



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND**

Volume 4

4th. Session

Number 33

VERBATIM REPORT

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 16, 1975

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE M. JAMES RUSSELL

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Fisheries.

HON. J. C. CROSBIE (Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, I just want to state on behalf of the government that our position is that if honourable gentlemen opposite want to continue with the debate on the Mines and Energy estimates today so they can discuss energy and the oil and gas crisis as they were so anxious to do in the last few days that it is quite acceptable to the government if the Opposition wishes to continue on -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CROSBIE: - to continue on with the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: When will we get the Private Members' Day?

MR. CROSBIE: Well you will get Private Members' Day next week, of course, yes.

MR. NEARY: Is that two days?

MR. CROSBIE: No, no, one day.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that arrangement is completely -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - that arrangement, Sir, is completely unsatisfactory to the Opposition. We want Private Members' Day. If the minister is prepared to let us have another day this week for Private Members' Day, we would be prepared to consider the matter.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, it is simply a question of priorities.

If it is not a priority of the Opposition to discuss that subject, we will leave it until tomorrow.

MR. NEARY: Right.

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Finance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

HON. H. R. V. EARLE (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition here -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

AN HON. MEMBER: You have been shooting off all week.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: You are very touchy on that subject.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, I have a petition here signed by just about all the residents of Wreck Cove, Fortune Bay. Wreck Cove, which is now known as Tibbos Hill, but they still like to call it Wreck Cove, is a small settlement about three miles off the main highroad between Belleoram and Coomb's Cove. The prayer of this petition is that the short stretch of road of approximately three miles be upgraded and that pavement be done in the settlement of Wreck Cove.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, this is one of the most difficult and probably one of the most picturesque areas in Newfoundland as far as roads are concerned. It is very, very hilly, steep, narrow, twisting and a very difficult place in which to place roads in any case. Their problem in that particular area is that they operate a school bus to the high school at English Harbour West, and the children from Wreck Cove have to take the school bus under, of course, all kinds of conditions during the winter. On some occasions the road is extremely slippery and dangerous. There is no question that the road needs to be upgraded. It

is an expensive and difficult task but as the people of Wreck Cove are very energetic, conscientious, hard-working people, I do not think there is any welfare in the settlement, they are all deep-sea fishermen, and as they intend to keep their homes there and to live in that area, I have the utmost regard for them and strongly support this petition that the road should be upgraded. Incidentally, there is some road work going on in that area and more will be done this season. So I intend to use my best efforts on my colleague, the Minister of Transportation and Communications to see if that particular short stretch of road can be upgraded and some pavement placed in the settlement of Wreck Cove.

I, therefore, have much pleasure in presenting this petition in asking that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. A. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure -

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Burgeo.

MR. EVANS: - to support the petition so ably presented by my colleague, the Minister of Finance. I know the people in Wreck Cove quite well. I have a lot of great personal friends there, and I would have to reiterate what the minister has already stated. They are some of the hardest working and most industrious people that you would find anywhere in this Province, and it gives me great pleasure, as I say, to support this petition. And I hope they will have their wish fulfilled.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Hermitage.

MR. R. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to rise on behalf of my colleagues and support the petition presented by the Minister of Finance and the member for Fortune Bay to the effect that some upgrading be done in the Wreck Cove or the Tibbos Hill area. It is a prayer that we can heartily support, and it is with pleasure I do so. I do hope the minister will, as he has indicated, use his influence with the Minister of Transportation to see that this section of road is improved this year. The

people of nearby Coomb's Cove of course, could cite for the people of Tibbos Hill a very sad story, one that comes to the matter of leaning on the minister to get things done. But, that is another story which is perhaps not pertinent here, Mr. Speaker. Let me say though, it is done, Mr. Speaker, just for the record, the Coomb's Cove section has been done. There is a story behind that too, a story that the minister himself cannot take too much credit for.

I was going to say though, Mr. Speaker, that what has happened here this afternoon, as the minister presents the petition, is fairly significant, a significance that has not been lost on me. While I read in the paper that a number of members have obtained a list from the minister about what is to be done, for some reason the Minister of Finance has no such luck with the Minister of Transportation. I certainly wish him better luck next time with the minister.

MR. DUNPHY: Out of order! Out of order!

MR. SIMMONS: Well, the honourable Member for St. George's would certainly know, Mr. Speaker. I do not know much he does not know.

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

MR. DUNPHY: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: You are getting touchy.

MR. CROSBIE: We are not getting touchy at all. There are certain rules, Mr. Speaker - the honourable gentleman can rise and support the petition or not, but he cannot introduce a debate on other issues, and he is doing that now.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose to allow the Minister of Finance to get into a charade as he is so often happy to do. I will proceed with the matter at hand. I am happy to support the petition. I do hope that the Minister of Transportation will see fit to grant the prayer of the petition. In this respect I do hope that the people of Wreck Cove or Tibbos Hill have a lot more luck in getting immediate action on this than their counterparts in the nearby community of Coomb's Cove had a year or so ago.

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

HON. J. ROUSSEAU (MINISTER OF TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS): Mr.

Speaker, I certainly will consider the petition placed before the House by the honourable member of the district, the Minister of Finance and my colleague. We are also aware, of course, of the problem in the area of Boxey. We will certainly give it sympathetic consideration.

But, I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that the more I hear from the Member for Hermitage the more upset I get. You know, he in effect stood up today and called me a liar which I am not prepared to accept when he suggests -

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

The honourable Minister of Finance rose a few moments ago and said that persons when supporting petitions could speak to the prayer of the petitions being presented and should not get into a debate on other matters. That is quite correct and very correct, and the Chair feels that the honourable Minister of Transportation and Communications is entitled to speak in support of the petition but not entitled to get off on another debate on the topic.

MR. ROUSSEAU: May I rise on a point of privilege?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: A point of order.

MR. ROUSSEAU: May I rise on a point of privilege? On two Late Shows here, Sir, in the past two weeks, I have been asked for a list of highways. I have told honourable members of this House that I do not have a list of highways. The inference by the Member for Hermitage for about the umpteenth time in this House is that there is a list. In effect he is not prepared to take my word. Now, I do not think that is fair. I have tried on two consecutive Thursday Late Shows to explain the situation. I am not now even aware of how much work we can do with the budget we have until we get the initial projects in to find what the costs are, Mr. Speaker, on reconstruction and on pavement. When we get the DREE Agreement signed, we will tell people about it. But, I resent the implication.

You know, I had the misfortune of having the honourable member as a colleague in the teaching profession. Do not make it unfortunate to have you an honourable member of this House as well. I resent the implication of being called a liar. I resent the implication -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. ROUSSEAU: I resent the implication of the inference of a list when I say there is no list. If the honourable member is not prepared to take that, then that is his tough luck.

Now, I stand up here and I have not lied to the people of this Province in my three years. I pride myself on my honour as a member of this House of Assembly. I say to Your Honour and the honourable Member for Hermitage that I do not lie. I do not mislead the House and I am not now misleading the House when I say there is no list. I do not know whether I can do twenty miles of pavement or 2,000 miles of pavement until I get the amounts that it is going to cost originally and the contracts that are being called. The price of asphalt has tripled. The price of reconstruction, I do not know.

You know, to get in public life and to have that suggestion put at you after two five minute periods is repugnant to me, Mr. Speaker. Knowing the member is an honourable member, which I will call him once more, if that member is not prepared to retract that, then he can no longer in future expect me to call him the honourable Member for Hermitage.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS: I would like to speak to the matter of privilege, Mr. Speaker, if I may. Mr. Speaker, first of all, of course, I deeply regret that the Minister of Transportation got that impression. I think the tapes will show -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I in no way imputed the integrity of the minister. I am upset that he would think that. I never called him a liar.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, may I be heard?

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

MR. SIMMONS: Or can they not stand the truth for a change.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sit down!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I want to make it perfectly clear that the minister has had an opportunity to make his case clear. I regret that he got that message. I have been upset over the two issue, the two Thursdays that he referred to. I have been upset but I do not think it was a matter of any lack of integrity on the part of the minister. I have not called him a liar. I have not meant to insinuate that he is a liar. I do not think he is a liar, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: I do not believe him.

MR. SIMMONS: I do not care who believes me, Mr. Speaker, I, for the record, would like to convey my thoughts on the subject to the Minister of Transportation through you, Mr. Speaker. And it is for him to decide and others to decide whether what I am saying is believed. But I want the record to show that I did not a few minutes ago, I never implied, I said directly that it was my impression that other members had better luck with the minister. But that was not meant to in any way cast aspersions on his integrity. I was indeed drawing on information which I have. And if the minister wants proof I have it right here, where one member is quoted in the press, the Member for Port au Port, as saying that he has from the Minister of Transportation a go-ahead on certain pieces of road, and that was what I was referring to. Now if in referring to what I have - documentation - is calling the minister a liar I am sorry. But I am quoting, and if it serves a purpose I can read the whole thing. But it is there pretty clear, in black and white, that the Member for Port au Port has been quoted as saying he has talked to the minister, and the minister has authorized him to go ahead and announce certain pieces of road which are to be upgraded and paved. Mr. Speaker, it is in that vein I rise. I want to say to the gentleman for Labrador West, his comments about the teacher part, I do not feel that way. I felt fortunate to have him as a colleague in the profession.

AN HON. MEMBER: You were lucky.

MR. SIMONS: Yes, I was lucky. I was lucky. And I am deeply upset that he would get the message that there is something personal here, because that is not the case at all, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications rose on a point of privilege, and the Chair allowed the honourable Member for Hermitage to reply to same. The Chair rules that it is perhaps a difference of opinion between the two members as to what was said and what was understood to have been said and feels that it is the end of that.

