination and one hell of a lot of inside information about the deal, about the arrangement, obviously the result of negotiations. It could not have been prepared, I am told, by a party dealing at arms length. There is nothing wrong with dealing with other than at arms length at this stage if in fact the deal was made, as it was, it may have been wrong for the government to make the deal.

Now, if that person, whoever prepared that tender, had done it the first time, Sir, it would have been all over. But, Sir, that was the third separate proposal - the third, separate proposal submitted in respect to this. It makes it very, very difficult to compare costs. I submit that is why it was done. I submit that is why the government deliberately set out on this course of practice to try to confuse the matter, fearful it would become public at some point, fearful that the matter would be looked into, set out to try to hide and confuse and cover up.

I am told it is a very good deal as far as it goes. Let me read a comment which a lawyer friend of mine Downtown wrote. The tender is by far the best except for the first tender on price. Also by removing the crude stratagem of pegging the quoted price to the construction cost index -

MR. DUNPHY: Is your friend John Mahoney or -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the honourable Member for St. George's may or may not be sober, but in any event he has not right to speak in this debate from other than his own place and has a right to speak then only when he has the floor. Now, Sir - does the honourable Minister of Justice wish to say something?

MR. HICKMAN: Are you suggesting that the honourable Member for St. George's may or may not be drunk -

MR. ROBERTS: No, Sir, nobody who knows the honourable Member for St. George's would say that of him.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: He may or may not be sober.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: - nobody in this House would say that of the honourable Member for St. George's. The Member from Burin should know better. He could say it of almost any other member in this House but not of the gentleman from St. George's.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Sir -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Mahoney and Maloney.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman is proving the truth of what I am saying. Well, Your Honour, I am not the one interrupting. It is this gentleman to Your Honour's left. If he is to be allowed to interrupt the debate, surely I have the right to defend myself from his low and base attacks.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Sir, as I was saying this is a very clever little document. The comment is, also by removing the crude stratagem of pegging the quoted price to the construction cost index, it is the best price quota with no if's, and's and but's and it could be defended politically with ease. That, of course, is the intention. They realized, whoever was behind this, Mr. Speaker, realized that the cover up was amateurish, cheap. They realized, Sir, that it could be exposed and so they then concocted this. Of course, they had the benefit of, not of a cover up, not of advice as to cover up from Trizec, but Trizec are a very knowledgeable property developer. They have been buildings all over Canada. They know the sort of lease.

I imagine that lease, change the figures from time to time and the parties and that sort of detail. The basic provisions of that

lease have been used 100 times, maybe 1,000 times, a very good piece of work. Sir, they were not quite that clever. The parking was taken out that was offered in the second tender. It was not in the third tender. It crops up again in the form of an undated letter, January, 1975, no day, but a month and offered a rent at the K Mart Plaza in Torbay Road, parking space, at a price not to exceed the price in Downtown St. John's for parking spaces. That is a very lovely offer indeed. That is like offering to sell a piece of land in Savage Cove in St. Barbe North for a price not greater than the price that it would cost for a piece of land in Wedgewood Park or in some housing subdivision in St. John's. That is a very generous offer indeed, Mr. Speaker.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Did we buy it?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes. The government did buy it. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I say -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

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

MR. ROBERTS: I say, Mr. Speaker, that if it had not -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: No, not one cent was spent, but not thanks -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: But not thanks to the gentleman from St. John's Centre, Sir. Thanks to the gentleman from St. John's East, not from -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: The man from St. John's Centre had his way, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: He stayed in the Cabinet. He accepted this. The Order in Council was made. Why the member -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: No. The honourable gentleman - Is the honourable gentleman saying there was no Order in Council made?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: No, there was not one cent.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Chair submits that when one honourable member is speaking he does have the right to be heard in silence.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable gentleman is saying no Order-in-Council was made -

MR. MURPHY: I never said -

MR. ROBERTS: No, he cannot because it was made. It is no thanks, Sir, to any man now in this Cabinet that no money was spent.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: It is no thanks to any man now in this Cabinet. If they had had their way, Sir, it would have been done, but thanks to the gentleman from St. John's East, who blew the whistle. He got out and he stood up and the Premier then said oh, no, it is just a little misunderstanding, I fired him really. He fired the gentleman from Grand Falls. He fired the gentleman from St. John's North, the Premier did. He did not fire the Member for St. John's East. He quit.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Sir, now, Mr. Speaker, we are getting to the truth of it and the truth hurts them. We are going to hear from the Minister of Justice now. We are going to hear him in this debate, I hope, and I have here, hardly a secret document, his great speech on principle when the liquor store leases came up and I did not vote against that investigation nor did I speak against it. Let us see what he will do. Let us see what the honourable gentleman will now do with an unsavoury deal far worse than any liquor store deal, far worse.

MR. HICKMAN: Where was the honourable gentleman -

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman was not in this House. He was not in this city. He was absent on public business and I ask where will the honourable gentleman from Burin be when the vote is taken on this?

MR. HICKMAN: Right here. - -

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, now, he can recall what he wants, but the record shows.