MR. ROUSSEAU: On the petition now, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: If the honourable member -

MR. ROUSSEAU: I was supporting a petition, yes, if I may.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes. And I accept the honourable member's words. The petition so ably presented by my colleague, and I can understand the problems, we have had communications from the honourable the member on the conditions not only in Wreck Cove but also in the town of Boxey, I think, which is close by as well. And, you know, we will certainly give every consideration to it. And I would like to take this opportunity, if I may, Mr. Speaker, to suggest to the honourable members of the House that the early part of the season until we get some cost estimates on the amount of road it is not economically possible to pave four and five miles of road in an isolated area. That is a difficult thing, especially - this morning we opened a tender and the tender was \$29.50 per ton asphalt - which was what? \$9.00 - \$8.00 or \$9.00 a couple of years ago, or a year ago or so. And until we get an indication of the cost we do not even know where the total amount of money we have, we do not know how much pavement is going to be done. Now we do not know how much we can do, \$29.00 - is what? over three times as much as it was when we did the Deer Lake-Wiltondale Road, and I think it was about \$9.00 a ton, plus the \$6.00 for the oil that the department has to supply, it makes it almost \$34.00 or \$35.00 for a ton of asphalt. And that is - the honourable

Member from Labrador North is nodding—you know, it is quite a price. And we have no indication of how much mileage we can do. But to do sections of four and five miles or two and three miles is a very difficult thing to do if it is isolated. And what we have to try and do as a matter of policy of this government is to spend the taxpayers' money, Mr. Speaker, to the best advantage, and to do that we have to reconstruct enough mileage so that a paving contract is warranted and will give us the best possible price. I think that honourable members of the House should accept that. I am sure that all honourable members, be they on this side of the House or be they on the other side of the House, want to see the taxpayers' money put to the best use. We will try and do as much work as we can. We will try and do it in as large quantities as we can so that the most value for the taxpayers dollar comes out of it. And after the first few contracts we will get an indication of cost and we will have a better idea of just how much work we can do during the year.

So I support the petition from the honourable Member for Fortune. I support the petition so ably placed. You know, I support the petition of every honourable member of this House. And, you know, I would like to be able to say on behalf of government that we love to pave everything, but it cannot be done. But we will certainly try and do as much as we can with the prices that we have, and the amount of money at our availability to get the best possible return to the taxpayers of this Province.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any other petitions?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Bay de Verde.

MR. HOWARD: Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of twenty-nine fishermen of Grates Cove. The prayer of the petition reads as follows: We, the undersigned, fishermen of Grates Cove do hereby humbly request that the road from the main road to the public wharf, which is about one-twentieth of a mile in length and over which all fishing gear and all fish caught must be hauled, be paved in 1975 while paving equipment is in the immediate area.

Mr. Speaker, I support this petition, and I think back to last Spring, prior to the fishermen in Grates Cove being able to utilize this wharf, I had to contact the Department of Transportation and Communications and ask them if they would remove from this particular wharf approximately two feet of gravel which flows down from this deep incline down to the wharf every Spring and Fall. I also met with some engineers who are familiar with paving, and they have informed me that the only way that this piece of road could be paved was for the asphalt to be laid and then be spread by a grader. Because of the deep incline, it would be impossible for trucks to move from the wharf to the main highway if this were rolled in which is done on the highways. So it would have to be a rough pavement.

Mr. Speaker, I fully support this petition, and I ask that it be placed on the table of this House and that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Harbour Grace.

MR. H. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition so ably presented by the member for Bay de Verde. I am sure those twenty-nine fishermen who fish in that great historic town of Grates Cove are sincere in their request, and I trust that the department will see fit to pave this one-twentieth of a mile.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Labrador North.

MR. M. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, we, on this side of the House, support the petition presented by the member for Bay de Verde. We, too, feel, Sir,

that the twenty-nine fishermen from Grates Cove, there are some very good friends of mine who come from Grates Cove, and I am sure that they are sincere about wanting that pavement done on that one-twentieth of a mile of road. I do not know how the Hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications would react to moving the equipment in, unless there is equipment in the nearby area to do one-twentieth of a mile of road or unless there is a small contractor in the area. But I am sure, Sir, that we are sincere, and I hope that the minister will take it under advisement and see what we can do for the fishermen of Grates Cove.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Placentia East.

MR. F. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of 1,000 really parents and individuals in the Placentia-Point Verde-Southeast area, and their prayer is for the immediate improvement of the primary and elementary school in Placentia itself as well as the complete reconstruction of that facility as soon as possible.

Now, I do not think in the time allotted to me, Mr. Speaker, I could deal adequately with the problems presented to the parents of these children and to the children attending that school. Number one, it is very, very overcrowded and number two, there is a serious lack of proper water and sewerage facilities. That, of course, to some degree is attributable to the water system in the town itself. And as you and members of the House of Assembly know, we have for some years been bringing this matter to the attention of the House, and I am glad that the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing is here, because he, himself, is quite familiar with the problems in the area. And we have received \$1,100,000 for the water and sewerage system for Placentia, in the Southeast, but the cost is considerable, and there are large areas out there presently without adequate sewerage facilities or water and included, of course, is this school. The pressure in the school itself is insufficient to provide drinking water from the fountain, and it presented a health problem. The parents were very, very concerned about it.

Only yesterday the school was obliged to close and I understand that the pipes are now being replaced, the pipes leading to the school. But, Mr. Speaker, this is only just a temporary measure as was some other work done on the school last year.

The Fire Commissioner for Placentia, Mr. Murphy, was very, very concerned about the safety of the school itself and at his request the Fire Commissioner here had the school inspected and he came up with certain requirements, some of which were completed, including the new wiring for the school. But there are still certain aspects of that school, as far as the parents are concerned, that are very, very disturbing to them and they would certainly want to see, not too much money spent on that school, but enough to ensure the safety of the children. And the only real answer, of course, is to build a complete new school in the area.

We are pleased to have here today, Mr. Speaker, in the House the President of the Parent-Teachers' Association and the Fire Chief from the area as well as another member of the association who are quite concerned about this problem, because as you can appreciate, where the education and the safety of the children are involved everyone should be concerned.

I would also like to mention this, Mr. Speaker, in support of this petition and that is that that school, like all existing municipal facilities in the Placentia area was, obliged to compete, or to meet the excessive demands imposed upon these services by the large influx of residents from the Islands of Placentia Bay. Placentia itself received over 200 families and in excess of 100 or more, probably closer to 200 or 300 school children now attending this facility are children from parents who moved their complete and entire families from the other side of Placentia Bay. And as I have mentioned so frequently in this honourable House, adequate recognition was not given these receiving centres by means of additional money to meet the additional burdens imposed upon the school facilities and, of course, the municipal facilities.

So I think the people of Placentia and Point Verde,

Southeast, Bonds Path and all this area have a demand, Mr. Speaker, which is very, very reasonable and I am sure it has the complete support of all members of this House, in particular the Minister of Education, because this area is administered by the same board that administers my district. So with the clout of the Minister of Education I sincerely trust that he will see fit to make whatever assistance he can available to the board in Placentia, to help build this new facility, and before it is built, of course, to improve it to meet the requirements of the school today.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Minister of Education.
HON. G.R. OTTENHEIMER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman from Placentia East presented the petition from the parents of the Placentia area. Actually, earlier this morning, just before lunchtime, I had the pleasure of meeting with the three people referred to by the member for the district when they kindly gave me a copy of their petition and discussed with me the problems referred to therein, and their wishes and requests as put forward by the honourable the Member for Placentia East.

Essentially it refers to the school facility for the primary and elementary students in the Placentia area and asks for the improvements to the existing facility and then, of course, the second part, for new school facilities. I am certainly pleased to have met with them this morning, to have gotten the kind of opportunity to discuss their problems at first hand, and as I mentioned to them, I shall certainly draw these matters to the attention of the school board.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House support the petition presented by the Member for Placentia East on behalf of parents of school children in the Southeast - Placentia - Point Verde area.

I am a little bit familiar with that area, Sir, and I must say that the member made a very strong case on behalf of

the people who signed the petition. And the member also, Sir, whether he realizes it or not, made a very strong argument for more assistance, financial assistance for school boards that we have been saying all along over here. My colleague, the Member for St. Barbe North, who is our spokesman on educational matters, Sir, has been saying this all along. The school boards need more financial assistance in order to carry out these kinds of capital works.

At the moment, Sir, they are in a strait-jacket. There is nothing they can do

MR. NEARY: and so I am glad to see that at least one of the members on the government side agrees with the Opposition that the school boards should be given more money in order to improve these kind of schools that the minister described, and to build new schools that are so badly needed. And I hope that the Minister of Education will take note of this and see that the money is made available because this is the only way that the facilities are going to be improved because, Sir, the petition really cannot be acted upon by this House except that the Minister of Education can merely act as a rubber stamp and just pass the petition on to the school board. It is the school board who has to take the initiative. And the minister may prod and encourage the school board responsible for that school to build a new school, but first of all to upgrade the school and then build a new one. But they can always come back at the minister and say, well give us the money, give us the tools and we will finish the job.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

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

HON. L. BARRY (MINISTER OF MINES AND ENERGY): Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in supporting the petition of the honourable Member for Placentia East. And I would like to attest to the accuracy of his statements with respect to the pressure put on communities that were receiving centers for people who have been relocated from Placentia Bay because I can testify to this from first-hand knowledge as to what is happening on the other side of the Bay in Marystown where we have exactly the same situation, and again specifically with respect to the elementary school level where we have considerable increases in the numbers of students that require access to these schools. We have considerable pressure on other services in the community. And prior to or during this resettlement programme we did not have adequate consideration of the needs of these receiving centers that would permit the growth and development of infrastructure to look after the increased numbers of people who had moved in from the outlying areas. And, Mr. Speaker, as I say this is a problem on both sides of Placentia Bay. And I take great

pleasure again in supporting the petition of the honourable member.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any other petitions?

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. S. A. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Mines and Energy, Sir, has any reaction to an article in the Mining Journal of Canada that suggested that mining companies will avoid us like the plague in future because if we implement the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Mining in Newfoundland?

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

MR. BARRY: I would like to make a reaction to that. I would like to say to the mining companies of Canada, of this Province or outside of this Province, I would like to say to The Northern Miner that this government will not be pressured, this government will not be bullied, this government will not be threatened into disregarding any of the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Mineral Revenue. We are not committed, Mr. Speaker, to implementing any of them, but we are committed and we intend to carefully study every recommendation of that Royal Commission. I hope, Mr. Speaker, in the near future to be able to indicate with greater certainty and precision, the approach of government to the various recommendations. There are one or two recommendations where I can see they might be causing concern justifiably to industry across Canada, to companies that might be interested in investing here.

But I submit, Mr. Speaker, to the mining companies of Canada who are continuously complaining that their positions are misunderstood, who are continuously complaining about the fact that people do not realize they have to make profits in order to be able to reinvest, that this type of approach, this type of attempt to put undue pressure on government, to make speedy decisions on matters of such importance to this Province that this approach, Mr. Speaker, is one that does not work, and will not work in Newfoundland.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

The people of this Province, Mr. Speaker, are convinced, and this government is convinced that we have not in the past obtained adequate benefits from the development of our natural resources. We intend, Mr. Speaker, as I have said, not to take any action on this royal commission until every interested party has had an opportunity to make recommendation to us on the report of the royal commission. Mr. Speaker, indeed over the next several weeks I have meetings arranged with parties who have expressed the utmost concern. But, we are not going to be rushed, Mr. Speaker. We are not going to be bullied. We are not going to be pressured into ignoring any of the recommendations. We would not be doing the job that the people of this Province expect if we did not carefully consider every recommendation however unusual or wide-ranging, far-reaching it might be. We intend to do this.

We brought in a royal commission in 1974, Mr. Speaker, in the Spring of 1974 it was appointed. That royal commission brought in its report in the Fall of 1974, November, or December, 1974, probably the quickest time any royal commission has ever reported. A lot of hard work was put in in a short time. This government, Mr. Speaker, released that royal commission to industry and to honourable members of this House and to the Newfoundland public within a matter of two months, probably again the shortest time in Newfoundland's history that a royal commission report has been released. We made it clear from day one that we were prepared to consult fully with industry before implementing the recommendations.

Now, I submit to The Northern Miner that they would be better suited to making representation on the issues rather than attempting to coerce or force this government into speedily acceding to their requests. We will not do it.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the honourable the Premier. Would the honourable the Premier care to react to a statement today made by the Liberal Premier of Prince Edward Island, Premier Campbell, to the effect that he would like to see co-operative union amongst the Maritime Provinces especially in matters concerning energy and transportation. How does our government and our Premier react to that?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Premier.

HON. P.D. MOORES (PREMIER): Mr. Speaker, I think it is fairly obvious. I do not think the Member for Bell Island could have been listening when we got back from the Energy Conference whereby the Liberal, as he said -

MP. NEARY: All I heard about was the increase in gasoline and -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MOORES: - Premier of Prince Edward Island took the same stand as we did at that time based amongst other considerations on the establishment of a regional grid in Eastern Canada which would provide a market for some of the power, potential power, hydro power from Labrador, Quebec. Transportation is a mutual problem we have in Eastern Canada. The sort of question that the honourable Member for Bell Island asked, whether we support a better transportation system and a regional grid for hydro-electric power co-operatively with the other provinces in Eastern Canada, Sir, is something that we have been saying for two years, and the honourable Member for Bell Island only read about it today.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Health, Sir, could tell the House the target date for the completion of the Health Science Complex, target date for the completion of the Health Science Complex over here at the university?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Health.

HON. DR. A.T. ROWE (MINISTER OF HEALTH): Yes, Mr. Speaker. The Health Science Complex which is the largest project every undertaken in health in this Province is scheduled to be completed sometime in 1976. This, of course, will depend upon the labour situation between now and then. There has been considerable time lost to date because of the labour unrest situation, but I would have to say that there are two components of the Health Science Complex, the new general hospital and the new medical school. Of these two components, the part which will be occupied by the medical school is now partially completed and is partially in operation. That will continue to be phased in and a large number of the medical students are now being taught in the new facility.

But, as far as the hospital aspect is concerned, that will not be completed until sometime in 1976.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister of Health care to tell the House then if any consideration is being given to what will be done with the old facilities down at the General Hospital when the new Health Science Complex is completed and open for business?

MR. ROWE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. There has been a fair bit of consideration given to the utilization of the old General Hospital on completion of the new facility. Essentially it will become what they call a convalescent chronic-care unit. By convalescent unit we mean a number of beds which will be available to all hospitals in St. John's for the care of the acute convalescent. This indicates a person who has had a major operation at one of the St. John's hospitals, after the few days when the need for intensive nursing care is over and they are transferred to the General where a lesser form of nursing can be given, and thus give us more benefit of utilization of the acute beds in other hospitals.

This has the co-operation of the hospitals in St. John's. In addition to this there will be a number of beds set aside for chronic nursing and extended care and certain facilities for rehabilitation and various other ancillary projects.

MR. NEARY: I wonder if the Minister of Provincial Affairs, Sir, would like to react to charges made today by members of the City Council that government were dragging their seals on the location of a regional dump in the St. John's area.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Provincial Affairs and the Environment.

MR. DAVE: Mr. Speaker, the alternate site as proposed by the honourable Member for St. John's South is between five and ten miles west on the Trans Canada Highway from St. John's and because of frost and snow it has not been possible to adequately survey the site but it is hoped in the near future that we will be able to get together with Municipal Affairs and Housing and the councils involved, sit down and determine on what basis we will survey the site and who will bear the cost of it.

We, as everybody knows by now, entered into an agreement with federal government some time ago and undertook a study which cost them around \$50,000 for the area in the Ruby Line site. This turned out to be unacceptable to the people who live in that site, and not being the type of government being dictatorial and forcing these situations upon people, we are quite flexible, and we decided that we would be open to suggestions and the last dated suggestion is one where a site might be available about five or ten miles from St. John's so we will have to wait until the study is conducted and we will see whether or not there is enough overburden there to adequately take care of garbage under the sanitary land fill system.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the honourable the Premier. Will the Premier tell the House whether or not his government has considered issuing instructions to government institutions to purchase the surplus potatoes that our potato producers have on hand at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Premier.

MR. MOORES: I do not know the answer to the question. I will certainly take notice of it and advise the member tomorrow, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Sir, would the honourable the Premier care to tell the House if there are any late developments concerning the third paper mill at

Come By Chance?

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

MR. MARTIN: I have a question, Mr. Speaker, for the honourable the Minister of Education, two-part question, first of all is the government prepared to give us a progress report on the matter of the elementary school at Forteau, are they concerned? Secondly, are they prepared to allow the Straits of Bell Isle School Board to continue to ignore this problem any longer?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Education.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, in answer to that question, are we concerned, we certainly are. And the second part-I think, was to the effect that is the Department of Education going to allow a certain school board to, I forget the exact term, but to ignore the situation there. Certainly the answer there is no, but I think I must add to that in defence of the school board that to my knowledge and understanding, they have not ignored it or been without concern. I think I must in fairness add that.

With respect to a progress report I would hope to be in a better position to give a later one because there is nothing new to add apart from a question asked by the honourable Member for Labrador North a couple of days ago, the superintendent for that district, and the superintendent of course is the professional adviser, employee, officer of the school board, the superintendent for that area is due in Forteau this evening and is planning to meet with a community meeting or representatives of the community this evening, to again discuss the situation and see what the alternatives are. The only alternatives really are the use of one of the other two halls and to see specifically whether that is in fact possible.

So this evening the Superintendent for the Straits School Board, Mr. Anthony Genge, is due to be in Forteau and to meet with the parents of that community. I would expect that by tomorrow we will have a report as to what transpired at the meeting and what consensus was arrived at.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Labrador South.

MR. M. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, we have been waiting, it seems, for a month now for all kinds of progress reports. Just as a clarification of government policy I am wondering whether the minister can tell us exactly how much leeway school boards have in this respect? How long must a school be closed before government decides that a crisis has developed.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: The second part of the question was how long need a school be closed before government will make available an alternative site?

MR. MARTIN: No, how long before you decide that there is a crisis?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, of course, the word crisis can mean different things to different people. Obviously, there is a problem. There is no doubt about that and I suppose whether one calls that a problem, and I am not arguing that it is not a crisis or that it is, naturally that is a question of individual interpretation. All I can say is that within the past few weeks, we have had two or three engineers there, as the honourable gentleman knows, sanitation engineers, furnace engineers, whatever one calls them, and I think of both types and this specialist in school construction. They have inspected the premises thoroughly, the furnace and ventilation. They made some recommendations as to repainting, which has been done, as to some work under the school, some cleaning under the school and some other recommendations all of which to the best of my knowledge have been implemented. They reported that they, from an engineering point of view, could not ascribe any cause from point of view of ventilation or anything else why people should be ill from attending the school.