MR. HICKMAN: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Sir, now, Sir, I, now, Sir, now, Sir, we will see, we will see, we will see who were the cover up artists in this government. We will see who is going to vote for an investigation.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Into what?

MR. ROBERTS: Into what? Into a -

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman from St. John's Centre, Sir, is unable to understand it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: I say a deal was made.

MR. MURPHY: No.

MR. ROBERTS: And it is no thanks to the honourable gentlemen opposite, except the honourable gentleman from St. John's East, that no money was spent. Now, Sir, -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, no! The honourable gentleman from St. John's East and I, I hope, are personal friends, but we certainly are not political friends, never have been and I am sure I speak for him as well as for myself when I say we never will be.

MR. EVANS: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: We have very different views on politics. But, Sir, he is an honest man.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Right.

MR. ROBERTS: He is an honest man and he could not stomach this and when his Cabinet colleagues would not go along with him, he backed out. He said no, I will fight it and that is why no money was spent and that is why the deal was made, Sir. It was not signed, sealed and delivered. It was signed and it was delivered but it was not sealed.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: We should - I do not know why the gentleman from Humber East did not take up his pen and sign it. He is not here to tell us. Maybe he could send a note and tell us. But, in any event, he did not, but there was an Order in Council authorizing it. We do not know the date because the ministry have covered it up and hidden it, refused to make it available. Equally, Sir, it is obvious that this third tender was the result of negotiations, and it takes away the expensive parking in the second tender. That is drawn back now. The developer has obviously realized that that was a little more than he intended to.

There is no mention in the formal document of parking. As I

have said, there was a letter dated January 17 which may or may not have accompanied, may or may not have accompanied the lease. We do not know the date of the lease. We do not know the date when it was received. That has very carefully been taken out of the files. This here, Sir, is an edited document. It is as edited as, say, the German papers on the origin of the First World War, or edited as Stalin's memoirs, edited, not the complete file.

I challenge the minister to table the files, not an edited version. This is as favourable as the honourable gentlemen opposite could make it and it is edited just like Stalin used to do with documents about the Soviet Union's conduct the same thing, Sir.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker,

they can talk about what is past, let them talk about what is now. Let them talk about, let them talk about this deal. Let them deal with the substantive points that have been raised by my friend from Hermitage and by my friend from St. Barbe North and by myself that other honourable gentlemen when they enter into this debate will say:-

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Sir, now, Sir, there was another undated letter attached as I said.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: And in that undated letter the developer agrees to provide 400 outdoor parking spaces adjacent "to the office building at a rental rate not to exceed that charge of the downtown area of St. John's". So this is the hook! Ah, this is the clever part! There is nothing hidden in the tender. The tender, as I have said, is the best of the lot. The first one submitted by Mr. Dobbin was a little better in price, but this is by - next to that - by far the best. But it is somebody being too clever by half. Because, Mr. Speaker, the parking thing, and there must be parking, it is a separate and distinct offer not connected with the offer for office space, and it would give \$144,000 a year extra cost to the government and pay the developer.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Because it is set by - the minister may ask the figures, the figures are just by computing what parking is worth downtown now.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, the minister is looking quizzical, and I am attempting to assuage his quizzical looks. I do not envy the minister his task in this. He has to play the game from a very sticky wicket.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, also that \$144,000 figure could go to \$544,000 or \$1,044,000. There is no ceiling on it. Now, Mr. Speaker, there may be a great deal more to this.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: No, I do not. Let me read the final comment I was given. It is not safe to assume that anyone would be so stupid as to release them -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: as they are so open to attack without some hidden defence which this gentleman and the people who looked at it have not deduced as yet. The minister may very well -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: No, I am not. They are my own working notes and I am not prepared to table them for one second -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: - any more than I do not ask the minister to table the information and advice given to him by his -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I am reading it. And I stand behind what is said.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Well all right, I tell the minister I am not prepared to table them. Of course not. I will read him anything he wants.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, like the Member for St. George's and the Member for Burgeo, that would give us some -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, let us now come to the dollar sign.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Let us come to the dollar sign, Mr. Speaker. Compilation of tendered and estimated prices all taken at 100,000 square feet for the purposes of comparison but not for identical parking facilities. "D" - well I will read them across, the first one is - the first proposal the quoted cost per square foot \$6.90, Mr. Dobbin; the Lundrigan one was \$9.50; the Crosbie one was \$8.30; the Dobbin second one was \$8.46; the Dobbin third one, the fifth and final proposal, was \$8.20 - a property tax, Sir, the property tax varies from twenty-four - now these are costs assumed by the owner, the government - I find I have a reference here - In all four final proposals since the first Dobbin proposal, I have a figure

here of \$0.24 per square foot per year, but the last four proposals the second Dobbin, the Lundrigan, the Crosbie, and the third Dobbin were all on the basis that all taxes were paid by landlord, these deducted when the net rent is returned to the landlord as calculated per the tender. So the property tax factor does not enter into it. The government assume that tax equally in all arrangements.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Parking, Mr. Speaker, -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I am comparing all five, if I heard the honourable gentleman's question. Parking - let us take the first Dobbin one, I have dealt with this throughout, but let me summarize it. The first Dobbin one dealt with parking as follows: that other than provision of adequate parking by landlord, no mention of number of spaces or possible charge. And there was definitely no written commitment to provide this free in the tender. In other words, the tender was silent on the question of parking. The Lundrigan thing was \$0.59 per square foot per year, and that is footnote (F), that is, ninety covered cars at \$37,800; ninety cars open at \$21,600, a total of \$59,400, spread over 100,000 square feet that comes to \$0.59 per square foot per year.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: This will be

reviewed after twelve months. I have already pointed out the danger in that.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the honourable gentleman from St. George's he requested to observe the rules of the House? It is very difficult for me. I am trying to make some points. If he does not understand or does not want to listen, let him leave. But, Sir, he is continually and continuously interrupting me, and I would ask that Your Honour would enforce the rules of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The Chair will remind honourable members again that when an honourable member is speaking he does have the right to be heard in silence. There has been considerable interruption from honourable members to my left over the past few moments. I would ask them to observe this rule of procedure.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, parking in reference to the Crosbie proposal, the fifteen cents a square foot, but they only spoke of fifty parking spaces which was obviously inadequate. There was no term on this price mentioned. The second government proposal, the one - the second Dobbin proposal, I am sorry, the one which the government accepted in a somewhat unusual move, the one dated November 15 or November 13, that proposal.

The parking, the 150 outdoor and indoor lots, 150 outdoor, 150 indoor were to be provided free of charge by the developer. That was a very good arrangement. The negotiated deal, the one that was negotiated but not consummated, much like getting married but not consummating it. Legally the deal was done. It is just that the government did not have the urge or the ability to follow through. The cost, \$1.44 per square foot per year. Now, Sir, that subject to whatever the latter letter may mean, the final letter, the one which I read, rates not to exceed that charged in the Downtown area of St. John's for parking space. When the City of St. John's gets through with their parking garage Downtown, Atlantic Place, we are going to know what parking costs. What is it? \$7 million for 300 spaces, is it?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, there is not. But, this one would have paid off at \$1.44 a square foot a year.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: The taxpayers will pay for the one Downtown.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, let us take operating expenses, Sir, which in each case would be carried by the government, the landlord. They have been taking it the same for all buildings at \$2.20 per square foot per year, operating expenses and cleaning. Operating expenses are estimated at \$2.20 - that is the current figure - per square foot per year with sixty cents per square foot per year for cleaning. It does not matter what it is for comparative purposes because I have allowed the same amount all throughout.

Now, Sir, let us look at the true price of these various tenders as I have calculated them. I again say that I have not seen all the information and my calculations may be awry but they are the best I can get and they are based on all the information the minister would make available. Total estimated cost to tenant, first tender, \$9.94; Lundrigan, \$10.09; Crosbie, \$11.25; the Dobbin one as accepted by the government, \$11.26 and the final one, \$12.44; \$9.94 up to \$12.44, a pretty good rate of increase, is it not? That is not bad. That is even better than the government is going to make us pay for the price of oil and gas in this Province, \$9.94 on October 7, 1974 and the one which is done sometime after December 6, 1974, two months later, up to \$12.44.

Your Honour, let me look now at the net return to the landlord less all expenses on quoted costs. This attracts, not unfavorable to us, the honourable gentleman from St. John's East's comment, that the deal would be \$100,000 a year. No, \$900,000 a year, I am sorry for ten years for the developer. The net return to landlord - now, he would have to pay his taxes out of that, Sir, but as against that he would be able to set off his depreciation and he would have to pay for the building, but his net, net return would be first one, \$6.90; second one, the Lundrigan one, \$5.10;

the Crosbie one, \$8.18; the Dobbin one, the second one, \$ 8.22 and then the bonaza one, the final one, \$9.40. Now, Your Honour, that is the saga of what the government did in this. That is what the documents show. That is what the information shows. It is no secret. I have not been grubbing around down in the minister's files. I took these documents, and I asked a number of my friends and colleagues of the bar, gentlemen who are not unskilled in property matters to have a look at this. They act for differing clients, and this was sort of their collegial advice.

AN HON. MEMBER: Partisan.

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman says it was partisan. It may or may not have been, but it is accurate. What matters if the man who did it may have voted Liberal or the men who advised him may have voted Liberal or Tory? What matters that? The truth is what counts, and this is the truth. Unless and until the minister can explain, and if he can explain, Sir, he got to do so. I do not doubt the minister's word. I would not doubt him in any event, but I do not doubt his word. I am not allowed to doubt his word in the House. But even if it were not for that rule, even if we were allowed to call each other liars, and we are not, I would not doubt the honourable gentleman's word. But he will understand my saying that his word is not enough. He will have to table documents to deal with the statements I have made. I have worked only with the documents we were given, and we were not given those willingly. They are obviously an edited set of documents. My colleague from Hermitage dealt with them. They have been gone through probably by about a half dozen cabinet ministers culling out anything that is the least bit embarrassing. The minister has not brought up the file and tabled it.