Now, from the medical point of view, there were, I believe, two doctors from the area there and the chief medical health officer for the Province, Dr. Severs, was in Forteau ten days, two weeks, in that period of time as well and he had submitted a report to the Minister of Health of which I have a copy, of which the school board has a copy. None of

these medical on-the-spot inspections were able to ascribe any scientific reason why people should be ill by attending the school. If one could think of any other area of expertise to send there, then one would be glad to send it. But if you have had more than one medical opinion, you have had some opinions, several opinions, and you have had more than one engineer's opinion, then one does not know who else's opinion to ask in the sense of what other kind of profession or specialist would be in a position to have an opinion of any relevance.

There was investigation of the possibility of using one or both of two other halls in the community. One is a community hall and one is a hall owned by the Loyal Orange Association. Up to the present, and although residents there initially were in favour of that, up to the present their consensus has been that this would not be an improvement. Now, this is what is to be examined again this evening when the superintendent for the area meets with residents of the community in order to determine whether one or both of these buildings can or should be used. Now, until one has the results of that, naturally I do not know what recommendations will come from that meeting which is due to take place this evening.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Labrador South.

MR. MARTIN: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Without getting into debate of this thing, if the minister could just answer yes or no, whether he is prepared at this point in time to make a political decision and order the school boards to take some action?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I cannot really answer that yes or no and have any kind of a meaningful answer. If somebody could say to me, this is what the school board or anybody should do and that will solve the problem, and that were something reasonable and capable and possible of being done, we would do it. But the doctors and the engineers who have been there, the engineers made some suggestions. They have been implemented. One was painting. One was cleaning underneath the school. They have been done.

If somebody of competence in the area can say, look, this is what needs to be done. You know, that window, you know, that done too, or something else, that done too. Certainly, we would be glad to instruct the school board to do it, and I am sure the school board would be very glad to do it on its own. But unless and until somebody with some knowledge can say, this is what needs to be done, then obviously neither the school board nor the Department of Education, you know, can require a specific act to be done when nobody can tell us what that act is.

MR. MARTIN: What the minister is saying is that he has nobody of any competence.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Nobody of what?

MR. MARTIN: Of any competence.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Nobody of any competence? Is that what - no, Mr. Speaker, I think in all fairness to the people -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: - who have been there, if my competence is going to be adjudged by the Hon. Member for Bonavista North, then surely I feel that -

MR. MOORES: Unfair.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes, as the Premier suggested, it might be a bit unfair. But no, Mr. Speaker, I think in honesty and in fairness to the people who have been there -

AN HON. MEMBER: "Gus" does not approve.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: - you know, there have been two doctors from the Grenfell Association, there has been the chief medical health officer of the Department of Health, there has been a school construction engineer from the Department of Education, and there have been either one or two other engineers, and I cannot certainly, and I would imagine - I can see the honourable gentleman, you know, this is in his district. And he cannot describe the cause to it any more than I can. None of us can. But I would not think that he really meant to suggest that these individuals are, you know,

are incompetent. I do not think he did. Certainly in fairness to them, I would have to say that, as far as I am concerned, they certainly are competent.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the Minister of Transportation and Communications, Sir. Would the minister care to inform the House if the minister or any of the officials of his department were consulted on this matter of locating a new hanger employing some 300 people in Halifax, Nova Scotia by Eastern Provincial Airways before they took the decision to consolidate their mainland part of their operation?

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

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, the minister was not. Government may have been or somebody else may have been but the minister or the department were not aware of the full, complete reasoning behind the move.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Sir. Is the minister aware that the Hon. Premier stated in this House yesterday that the government was aware of E.P.A.'s move to create this operation in Halifax? If the minister was aware of it, would he tell the House what action he took on it, if any?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Excuse me.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Premier.

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, that question was answered yesterday and the Hon. Member for Bell Island well knows it. He is trying to mix up here, as, I suppose it is a habit of the past, Mr. Speaker, that he is used to government interfering in everyone's business because they usually put them in business, and made them successful in it. The fact is that there is such a thing as private enterprise. There is such a thing as private companies, and it is not this government's business to tell E.P.A. where to assign their personnel. When it affects this Province directly, of course we do. If we can attract the business to this Province, of course we will. And this is what we are trying to do. But an internal decision

in the airline whereby they moved people from Moncton to Halifax, it would be like us complaining to Bell Telephone because they moved someone from Toronto to Vancouver instead of St. John's. It is just as asinine and the member knows it, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. NEARY: A supplementary to the Hon. the Premier, Sir, who felt that he should leap in and answer the question. Would the minister tell the House just what efforts were made on the part of the Premier and the administration to try to influence, not direct, influence E.P.A. to put this project that they are building in Halifax in Gander where we have all the facilities?

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, that question has been asked. He says we have the facilities in Gander for 400 stewardesses. Even if the honourable member was there, I doubt if we would, Mr. Speaker. But the fact is that the service centre for Gander has been promoted by us as much as possible. We have contacted Mr. Miller. We have been in continuous conversation with him regarding or trying to get more E.P.A. stationary work for the Province, and we will continue to do that.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, this is rather

a peculiar sort of horse trading where - is the Premier saying that we are accepting fifty or sixty jobs in Gander as compared to losing 300 or 350 to Nova Scotia? Is this the kind of horse trading the Premier is talking about?

MR. MORGAN: He is not saying that. Come on "Steve".

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, the honourable Member for Bell Island is putting the same sort of position on this as he and the previous Premier did on the reopening of the mines on Bell Island, I mean the jobs lost or the jobs gained sort of thing. I mean he mixes up figures, people, and of the economy, Mr. Speaker, so that it is unique. The fact is in this regard the Province is doing everything possible with EPA to get EPA as active in this Province as we possibly can.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary to the Premier, Sir. Would the Premier inform the House if the government offered EPA any incentives to locate this multimillion dollar hanger in Gander and create some 300 or 400 jobs here on the Island of Newfoundland? Were there any incentives offered to EPA?

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, when the honourable member speaks about incentives, I mean, you know, I would think possibly the biggest incentive we can have in this Province is if the honourable member when he leaves Bell Island-Harbour Main moves right across the Gulf. But, that being beside the point, the fact is that of course we are trying to get people in here. We are not having giveaway programmes. The fact is that EPA have told us that the reason their personnel would be located in Halifax, and move from Moncton and Montreal and not from Newfoundland to that location, is because it is the central location on their route. It is the place where they can most easily have changeovers under aircrafts of their operating personnel. That, even though we would love to have it in Newfoundland, is a position that we are not in a position to argue about. We of course would like to have them here. Gander is the last stop on their run, as people know when they come to St. John's and go back to Gander. It is the last stop and it is not operationally desirable to have all your people at one end in case of fog the night before, or whatever the case might be. They want flexibility for that reason.

MR. NEARY: But this is a main training center.

MR. MOORES: And their position is basically fairly reasonable. However with regard to the development of the service of the aircraft at Gander, the situation there is that we are offering every encouragement, every incentive we can. We want that sort of development at Gander. I know the people of Gander want it. This government wants it. Sir, to the best of our knowledge, FPA want it as well.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable the Premier could tell the House whether he is going to take the advise of his colleague, the Minister of Mines and Energy and go down to the governor and resign?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Is the Premier going to take the advise of his colleague and go down to the governor and resign?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, the answer to the question is yes. The question should have been, Sir, when.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Sir, a supplementary. Could the Premier indicate or be a little more specific and give us the date?

MR. MOORES: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will at the appropriate time.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Premier. Could the honourable Premier give us a sort of a time span? Would it be within the next two weeks, the next month?

MR. MOORES: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can. It will be before April 1, 1977.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. THOMS: Hang on until the last minute.

MR. SPEAKER: There is approximately three or four minutes left in the question period if the honourable Member for St. Barbe North has a question.

MR. F. POWE: Well, I just have a short question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. Has the minister received any communications or representations from the Community of Hodge's Cove protesting the \$12.00 water fee for that community?

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

HON. B. PECKFORD (MINISTER OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS AND HOUSING): There is no such thing as a \$12.00 water fee. The honourable Member for St. Barbe

North first of all should get his facts straight.

MR. MURPHY: Did you hear the statement on this morning and what he said about you?

MR. PECKFORD: I have not received to date to my knowledge any representation from the community or town, community I think it is, of Hodge's Cove in Trinity North protesting water or sewer rates, not to my knowledge up until today. I have the mail up until - the latest mail I have is right here. I just received it. It takes me up to about 3:27 this afternoon. So now, unless it came in since 3:27 this afternoon, I would have seen it.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: (Inaudible) or what or flower power?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

It is not flower power. It is Private Members' Day. So, we shall proceed to motion number 1 on the Order Paper. I think the debate was adjourned last day by the honourable Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. POUSSEAU: Yes, Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have, by the way?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable minister has used up to five minutes, I understand, and has forty minutes left to speak.

MR. CROSBIE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman is a government minister replying to a motion moved by a member on the other side of the House. I therefore submit that he should have unlimited time. That the motion now before the House is a motion of non confidence in the government. It is a motion that calls for a Select Committee into certain matters. And it is a motion that the government would regard as a non confidence motion if it was carried. And therefore I submit that the honourable minister who answers on behalf of the government in accordance with the Standing Orders - I will get the page number now - has unlimited time in replying to the motion. Page 29, no member except the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition or a minister moving a government order and the member speaking reply immediately after such minister or a member making a motion of no confidence in the government which was done by the Member for Hermitage, and the minister replying thereto shall speak for more than forty-five minutes of time in any debate. The Minister of Transportation is replying in behalf of the government. And I submit this is a motion of non confidence and he has the right to talk for twelve hours, or twenty or three or anytime that he requires.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of order, Sir. That is childish. It is almost too foolish, Sir, to comment on. The Minister of Transportation and Communications does not have unlimited time. He is not a leader of a party in this honourable House. He is not, Sir, he is not moving a vote of non confidence in the government. I wish he was.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: And he has no more privileges, Sir, than any other member of this honourable House outside of the Hon. the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition and my friend down here, the Member for Labrador South. I do not know what the House Leader is up to, Sir, but whatever it is it is almost too foolish to talk about.