MR. ROUSSEAU: You have the information. You got the facts out.

MR. ROBERTS: The minister says I have the facts out. I certainly have got out what is in there as far as I know, but there is a great deal - where is the Order-in-Council? Where is the cancelling Order-in-Council?

Where are the notes on the negotiations? Because there obviously were negotiations between November 15 and the final lease was done some time after December 6. There obviously were negotiations going on. They may or may not have involved the minister, and it was not the present gentleman from Labrador West. It would have been the gentleman from Humber East. They may or may not. I do not know. I have no way to know. All I say is that the people of Newfoundland do not know either and that in itself is enough to justify -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: That in itself, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I got up to speak only when nobody on the other side would rise.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: While I am on that -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: - let me ask, if I might Your Honour, how many minutes have I left out of my ninety? Would one of the clerks tell me? How many? Twenty-three. Well, okay, so I have enough to make one or two other points.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, the press will report or not report as they see fit, I remind the honourable gentleman opposite, and I might add that after reading Mr. Wickford Collins' exudations yesterday, I am not so sure I want any more of that tender caressing care. At least I do not consider the press a yellow dog. I may disagree with Mr. Collins' conclusions, I obviously do with respect to yesterday, but I will not be calling any press conferences to launch an attack on the Telegram nor will I be asking the government to cancel the advertising in the Telegram. These are two responses

that this government make to criticism in the press. I even went so far as to buy an extra copy of Mr. Collins' comments, because I thought they were very much to the point, and I got a great glee out of reading them. It shows that somebody, at least, has been listening to what has been going on in this House. That is more than can be said for any honourable gentleman opposite.

Now, Sir, let me deal -

AN HON. MEMBER: That is not nice.

MR. ROBERTS: No, it is not nice, I agree with the minister. It is not, but it is true. Much of what I have said is not nice but it is true.

There was a deal made for that space. The deal was ready to be signed. The Order-in-Council was issued. The price was there, the highest price of any of the tenders. The deal was made after a second tender.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: The minister can say that it is not true.

AN HON. MEMBER: I was not talking about what you are talking about.

MR. ROBERTS: I know the minister was not talking about what I am talking about. I hope he will talk about what I am talking about when his turn comes to speak.

Now, Sir, they touch on one another. The Dobbin affair of the Wedgewood Park building - it is too bad Mr. Dobbin's name - I mean there is no way to avoid it. The government call it the Dobbin deal. I mean let us call it the Wedgewood Park building. I have nothing against Mr. Dobbin. He is a nice fellow. You know, I do not suppose I have run into Mr. Craig Dobbin for years. I saw him recently - I guess, it was lunch somewhere with Mr. Harnett and Mr. Richard Greene, gentlemen with whom, I believe, he is associated in a business venture -

AN HON. MEMBER: At a morning prayer meeting?

April 9, 1975

Tape no. 1226

Page 4 - mw

MR. ROBERTS: Well, maybe at a morning prayer meeting.

Or it may not have been, I do not know. But whatever they were doing I was not part of it, I can assure you.

Mr. Speaker, let me say

a few words now about one or two other curious arrangements where all the facts are not out. I asked the minister to tell us about the government's decision to rent space in the new building, I believe it is called the Commerce Building, that is being built in Corner Brook. I understand the government have rented two floors in that building. I say I understand. I do not pretend to have all the facts, but I would like the minister please to indicate whether the government - perhaps he could tell me, have the government rented space in that building or undertaken to rent space?

MR. ROUSSEAU: I do not know.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I appreciate the fact the minister does not know. I mean, he is on acting basis there, but I understand they have. I understand they did it without benefit of tender. I also understand that one of the chief promoters of it is Mr. Hubert Harnett, a very well-known and reputable citizen and a staunch supporter of the Tory Party. So, perhaps the minister could indicate - Mr. Harnett is also a councillor in Corner Brook. He is the President of the Federation of Mayors, I think. You know, a very fine citizen. A little off in his political views in my judgement, but he would probably say the same about me.

But, if the facts are as they have been related to me, very curious. The same pattern, Sir, the same pattern. I am told by people in Corner Brook that there is a new building. They have torn down the old Bank of Commerce. Indeed it is a little embarrassing because they went ahead and tore it down and had a new building about thirty per cent up before they got a permit from the City Council. Hubert Harnett is on the council in Corner Brook. Yes, he is - anyway, I believe Mr. Harnett is connected with it. I am not saying he owns it but I think he is a shareholder in whatever firm it is.

But, I find it curious. Let me just ask whether the government have rented space and if so would the minister indicate when the tenders were called and perhaps table the advertising for the tenders and so forth and let us know because on what I know now there is certainly something to be looked into.