MR. CROSBIE: He is a minister replying -

MR. NEARY: No, he is not a minister replying, Sir. He is not.

It is not a non confidence motion.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: No it is not.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: It is merely a private member's resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Chair at the moment feels that perhaps the minister may have only forty-five minutes, but it is not making that ruling at the present moment. There are a few points the Chair wishes to consult with some honourable members at the table and will ask the Deputy Speaker to relieve me and to sort of advice the House before the forty-five minutes has expired in the honourable member's speech.

MR. SIMMONS: Do we get the opportunity to speak to this point? Will we have further opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to speak to the point of order before a ruling is made?

MR. SPEAKER: No, the Chair has taken the matter under advisement and will rule on it before the minister is finished his forty-five minutes.

MR. F. ROWE: heard by Your Honour in the Chambers while the decision is being made or during the decision?

MR. SPEAKER: If the -

MR. F. ROWE: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! If the Chair feels that representation from both sides of the House is necessary it will request honourable members to make such representations.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Well, Mr. Speaker, if I may could I try it another way? Maybe honourable gentlemen across the House could give me leave to speak, to answer the questions that were put forward since they are looking for the answers to it. Would the honourable members across the House do that?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROUSSEAU: You know, I want to know because I have some points to cover. Will you give me leave to speak and answer these points that were raised?

MR. NEARY: How much time does the honourable member have?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Forty minutes.

HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: launches out into a vicious attack, you know, for the next forty minutes. If he is kind and sensible and all this sort of a thing -

AN HON. MEMBER: We will give it due consideration at forty-five minutes.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Okay, Mr. Speaker, you know, I will not accept that. I want forty-five minutes either one way or the other. You know, this is incomprehensible. You know, if the people of the Province - honestly there is sometimes I wish there was television here. Here we are, Mr. Speaker, on two consecutive days moving for a special sitting of the House to discuss the oil situation in the Province. They get an opportunity today, and they deny that opportunity. They deny it. It is not very important. Now I am asking -

MR. F. ROWE: On a point of order.

MR. ROUSSEAU: - for a few minutes, Mr. Speaker, to try and reply to-

MR. F. ROWE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROUSSEAU: - a set of questions.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please! Maybe I am anticipating the honourable member's point of order. The minister is irrelevant at this point, I think he knows that.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Unfortunately he has not persisted in the irrelevance, consequently I cannot order him to take his place. However I would suggest to him that he might direct himself to the matter which is rightly before the House.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Well, maybe I can put it another way, Mr. Speaker. What pure unadulterated politics, what pure unadulterated politics that honourable

members on the other side of the House want to foist on the people of this Province. This is not important enough to move to discuss something that they thought for two days that was important. This is pure politics. Give forty-five minutes, excellent, not because they want the answers, not because they want the answers, but only because they want to make political hay. I have every lease here that has been entered into the government since January 1, 1973 which I am prepared to put on the table of this House, but I cannot do it in forty minutes. They have asked, the motion reads, Mr. Speaker,

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if the minister will permit me, Sir. The way out of his dilemma, Sir, is not to make a speech about all of these things, but just table it. If the minister wants to table these documents, we would be very happy to let the minister table the documents. Table them.

MR. ROUSSEAU: We are going to read it out. I am going to read it out. I am not going to table it because there are some names that the honourable members would like to see read out and should that there is no political patronage. Anyway, we will go to the questions of the day and I will take the forty minutes, Mr. Speaker. I can see why honourable members of this House change from one day to the other. This time last year I never thought I would ever get to be like I have been in the House today, but I guess, with time, I guess, you get this little game of politics when people are trying to do the job they are supposed to be elected to this House for, but there is none of that stuff. Out with administration, out with government, pure politics!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! Order, please! The honourable member now only has thirty-five minutes left. He has yet to deal with the subject.

MR. ROUSSEAU: To get on with the job anyway, Mr. Speaker. The last day I started to make a point. I only had a few minutes and I would like to make this point and I think it is important. Then I am going to answer the questions and what questions are not answered in forty-five minutes,

it will be unfortunate, but I am sure we have other able members on this side of the House who like to push a few things across before this debate is over. But we started last week on-or the week before, no, last week, on this item and three honourable members across the House spoke, the honourable Member from Hermitage, the honourable Member from St. Barbe North and the honourable Member from White Bay North, the Leader of the Opposition. I had a few minutes left when the six of the clock was called. I started on a point, Mr. Speaker, at that time that I would like to elaborate on at this point in time. There were points during the afternoon and I cannot recall, I do not have it written down for the honourable Member from Hermitage, so I do not know if he said it or not. There were times during the afternoon in the speech from the Honourable the Member for St. Barbe North and the honourable the Member from White Bay North, the Leader of the Opposition, when I expected the gentleman in question to ride into the House on a white charger. I am not saying that is wrong. The gentleman is a gentleman, but I would just like to make a point.

We talk about negotiations, you know, there were negotiations going on in this situation. Nobody said there was not. We had been discussing that. There is no question about that. But the honourable members across the House tried to infer that the government were crooked, and by innuendo and by insinuation and by suggestion, what honourable members did to another gentleman in this Province, which they have done on numerous, previous occasions in dragging names across the floor of the House as if anybody involved with the government is crooked, is a crook, is a rogue and, Mr. Speaker, that is one awful thing to occur in this House of Assembly. It has occurred consistently in my three years here, that anybody who does work with the government, anybody who does business with the government, anybody who gets a government contract is crooked, is a rogue and this is what the inference was. There is no question in my mind about that.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Order, please! There is a rather neat, procedural point here where the honourable member can accuse other honourable members

of calling other people rogues and crooks and so on. It is getting into the realm of saying things indirectly which cannot be said directly and then accusing others of saying them. It is a point that I do not think has been decided upon, to my knowledge, but it is one that certainly will have to be decided upon if the honourable members, if this is going to be the tenor of the honourable member's speech.

MR. ROUSSEAU: All I wanted to do, Mr. Speaker, was make that point, by innuendo. I will leave it there. I think the honourable members know what I am talking about anyway, but quite -

MR. ROWE: On a point of privilege. Since the minister insists that he wanted to make that point, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that he totally withdraw the statement because at no time did I say that the government engaged in crooked activity, nor did I imply that the government engaged in crooked activity, and nor did I imply therefore that Mr. Craig Dobbin is a crook or was engaged in crooked activity or that he was a rogue. I would ask that the honourable the minister withdraw without qualification these particular statements that he has made because it is a very important point and he insists that he wanted to make that point.

MR. SIMMONS: Right.

MR. ROWE: Now, I ask for an unqualified withdrawal of his remarks.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker,

MR. ROWE: A ruling please.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I will -

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Inaudible.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I will without qualification withdraw the statement that the honourable Member from St. Barbe South said the words to the effect that I have used in the past few minutes. Is that satisfactory?

We know what the words are. Now, Mr. Speaker, anyway let us get to the point at hand, you know. There are a number of points raised by the honourable members across the House who spoke on this issue. I can assure honourable members that if there is anything crooked about the issue, I would hardly be standing up to try and defend it on behalf of government.

Now, honourable members across the House are attempting to score political points. I accept that, but, you know, there are a number of matters of difference of opinion, or whatever you may want to call it, in which there is disagreement between both sides of the House. But, I am going to attempt now to the best of my ability to lay before the House the facts as government sees them in respect to the number of issues arising as a result of the statements of the three honourable members last week. As I say, too, I am prepared to speak to the number of leases that have been entered into, list of dates and so on and extension dates that government have entered into. I am not prepared to table them. I am prepared to give them in this House.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROUSSEAU: It will not be edited. It is a complete list.

MR. F. ROWE: Yes, well why not table it?

MR. POUSSEAU: Why not give me the opportunity to present them?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Why not table them?

MR. NEARY: Table them in the House.

MR. MORGAN: He is going to explain them.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Now, let us go back, Mr. Speaker, and try and put this in proper perspective. There is no question about one basic premise. That is that - do not look worried, it is a legitimate premise - government needs space. There is no question about that, as far as I was concerned before, and I am sure, as the honourable Minister of Public Works is now, also sure that there is a need for space. We have had representations from just about every department in government for added space, and we have had representations from the honourable the Leader of the Opposition for more space. I think honourable members across the House will accept

the fact that one of the happiest things they would like to see occur is added space in the Opposition rooms. I wrote the Leader of the Opposition back before I left the portfolio and said, I am sorry, there is no space in the building. That premise we have to assume to be a correct one, that there is a need for space in this government. The Opposition have indicated that they need extra space. They have been told that there is no extra space available.

Number two, there are a number of government departments and a number of government agencies which exist in many areas throughout the, well, the City of St. John's - I guess you could say the metropolitan area I suppose - but anyway the City of St. John's especially. There are many different departments of government, many different agencies of government which exist in spaces, locations which are quite a distance from each other. Now, you know, it is all right for people in the City of St. John's who know the city well, but people who have come in from outside the city and who have to visit maybe two, maybe three, maybe four and hopefully not, but unfortunately a possible five or six different locations. That is certainly not convenient to the people of this Province who have a right to visit any department or any agency to register requests or indignation or what have you.