My colleagues who get to speak in this debate, I hope, will make a note of this because if the minister does not deal with it adequately, there should be some reference made to the Corner Brook, the Commerce Building. There is a new building going up. It is four stories in downtown Corner Brook, right down - it is where the old Commerce Bank used to be.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: There are some weird and wonderful things going on.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh well, there are a few more I will come to. But, in any event, the Commerce Bank, the old bank, was torn down. They moved across the street into the old federal building for the time being, and that is where they have got their money locked up. Have you got any of your money there "Mel"?

MR. WOODWARD: No, I took it all out.

MR. ROBERTS: The gentleman from Labrador North took the money out and things must be rough, lean in Corner Brook. But, in any event, the new building is being built. I understand the ground floor is to be the bank. You know, they are the prime tenant. The building will be called after them although they do not own it, the Commerce Building. Then, there are three floors to rent, the first, second and third. I understand the government have taken two of them. I do not know if it is true or not. I just do not know. But, I am told that they have. All I ask is, if they have, that the minister indicate, you know, when the tenders were called and who bid and, you know, the normal and legitimate and proper sort of information.

Now, Sir, I will not go into the group building systems or the Corner Brook College. I understand there are to be substantial extras on it. The minister might care to indicate that to us, whatever he might know about it. I wish he would table all the documents about that. I understand two or three companies bid on it, the Lundrigan Company -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: The junior college?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, the junior college in Corner Brook - the Group Building Systems Company - a new company but apparently a very good one. They seem

to be doing very well in Corner Brook. But, I wish the minister - I would be grateful if he would table all the information on that including the various tenders. You know, the government have a reluctance apparently to make documents available.

Now, that leads me, Sir, to a brief consideration of the Trizec deal. Now, here we are handicapped, Sir. We do not have the documentation.

MR. DOODY: There is no documentation.

MR. ROBERTS: Ah, the honourable the Junior Member from Harbour Main tells us there is no documentation. I say to him, that there is in existence a draft lease which Trizec - there may have been many - which Trizec decided not to go into. That is right. None of which was satisfactory. That is quite correct. For that we have to be thankful because otherwise, Sir, we, the people, would have been locked into a deal in Downtown for a great massive building with all it would mean in terms of traffic and arterial roads and what activity to the east end of the city with Queen's Road and Military Road and King's Bridge Road. We are going to be locked into it for the rest of our lives unless the legislature, at some future date, chooses to cancel it.

Honourable gentlemen who wish to sign leases might recall the fact that no legislature can bind its successors, no legislature can. Sir, any developer who enters into a lease with any government must be aware of the fact -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: - must be aware of the fact, any developer who enters into them, including Trizec, must be very much aware of the fact that a subsequent House, if it wishes, can cancel a lease. I would not hesitate to say that if the lease was improper, it should be cancelled. Let Trizec then take their building and lump it.

Now, Sir, there are, however, some very real questions about the Trizec deal.

MR. DOODY: There was no deal.

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable the junior Member from Harbour Main says there was no deal. His Premier is fond of saying no agreement was signed and he said exactly the same thing time and time again about Trizec. I will say there may well have been no executed lease. I have no hesitation in that. There were negotiations. There were extensive negotiations. There were extensive negotiations carried on within the Premier's office by Mr. John Colbourne who came to work, he left the Royal Trust Company where he had been the manager, he had been a senior man for many years and he came to work in this Building. At the same time, he opened up a little mortgage company. He was putting out money for mortgage. That is a legitimate business, but an interesting business for a man full time. I think he was paid a substantial salary. Was he not to work on federal-provincial relations? That is what we were told.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Colbourne, Sir, spent most of his time negotiating office space. Now, there is nothing wrong with that, a very knowledgeable man. He had worked for many years with great success with the Royal Trust Company.

MR. NEARY: He had something to do with the liquor leases too.

MR. ROBERTS: Did he? I did not know that, but in any event, he had worked with the Royal Trust Company for many years. Then he came to work for the government, Fair enough, friend of the Premier's and the Premier needed a man to do that sort of work and there it was. Mr. Colbourne then leaves the government and goes to work with Trizec. I do not know what he is doing with Trizec. I do not know if there is office opened or anything else. I do not even know if he is still with Trizec. I do not think I have run into Mr. Colbourne for months and months and months. We do not move in the same world and I guess a fact for which both of us are duely grateful. But I find it passing

strange, Mr. Speaker, passing strange that a man who is high in the government's confidence, worked in the office next door to the Premier's and we kept hearing rumors, founded in fact, I believe, that he was calling upon officials of the city of St. John's asking about the Trizec proposal, negotiating, and we did not know whether it was in behalf of Trizec or in behalf of his lawful masters at the time, the government of this Province. Negotiations going on with Trizec for a very large building, apparently have come to nought and so has the building because, Sir, the Trizec Building will not be built unless the government sign a lease for ten or twenty years at very substantial rentals. That is the reason Trizec has not gone ahead and those who want it or those who do not want it should judge by that. The Trizec Corporation, a large British owned firm, they do a lot of work in Montreal, have done a lot of work -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Place Ville Marie

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, I think they now own Place Ville Marie, do they not? They did not build it. Mr. Zeccendorf was the promoter who built it and I think, it is not even the one Zeccendorf went bankrupt over, Place Ville Marie.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry?