Now, this is certainly not an easy task to those unfamiliar with the city. We have said some two years ago as a government that we would like to consolidate all the bits and pieces of government departments into one central location. There is nothing wrong with that concept. I have never heard actually a statement from the Opposition to the effect that that was not a good idea. It was stated on radio. It was stated in the newspapers. It was stated publicly in the House that we indeed would like to consolidate the space requirements of all departments and agencies under at least, at the most two buildings, this one and one other so it is a convenience to the public of this Province. Now, that being the case, government looked at the possibility of acquiring the extra space needed and to have it situated in one location. This was brought - by the way, there was no deal, no shady deal, no underhandedness, no crookedness.

As a matter of fact, the honourable gentlemen who wrote me as ministers, the honourable the Leader of the Opposition who wrote me, it went to cabinet because I was inundated requests that we needed space. Everybody in government accepted the fact that they needed space because many of the gentlemen who made the decision to attempt to secure sufficient space were indeed in the midst of looking for space themselves. So, government in its wisdom decided that we would find out just what space was available. To this end government directed the Minister of Public Works and Services, who was me at that time, to invite proposals from people who might have the space required available. Four proposals were requested. One person choose not to submit a proposal, and three did.

Now, from that point in time government looked at the proposals and the honourable the members across the House last week threw around dates because the original request was made on September 30 and the first proposal came in on October 7, therefore there was a deal. The other proposal was October 11 which in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, does not at all mean that the person who made a proposal on October 11 could not have done it on October 7.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROUSSEAU: But, that for the honourable Member from Hermitage who was an administrator who, I hope, I presume, took philosophy somewhere along the way, that is not a logical assumption. He may think that, and the honourable member may hope that was the case, but that does not logically follow that because somebody has one ready on October 7, that none of the other two could not have done that. That is illogical and below, I think, the thinking ability of the Member from Hermitage. But, of course that is inferences, drawing conclusions, duping the people as to the fact that he was already there as soon as he saw it in the newspaper.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

MR. ROUSSEAU: I withdraw it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Duping the people is the controversial phrase.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I withdraw it.

MR. SIMMONS: Oh boy, oh boy! What are we seeing at all? What is it?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Being inaccurate in his definition of dates, that as soon as the proposal letter was put in one hand, the gentleman had the proposal ready to pass back in the other hand. That is the inference he was attempting to draw last week. I do not accept the fact that because one proposal was in on October 7 that the person was ready, that it was all made up, you know, that is bologna. I can stand here and say to the honourable member and to all honourable members and to the people of this Province that if I, Joe Rousseau, thought there was a deal, then I would resign from this government. I would say that. Sure I would because there was no deal. There was no deal.

Now, there is a difference of opinion because we called four proposals. Why did we not call twenty-four? Okay. That was a government decision. They certainly were not all supporters of government that the proposals were called from by any stretch of the imagination.

One was the four names, and the honourable members of the House know the four names, it was Andrew Crosbie, W. J. Lundrigans, Seabord, Mr. Brown, and Mr. Dobbins. Four people, there was no political attachment of this Party to the four individuals, and rightfully so, there should not be, but four successful Newfoundlanders who had made a good business for themselves in the Province and who, I feel, are above reproach. I do not know the gentlemen that well but I assume that they are above reproach. I assume all honourable members accept that. There is no deal. There could not be a deal, because I will tell you why, you know many times people talk about deals in government and all this, but you know what the honourable member is inferring, and I say this not accusing the honourable member, Mr. Speaker, so you just might be able to finish what I am going to say, that the officials of the Department of Public Works worked on these proposals, and what the honourable member is inferring, and I do not think deliberately because I do not think probably the honourable member is fully cognizant of what he is saying, is that there was complicity right down the line from government to the minister, to the Department of Public Works. Now that is what he is suggesting and I do not say he is doing it deliberately, Mr. Speaker, but that is what the suggestion is because these proposals were looked at by the officials in the Department of Public Works and the honourable the Leader of the Opposition and the honourable members who spoke had the notations on the side of what they call the green paper. The officials saw this, officials I think who are honourable men.

Surely to God there is not one man in this House who would even question the integrity of Jack Ralph, the Deputy Minister of Public Works, a civil servant of twenty-five odd years, one of the most honest upright men in the Civil Service.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, I spent a year and a half with Jack Ralph, you do not even tell Jack Ralph, you know. But Jack will come to you, and Jack Ralph is an honest Deputy Minister who will come and say, Sir you should not do this. He does not tell you what you want to hear. He tells you

what you have to hear.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about the four deputy ministers who retired.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I do not follow the -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please! Two points, the honourable member is not permitted to interrupt an honourable member who has the floor and secondly of course the honourable member must be, if at all, from his own place. He has violated both of these rules.

MR. ROUSSEAU: What I am suggesting, and again I will say to the honourable Member for Hermitage, with all honesty, that I do not think that he fully recognizes what the implication of the term "shady deal" is. You know, when people in a department are involved in the analysis of a proposal, you know they are not down there implying shady deals. Mr. Speaker, it is unbelievable. Especially the individuals, and I do not want to name them all, but I know the gentleman, I served with him a year and a half prior to this, who would have been involved in this had this been a shady deal and they are not gentlemen who would be involved in that.

I would say that the honourable the Member for Bell Island, would know that since he served in the government and would not question the honour or integrity of these officials I am sure, no question about it, but I do not think that the honourable Member for Hermitage and the honourable Member for St. Barbe North and the honourable the Leader of the Opposition fully recognized what they were saying.

Now, had not the members of the department been involved, okay I could not refute the argument as I am refuting it now, but they were involved and the very fact that their notations are on the side of the paper show that they were involved. And I do not think, I think that the honourable member would like at some time when he is speaking in the House of Assembly to stand up and apologize if that suggestion came across, and I am sure he did not mean that and I am sure that was not the intent of what he was saying, but it certainly has the effect of that and I do not think he would want to say that to stay on the record.

So, there were three proposals.

MR. SIMMONS: I would like to rise on this because the minister has been - I tried to resist but I was not able to - because the minister has been persuing what I think is a fairly dangerous course of action in the past few minutes, Mr. Speaker. He is putting all kinds of words in my mouth that are not there. My point of order, Mr. Speaker, is that if the minister is going to quote me at least he can do so correctly.

And you know the ifs and ands that he is getting on with that if the member meant this that he should do this and that kind of thing, look I am fairly capable of speaking for myself or I will live with the incapability and I do not particularly like the tactic particularly when it leads to the result of giving the impression that somehow I imputed the motives of persons working in his department, Mr. Speaker, left me for the records say that I have no dispute with the way the members in the Department of Public Works performed their job, it is my understanding from a lot of evidences that they do it extremely well and I would like the minister -

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please! Order, please! The honourable member is not permitted to make a speech on a point of order. This is he is now in the realm of trying to, and debating a point being made by the, or attempting to debate a point being made by the honourable minister. His point of order basically is not one. It is a matter of opinion between two honourable members and his remarks would more suitably be made when he concludes the debate.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry. I did not say that the honourable member deliberately said that. You know I have to read that, or either I have to assume that the honourable member is too stupid to know what he was saying. It was either one or the other. But anyway I will give him the benefit of the doubt and I will drop the matter there, because I know the honourable member is not stupid. He is, you know he was an administrator and he has a Master's Degree and he must be able and capable and know the difference between the use of the words, but

I was implying, I was using the term, Mr. Speaker, that he used last week, that the honourable member used of shady deal and I was trying conclusions from that and I do not think that the intent was there for the honourable member anyway. But quite apart from that I will go ahead with this, Mr. Speaker.

So the proposals came in and the department, officials of the department looked over the proposals. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a very fine difference possibly in the minds of some people between a proposal and a tender. A proposal is not a concrete plan as you would have with specifications and so on that you would call in an actual tender call. Because a proposal looks good does not mean that you can further discuss with the parties a better situation that was suggested in the proposals. And discussions went on, Mr. Speaker. Nobody suggests that discussions did not go on in our attempts to secure the best possible deal for the Province.

And this leads me by the way, Mr. Speaker, and I will just spend a few words on this, last week the Leader of the Opposition gave some figures and he came up with certain figures, different types of figures that I have here somewhere, the true price, the net return and so on and so forth that I asked officials of the department to try and determine just where the honourable the Leader of the Opposition came up with the figures. How did he arrive at these figures? And the officials of the department could not determine where he arrived at those figures. It was impossible for them to do that. But anyone is aware of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that you can take a set of dates and by implication and innuendo suggest that something is wrong, Using a set of figures you can do the same thing. As a very wise gentleman once said, Mr. Disraeli, there are lies, damn lies and statistics. And you can use statistics, Mr. Speaker. I could use by logic and argument, certain arguments to even make the Leader of the Opposition look like he was a defective Leader of the Opposition. I could even do that. And that is stretching the point but you can do it by argument. You can convince some people of that.

But you can do anything by a process of argument if you want to use

one side of an argument, or you want to use one set of figures, or you want to make up your basis of what figures you are going to use, or you want to add up things that you intend to add up that are not accepted accounting procedure and the officials of the Department of Public Works and Services could not determine where the honourable the Leader of the Opposition came up with the sets of figures he came up with last week.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I cannot even figure where he got them. Now one second - good - Mr. Speaker, it is up to me to do that and if honourable members across the House were prepared to do that they would have given me unlimited time to do so. Right. But they will not give me unlimited time because they do not want to hear the whole facts and I have got to rush through things in forty minutes and I have not got time to read figures in forty minutes. But there are a few points I have made. Good, but anyway -

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I am suggesting to the honourable House that I have asked the officials of the department to try and determine where those figures were arrived at and officials of the department could not tell me where the figures were arrived at.