MR. DOODY: Canadian subsidiary to Zeccendorf.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, Mr. Zeccendorf owned it. A cow that has calves in a China shop does not produce soup plates. Mr. Speaker, the nationality of a corporation should not in the least bit confuse or hide its owners. I mean, Trizec are a British owned corporation. I think they are owned - Are they not owned by the White Star Insurance Company. I think that is the name. What is the name? Does anybody know? White Star or something -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Eagle White Star. Well, Your Honour, the honourable gentleman may struggle. He is good at struggling. Now, Sir, -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, he has had years and more to come. Now, Sir, the thing about the Trizec deal, the thing about the Trizec deal is that this company comes in, close acquaintances of the Premier. Now, they may never have met the Premier before they came to them. I do not know. I have no idea at all. Mr. James J.L. Greene is their solicitor and if one is looking at circumstantial evidence one cannot help but be impressed by that fact. Mr. Greene, a distinguished member of the bar, a very active and able solicitor and a gentleman who has been blessed by fortune since the Tory Government took office, his legal services have suddenly become in great demand by the government, a fact which I assume in my naivete, not unrelated to the fact that he is very active in the Tory Party and indeed is President of the Tory Association at present, President of it. He defeated Mrs. Maynard. It was a question of ladies first in Mr. Greene's eyes, Sir.

So, Mr. Greene is their solicitor. A very active Tory is their solicitor and Mr. Greene, Trizec to my knowledge have never done work here before, but he may have been hired by them for a number of reasons, many of which might have been perfectly legitimate. If they had to have a solicitor here, and I can assume they did, they may very well have chosen Mr. Greene by throwing darts at a list of the lawyers in town, the sort of thing my colleague from Bell Island does. They might have asked counsel on the mainland who may have recommended the firm of O'Dea Greene and Neary, a firm which has been favoured, a firm which knows a little about property dealings, Sir.

They might have, it is not inconceivable, asked the Premier to recommend somebody. It got to be Mr. Greene. And, Sir, Mr. John Colbourne, Special Assistant to the Premier, the government negotiating - the whole thing smacks and smells. The whole thing must be investigated. I want to know what the facts are. No deal was made, not for lack of trying on the government's part.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. ROBERTS: And the government are hiding something.

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, the minister says they are not, Sir, I am told that this lease in here, leaving aside the figures which are different and that sort of thing, is exactly the same as the lease which Trizec proposed and which the government were willing to accept but Trizec were not because their costs had escalated and they want to be tied to the construction cost index, Indeed, I think a spokesman for Trizec has said that publicly on more than one occasion. It is in the newspapers. So Trizec backed out. So that is the only reason we do not have a deal. It is the only reason the government are not today locked into a 300,000 or 270,000 square foot proposal downtown and another 100,000 out here in Wedgewood Park, that is all. That is the only reason. Sir, that is why my colleague drafted the motion. He said he wanted to look into the circumstances surrounding the Wedgewood Park Development, it was suggested to him that he might want to look into all the circumstances surrounding all the dealings of this government, because there is a stench of corruption about these dealings of this government, Mr. Speaker. There is -

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please! The honourable member knows he cannot make statements of this type.

MR. ROBERTS: No, Sir, I do not know that. I will accept your ruling as your ruling.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Yes, that is my ruling. The honourable member is an experienced member of the House, and in the opinion of the Chair should

know it if he does not.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, Your Honour, I resent that, when I have used that phrase in this House today several times, and I do not know whether Your Honour was in the Chair or the Speaker was in the Chair, but Your Honour has no right to say that I knew or ought to have known, and I ask Your Honour to stand up now and withdraw that. If Your Honour rules I cannot use it I shall not use it, there is no question there. But Your Honour has no right.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please! If the honourable member has made the statement and it has gone unchallenged earlier in the day then of course -

MR. ROBERTS: Your Honour -

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please! Now if the honourable member would permit, he has seen an opportunity to dispute the Chair's ruling and of course has jumped in, as probably is his right. However the Chair would like to have the right to make a reply without being abused. Now if the honourable member has made his statement earlier in the day and it has gone unchallenged then of course he makes the statement again, it is his right to dispute its being challenged. However, in my interpretation, the honourable member's remarks are unparliamentary and I think that should settle the issue.

MR. ROBERTS: Your Honour I do not challenge nor did I challenge your ruling, All I said was that I have used the phrase before and all I said was Your Honour had no right to say it, and I ask Your Honour to withdraw it that I ought to have known or that I did know. I had no way to know. And I ask Your Honour to consult with the clerks at the table. Now, may I please have a man fashion answer from Your Honour. I used the phrase and it was not objected to by the Speaker. I used it again and Your Honour chose to object, That I accept. But Your Honour has no right to say that I should have known.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please! As I was making a ruling on this matter the honourable Leader of the Opposition persisted in interrupting me and attempting to guide the Speaker, Now what he was doing was,

I presume now, was to inform me that he had made a statement without challenge a couple of times earlier in the day. If the honourable member wished to bring that to my attention he would have at least have had the courtesy to wait until I had finished. So I make no apology to the honourable member, and will make none.

MR. ROBERTS: I thank Your Honour and Your Honour's words stand in the - that is revealing, Sir, that is revealing. Not Your Honour revealing, that is revealing of the gentleman there.

Now, Sir, let me try to draw this together.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: That is interesting. His Honour has said what his Honour has said and I do not quarrel with it. The words speak for themselves. Now, Sir -

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): I think the honourable member has a couple of minutes left.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, and I intend to use them if I might, Sir. I have I understood until five to six, That is what the clerks told me earlier, so that is a few not a couple. Now Your Honour -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Well,

if we are going to be so precise, I think it is important.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Your Honour is the word "stench" parliamentary or is it stench of corruption? I mean you have ruled stench of corruption is not, but is it the corruption part of the stench part or all parts?

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): That question is hypothetical.

MR. ROBERTS: All right. There is a stench about this deal Your Honour. There is a miasma about this entire dealings by this government in the question of property and of renting. There is that stench. There is that air. There is that aura, that atmosphere. I am not to say what I think it is, but I can think it. The people of Newfoundland can think it and will think it unless this government allow this investigation to go ahead. They have nothing to fear, Sir, nothing to fear from the truth. Who can fear from the truth? We are suggesting a select committee, not a royal commission, a select committee on which the government, by definition, will have the majority. They are the majority of the House. They are entitled by all all the rules and practices and precedents. They are entitled to a majority on the committee, the committee with a power to send for documents, and to examine witnesses under oath, to subpoena documents, a committee with the power to get to the bottom of this entire stenchful matter. And I say, Sir, the public interest demands that this investigation go ahead. We have had much of this in the past before, Sir. Let us learn.

Honourable gentlemen opposite, some of them were in the House, and used to be great Galahads, great White Knights. I hope this time they will let their consciences guide them, not party discipline or party loyalty. Let the minister make his case. And let other honourable members who wish to speak, let them speak. I am particularly pleased that the gentleman for St. John's East is to speak because he, I am sure, will have a great deal to say that is relevant. He will doubtless have some very nasty words about me and my antecedents and my political antecedents. Maybe he would wish to hazard a guess at political futures, that is up to him. But he can also, Sir, speak -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: He is the only man who can speak with inside, authentic knowledge on this because he is the only man, Sir, who had the courage to leave the cabinet over this entire stenchful matter.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is a matter of opinion.

MR. ROBERTS: No, Mr. Speaker, it is not a matter of opinion. The documents speak for themselves. And what will also speak, Sir, is whether the government are going to cover it up? Are they going to let the truth come out? If they do, either what we say is correct or it is not, and if it is not, Sir, we are the ones who are exposed and our credibility and our political stature destroyed. And so surely the government, surely the government would court that. Surely the government would like the chance to expose what we are saying, if it is not true. But I say, Sir, that they will not do that. I predict to a man - honourable gentlemen opposite when the vote is taken on this motion will stand and vote against it -

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. ROBERTS: to a man. It is a matter of party discipline with them. They will stand and do it. And I say there will be an investigation into this. I say, Mr. Speaker, that there will be an investigation. The conduct of every honourable member who participated in any part of this deal, in due course, will stand exposed for what it is, for good or for ill. Let honourable gentlemen say it is for good. The honourable gentleman for St. John's East said it was for ill, and left the cabinet over it. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a little different from the liquor stores - the liquor stores never come to the cabinet. Ask the minister of Justice, he was in the cabinet. It never came to a cabinet first nor last. Ask the Minister of Finance. He was the Minister of Finance dealing with the corporation when it was entered into. I do not think it ever came to him. But this, Sir, came to the cabinet, it has come to the House. There can be no member now who without reason can vote against this. The people of Newfoundland, Sir, will judge what the reasons were. The people of Newfoundland, will judge. They will get the truth. Either they will get it now with the help of this administration or they will get it in time to come, be it next month, next year or ten years from now, from

another administration. The truth will out. The deals were made. They were made without tender. They were made for improperly high prices. The whole thing must be investigated. I will vote for this motion, Sir, and so should every honourable gentleman here.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: That may be true.

MR. SPEAKER: (STAGG): The Hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, I have had a number of questions proposed from three speakers, I do not know whether I can do it in forty-five minutes or not. But I would like to know at the beginning, do I have forty-five minutes or can I try and answer the questions?

MR. ROBERTS: Your Honour has forty-five minutes

MR. ROUSSEAU: Period.

MR. ROBERTS: And if anybody else is for it - I for one would like to hear what the honourable gentleman says and would be willing - but as the Speaker said, it is a hypothetical question.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Okay.

MR. ROBERTS: Fair enough, is it not?