You know, it was up to what? \$12.00 or some, I do not know, some weird twelve-odd dollars in a lease now.

MR. NEARY: How much time does the minister have left?

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Fifteen minutes.

MR. NEARY: Fifteen minutes.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Fifteen minutes.

Well now, so anyway, Mr. Speaker, there were a few other moot points that were discussed and I would like to point out. First of all the honourable Leader -

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please! I believe some honourable members are questioning my arithmetic. The point at which the honourable minister began to speak is calculated from the time the Speaker retired to determine his point of order. Because up to that point the honourable minister had not commenced his debate, so I commenced the clock at five minutes after four.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): The clock as it related to the honourable minister.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please! The Chair has ruled that the point of order as to whether or not the honourable minister would have unlimited time is a matter separate and apart from the honourable minister's speaking, and he commenced his speech at approximately five minutes after four, it may have been a minute one way or the other, and consequently it is from there that his forty minutes commenced.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Do you have a point of order?

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I must be getting to the honourable members I guess. Mr. Speaker, there are a few other things that I would like to say, by the way, and, you know, the highlights - that is about all of the time I have. But anyway, last week the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition accused the government of not providing all the documents. And what the Hon. Leader of the Opposition wanted was a minute-in-council authorizing the negotiations, not the deal, not the agreement, the negotiations. He wanted the minute-in-council rescinding that previous minute-in-council and he wanted a copy of all of the notes that went on in negotiations. Now

I do not know whether or not there were notes. What the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition saw was a lease and on the assumption that a lease was arrived at as a result of a letter of October 7 there were negotiations going on. I do not know if there are notes or what there are. But it is immaterial whatever was arrived at is by agreement between both parties was entered into the lease. And the minute-in-council, no. But I will say here, I will stand up and say it, and I will use my credibility for it, and hope that the honourable members across the House will believe it, and if they do not - There was a minute-of-council which rescinded any minute-in-council authorizing negotiations with Mr. Dobbin in respect to the lease. Okay? I am saying that. Now if you do not believe me, if the honourable member -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROUSSEAU: No. Oh. I did not hear what you said.

MR. SIMMONS: I am trying to get clarification. Did I hear the minister say that there has been a minutes to rescind, which rescinded the earlier decision?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes.

MR. SIMMONS: What was the deal?

MR. ROUSSEAU: I said the original decision enabled the Minister of Public Works before the - no, that was before the letter was written of September 30 to attempt to secure space, not with any individual. And that minute was rescinded and we went on public tender.

MR. SIMMONS: When was that?

MR. ROUSSEAU: The Hon. the Leader of the Opposition last week asked for the minute-in-council authorizing the negotiations, and for the minute-in-council rescinding any situation that occurred. Now, you know, there is a great deal of, a difference between words here. The honourable Member for Hermitage suggested that no agreement had been signed, the Premier had said. And was there a deal? But there was a deal. Look, Mr. Speaker, as far as I am personally concerned if the Minister of Public Works name is not on that lease then there is no deal, no agreement or whatever you want to call it. You know, there are many times that I may go down to the bank to borrow some money and negotiate with it, and never,

never decide to actually to take them up on it. Does that mean that there is a deal or an agreement? Not unless I sign something and accept the money. Then there is an agreement.

MR. SIMMONS: The minister signed something. Check the letter.

MR. ROUSSEAU: But the minister signed no agreement or no lease and until that lease is signed or until that agreement is signed there is no legal document to suggest that a deal have been made, or an agreement have been reached.

MR. SIMMONS: So the minister is saying that the Minister of Public Works ran a bluff with Mr. Dobbin?

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, I am not saying that.

MR. SIMMONS: Inaudible.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I said the deal.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please! So that proceedings do not take on the appearance of a discussion in somebody's living room I have to interrupt two honourable members who are engaging in such a discussion. And I remind the honourable member to my right that there is a time set aside for reply to arguments made by both honourable members to my left and right, and that time is reserved for him at the end when he closes the debate.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I would like to congratulate the honourable member for drawing me away from my main thesis, a very smart move. But anyway I have only a few minutes left so I would like to continue my speech here. But as far as the government are concerned, Mr. Speaker, there was no agreement signed, no deal concluded, that the matter has now been put to public tender, that there are public proposals being requested, that in the meantime that the officials of the Department of Public Works and Services are looking at the possibility of government itself providing the facilities. And when these proposals come in, Mr. Speaker, they will be compared, those that are called for publicly and that report which emanates from the officials of the Department of Public Works and Services in respect to the possible construction of our own building, and we will then determine which is the best way to go.

Now, Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that there was no deal. There was certainly no shady deal. And I am only using the words, Mr. Speaker, that the honourable Member for Hermitage used last week, there

was no shady deal. That government, the officials, and the departmental officials were involved in it, you know, the web is too big. You know, everybody involved, the implication, everybody involved is participating in the shady deal, and I keep using that word because that was the word used by the honourable member last week - is, you know, incomprehensible. Now as far as the government are concerned that they did, they did indeed discuss with Mr. Dobbin the possibility of providing space. You know, nobody is saying that that did not occur. Nobody is saying that a final agreement was not put forward as being something to be signed in order to then have a legal and finalized document to indicate that there was indeed a commitment from the government to acquire space by lease or by whatever way from - nobody is saying that. But what the government are saying that it has now decided to go by public tender. We, government, are saying that there was no deal, there was no agreement. Now that is merely a matter of opinion I presume between the members across and over on this side of the House, but that is the situation.

Mr. Speaker, I can say quite, quite, quite honestly that whatever suggestions were made by the three honourable members, and I can not - you know the words that were used last week, and I can not use them this week, but anyway the suggestions that were made, you know, is pure unadulterated politics. That is all it is, Mr. Speaker. That is all it is. The implication is drawn because a letter went out on September 30. Mr. Speaker, if I may suggest to the honourable members of the House that the letter that went out on September 30 - I presume, Mr. Speaker, I have forty-five minutes only, is it?

MR. SPEAKER: If the honourable member would permit the Chair: I am reasonably confident about that particular ruling but I will look at a couple of points to be sure.

There has already been a precedent set. I think the Hon. Member for Hermitage was permitted forty-five minutes some time back on a private members' motion. The Chair does not consider this to be a motion of non confidence and thus the honourable member, except by leave, of course, only has forty-five minutes.

April 16, 1975

Tape 1508 (Afternoon)

PK - 5

MR. ROUSSEAU: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I accept Your ruling.

The suggestion of the September 30 letter - I would like to get into all of these points, Mr. Speaker, because we can reply to all these points. The suggestion that the September 30 letter, the Hon. Member for Hermitage in leading off suggested that it was a sloppy letter. A sloppy letter.

Mr. Speaker, do you know, Sir, who made up the letter? I did not do the letter. Officials of the department did the letter. I asked them, I said, how would we ask to make it the fairest sort of deal, people who are involved in this sort of thing. No, there was no suggestion that there was -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Why?

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

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, one second now. The letter was put forward and looked at by officials of the department and they were asked whether or not this would be as good a set of specifications as we could ask for under the conditions, and they agreed. It went out to the people in the department who were responsible for this sort of thing and the letter was made up. To call it a sloppy letter, well that is a matter of opinion. I do not think that the officials who assisted in composing this letter did a sloppy job. The suggestion that, the inference, Mr. Speaker, I have it here, look the inference that it did not matter whether the letter was accurate or not because a deal had been made. That is all we talked about. The deal had been made. My God Almighty!

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, the letter was not a sloppy one. I thought it conveyed what we needed and one of the proposers phoned me personally a few days after the letter was written and asked for clarification. I gave the clarification over the telephone to the honourable gentleman. That is possibly why the letter was three or four days after the first one. But the red herrings, the -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, who?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Table the document.

MR. ROUSSEAU: As a matter of principle, I hate to table them. Really, I would like to be able to go over them. I am not given the time, but

I am prepared to table them. Yes, Mr. Speaker, when I am ready.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Your time is up.

MR. ROUSSEAU: My time is not up, is it?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: - Select Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The honourable Minister of Transportation and Communications has three minutes left.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Well, Mr. Speaker, in three minutes all I can do is say what I say again, that the inference is drawn as a result of the dates of September 30, October 7 and October 11 we are just that. The fact that the original proposal that was deemed to be the best, there was an attempt to secure an even better, an even better situation than had been proposed, which is normal and the honourable Member from Bell Island who was in government, if there was a proposal, went out and tried to get a better proposal than the original proposal I am sure on many occasions.

MR. NEARY: I am not arguing with you.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I know you are not arguing with me. It is impossible to argue that. The honourable members have not been in government.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Why?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes, but anyway, in the meantime, it is not. These are inferences. The figures that were quoted by the honourable the Leader of the Opposition last week were not figures that were comprehensible to the officials of the department, where they came from, what the final figures were. So, all in all, Mr. Speaker, I can only suggest that government has nothing to be ashamed of in respect to this situation. Public proposals have now been called. Public proposals will be reviewed by the officials of the department and that in conjunction with their own studies in respect to providing our own building to be compared, and that the government will decide on which is the best avenue to go.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The time has expired except by leave.

I do not know if the honourable Minister of Transportation and Communications is requesting leave or not. If he is the Chair will put the question.