MR. ROUSSEAU:

Well, anyway, we have a number of comments from three honourable members on the other side of the House. There are a number of things I would like to say, and I think everybody can appreciate within the five minutes available to me now that there is very little that can be said.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Three minutes not five.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Three minutes. But, I will say this, Your Honour, that of all the things I have heard today - I am speaking now purely academically, and I hope logically - a high tribute has been paid to Mr. Dobbin, which undoubtedly Mr. Dobbin deserves, by two honourable members. I do not recall the honourable member last week, but that is not meant to mean that he did not say anything. But, I know that the honourable Member for St. Barbe did and the honourable the Leader of the Opposition did and went to great lengths, I think, this afternoon, to pay tribute to each of the individuals involved.

On the other hand and I am talking now - my logical mind cannot comprehend - is the stench of government or corruption or whatever terms or else were used, that we did indeed do something that was underhanded, beneath the table. The words used, I think, indicated what the honourable members across thought what we were doing on one part of what was supposed to be a deal cooked up between two parties or an individual and a government or what have you.

I cannot for the sake of me understand how honourable gentlemen across the House can stand up and say that, on the one part, this gentleman is a wonderful man, which I do not doubt he is. I want that point made. That is not the question - but that we have the stench of corruption on this side of the House. In other words, what the honourable member is saying - and my mind cannot comprehend it - is that through any negotiations that might have been going on, Mr. Dobbin was being hoodwinked. It is unbelievable. I just cannot comprehend the -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: You missed the point.

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, I did not miss the point and next week I am going to go with that point to quite an extent. I think that is a very important

point.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to adjourn the debate and call it six o'clock if you would. So, can I adjourn the debate?

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

It is moved and seconded that this House do now adjourn. Those in favor "Aye". Those against "Nay". Carried.

It now being six o'clock, I do now leave the Chair until three o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

CONTENTS

April 9, 1975	Page
Oral Questions	
Public statement sought concerning government financial assistance for Teach-A-Tot day care centre. Mr. Neary, Mr. Murphy.	3610
Freeze on financial assistance to the 1977 Summer Games. Mr. Neary, Mr. Doyle.	3610
Construction of a swimming pool at Memorial University for use during the Summer Games. Mr. Neary, Mr. Doyle.	3611
Government representation with respect to Eastern Provincial Airways' decision to locate a new training facility at Halifax, N.S. Mr. Roberts, Taken as notice. Mr. Hickman (Acting Premier)	3611
Government's position respecting the Dalton Royal Commission report recommending CN ferry stops on the Burin Peninsula. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Rousseau.	3612
Has the government adopted a position on the report? Mr. Roberts, Mr. Rousseau.	3612
Financial assistance to the town of Wabana. Mr. Neary, Mr. Peckford.	3613
Disposal of surplus funds from the sale of DOSCO assets. Mr. Neary, Mr. Peckford.	3613
Reports of issuances of big game hunting licences to blind people. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Hickey.	3614
No requirement in the regulations that only sighted people can apply for big game hunting licences. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Hickey.	3614
Do regulations prohibit a second big game hunting licence from being issued to the same family unit? Mr. Roberts, Mr. Hickey.	3616
Consideration to limiting the open season on big game animals to a period in the month of December. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Hickey.	3616
Representations from the Placentia area to have a vacant gymnasium located at the Base made available for the use of residents. Mr. Neary, Mr. Doyle.	3618
Request for government action on recommendation No.10 of the Food Prices Review Board Report of November 1974. Mr. Neary, Mr. Dawe.	3619
Request for report of government action taken on the seven other recommendations of the report. Mr. Neary, Mr. Dawe.	3619
What recommendations in the report come under provincial jurisdiction? Mr. Neary, Mr. Dawe.	3620
Circulation of white paper on snowmobile regulations. Mr. Woodward, Mr. Rousseau, Mr. Hickey.	3621
Establishment of the Labrador Resources Development Corporation. Mr. Woodward, Mr. Doyle.	3621
Will the Corporation replace the Labrador Services Division? Mr. Woodward, Mr. Doody.	3622

CONTENTS - 2

Oral Questions (continued)	Page
Location of headquarters of the Corporation. Mr. Woodward, Mr. Doody.	3622
Will the Corporation be operational this Summer? Mr. Woodward, Mr. Doody.	3623
List requested of receiving communities under the Community Consolidation Programme. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Reid.	3624
Vietnamese babies available for adoption in Newfoundland. Mr. Neary, Mr. Murphy.	3624
Progress report sought on the <u>Norma and Gladys</u> . Mr. Neary, Mr. Hickey.	3625
Emergency Debate Sought	
Mr. Roberts moved the adjournment of the House to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance, i.e., government's failure to support other Provinces to prevent an increase in the price of fuel and oil products. Mr. Hickman.	3626
Speaker's ruling appealed. Upheld on division.	3628
Orders of the Day (Private Members' Day)	
<u>Motion No. 3</u> That a Select Committee be appointed to enquire into and report upon all circumstances surrounding any decision or decisions by the Government to acquire any office or other accommodation by rental purchase or otherwise since January 1, 1973 etc. Moved by Mr. Simmons.	
Debate continued by:	
Mr. Simmons	3628
Mr. Rowe	3639
Mr. Roberts	3652
Mr. Rousseau	3702
Adjournment	3703