Does the honourable member have leave to continue, if he so desires?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: I gather then that there is not unanimity and I recognize the honourable Member for St. John's East.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I have a number of things quite obviously to say about this resolution. First of all, having heard the honourable the Minister of Transportation and Communications in his capacity of acting Minister of Public Works finish his speech, I must compliment him on, well, compliment is not the word, but compliment him on his frankness in communicating the fact that there was no deal, and deal has been used in the sort of the crass sense, I will come to that later, but not denying the fact, of course, that there had been an agreement to enter into an agreement.

Before I get to the main brunt of my remarks with respect to this resolution which the Opposition has lead in for the purpose of having an enquiry into the leasing practices of this government with particular reference to the proposed, now aborted, Dobbin transaction, I would like to address myself to a few of the remarks that have been made by the gentlemen on the other side in support of their request for the enquiry. In the first place, two Wednesdays ago, we had a situation where the honourable Member for Hermitage, the leader of, the person introducing the resolution, when he was first touching off the debate made certain comments with respect to the relationship of Mr. Craig Dobbin, who was the person involved in the lease and the government which did not appear to be to me anyway that favourable. Subsequently, even the following week we were treated to two speeches, one from the honourable the Member for St. Barbe North and one from the honourable member, the Leader of the Opposition. In that speech, Mr. Speaker, in both speeches, instead of attempting to put the position before us to why there should be an enquiry, they seem to my untuned ear anyway, to be spending most of their time

lionizing, immortalizing and practically canonizing Mr. Dobbin.

Now, it is not my function to attempt to tear down Mr. Dobbin or any man, but neither do I put any of Mr. Dobbin or any of the contractors on a pedestal. They are ordinary human beings. They are not saints. They do not walk on water. They are subject to the normal vicissitudes of life, I would assume, but when you heard the honourable gentlemen opposite the other day, all they appeared to be doing, the honourable Leader of the Opposition, the honourable Member for St. Barbe North, was to give a great eulogy with respect to Mr. Dobbin himself which in my view is totally irrelevant but now becomes somewhat irrelevant because I am motivated to ask the question, and perhaps the honourable gentlemen who have already spoken, perhaps the members of the press might like to take up with the Leader of the Opposition, the honourable Member for St. Barbe North as to why they choose to take this tack. I mean, did they get any message? Was there any request from anyone for them to speak along these lines for any reasons?

The remarks as far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, and I say this, their remarks -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could the minister elaborate on that? I do not -

MR. MARSHALL: I am just talking about the changed attitude in the Opposition from one week to the other. From the one case it was a case of attacking or semi-attacking what could be construed, although I do not think it was an attack, but it could have been construed as an attack, not only upon the government because the government and Mr. Dobbin were not separated at the time by the honourable Member for Hermitage, but they were later.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Dobbin is the completely innocent victim.

MR. MARSHALL: I agree Mr. Dobbin is the completely, the innocent victim. I agree wholeheartedly. There is no attempt to drag down Mr. Dobbin but what I am saying I am not going to canonize the man either. He is an ordinary individual like myself and the honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. MEARY: He is a businessman.

MR. MARSHALL: Exactly. He is a businessman operating within the framework, the economic framework that was set up by the previous administration in which all businessmen had to operate in this Province, and therein lies it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that the honourable members opposite, the Member for St. Barbe North and the honourable Member for Hermitage, were very good teachers, but they make very, very poor prosecutors. They want an enquiry into something, they want an enquiry really into something which has never really happened, because the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, the proposal or the intention has been stopped. Government has abandoned any intention that it may have had before with respect to entry into this lease, so, they want an enquiry, they want an enquiry into something which really now has not occurred. I think the time of this House and the time of this Assembly can be better served in other ways rather than, there are plenty of things to have enquiries into, Mr. Speaker, they are plenty of enquiries that have yet to come to fruition, but I do not think we need to extend the enquiries into events which never happened. A proper place for an enquiry is not through a committee, not through a royal commission or anything like that, but it is totally and entirely on the floor of this legislature through the medium of the procedures of this House, the question period and what have you.

Now, this is a

rather difficult debate as I am sure members might, some members might be able to appreciate, some people may not, a rather difficult one for me to participate in because I find myself in the situation now, as I have said before, of sitting very comfortably at the right hand side of the honourable Member for Burgeo-La Poile and very comfortably at the left hand of the honourable the Member for Port de Grave.

MR. EVANS: Never had such good company in your life -

MR. MARSHALL: Never. I have learned a lot.

MR. NEARY: A thorn between two roses.

MR. MARSHALL: I have learned a lot in the few weeks I have been here. But, I want to state that, you know, for this reason it is a difficult debate. I would not want any words that I say with respect to not supporting an enquiry at any time to be construed by any person living or dead, stunned or half-stunned or any other way as a mea culpa on my part because with respect of those events to which I had referred, Mr. Speaker, I suppose there are very few things that occur that people look back on and say if they had it to do all over again, they would change certain things. That is human nature. But, I have to say very firmly and very directly that of everything that I have done in the past three months in relation to, certainly in relation to my relationship with government and as an elected person, if I had them to do all over again, if I had to say everything I said all over again, I would do and I would say everything exactly as was done. So, I want to make that quite, quite clear.

The fact of the matter is that there was an agreement to enter into a particular arrangement with a certain individual, which I found just as - I found it unsupportable and unacceptable. Now, I would like my former colleagues in cabinet to realize - I think it is not necessary, I suppose, to be repeated, but perhaps we should talk about it very, very generally just in case there is somebody who may not fully realize the import. When you are in cabinet, there is a principle of collective responsibility. Cabinet is really a very fictitious body, as it were, it exists almost as a superhuman or some people might look at it really as

a subhuman being, but it certainly is different from the individuals who make it up.

The persons themselves while they are members of the cabinet have no opportunity whatsoever to voice their dissent with respect to important matters that they find correct unless they - if they find it unsupportable and unacceptable - unless they remove themselves from that cabinet and speak as individuals. That is exactly what had been done because there was a cabinet decision in this particular instance - I think it is general knowledge. I am delighted to hear from the Minister of Transportation and Communications today that a cabinet minute was passed rescinding that decision. It was passed after my absence from the scene. But, certainly there had been a decision made and there is no point in attempting, and I will not be put off by anybody, from asserting that there was a cabinet decision to enter into an agreement of this nature.

Now, the agreement was never signed, but, let us put it this way. There had been an agreement to enter into an agreement. There had been an authorization, and there are those, including myself who might say that a positive Order in Council of that nature is not just an authorization but indeed a directive to the person to whom it is addressed, he being a member of the cabinet.

So, this, as I say, Mr. Speaker, I would want, when I say that I do not feel there is any necessity for an enquiry into something that has not happened, because what was going to happen is not now going to happen. It is really a waste of time. The proposal has not been executed. But I would not wish my stand on this to be in any way by any person or any group of people interpreted to be a mea culpa on my part with respect to actions that, as far as I was concerned, I had to take.

Now, I do not propose to get into these actions and the long events that occurred with respect to this. I do not think it serves any purpose. They have all been certainly publicly aired. The fact of the matter is when I became aware of this transaction and all its facets, when I was aware of its possible conception, I informed that I would leave

if it was hatched. When I saw that it was likely going to be hatched, I so left. I do not propose to debate the ins and outs, the ups and downs of it. I do not think it serves any particular purpose except I shall say, because the rules of this House require that one can only speak once in a debate of this nature, if other people choose to debate that particular fact, as it were, which is a fact that has been accepted, I think, I am pretty sure, by the great and vast majority of the populace who have shown any interest in it, then there will come other times when I shall be forced to debate it, because really it is not relevant. The fact of the matter is I am not now a member of the cabinet because of the fact that I did not agree with this particular action. I can certainly fully support a government which realizing the feelings of a person then takes the countervailing action which it has.

Neither to I propose, Mr. Speaker, to get into a long analysis -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Would the member permit a question?

MR. MARSHALL: I do not propose to get into a long analysis with respect to the correspondence that has arisen. A short question, yes. I do not mind.

MR. SIMMONS: Just a short question, Mr. Speaker, on what the member had to say. I thank him for yielding. Just a quick question. Is he satisfied, first of all, that the matter which he refers to, the Dobbin situation - you had a better word than deal just now, Dobbin transaction - that the Dobbin transaction, the proposed transaction, not only has it been aborted, as I quite agree with the member, but is he satisfied that he is aware of all the circumstances which led up to the abortion, if you like. Secondly, would he address himself to the resolution, which I submit to him is larger than the so-called Dobbin transaction, that it relates to other decisions by government to acquire rental accommodation.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, yes. I am aware, as far as I know, as far as a human being is aware of where his knowledge extends I am satisfied I am aware of all the circumstances, and I will certainly be addressing myself to the other items as we go on.

As I said, now I do not like the word, and I say I do not like the word, I can see when a government is under attack, it would take this particular view. The honourable Minister of Transportation and Communications refers to no "deal" had been made, as I imputed his remarks that he made, and I would thoroughly agree with him, "deal" used in the sense that it has been flung across the House by the opposite side, "deal" is something that is shady or what have you. Certainly, there is nobody - I do not think there is anybody who is entitled to or anybody really who should, unless he is prepared to come out with letter, verse and complete and absolute facts, should lightly be able to get up and make any innuendo or any suggestion of that nature, that that has never been made.

All I will say is that, you know, there was an agreement to enter into an agreement. I think when emotions get high and emotions run riot as they do from time to time, various things get interpreted in certain ways. I do not think it is fair for anyone to insinuate that there is a deal because I think the word used by the minister, acting Minister of Public Works the other day at the end of the debate after he had heard the ululations by the Leader of the Opposition and the Member for St. Barbe North were quite pointed when he turned to him and said, look, how can it be, you know, that Mr. Dobbin or the third parties involved or all of the contractors involved, that they are completely clean and the government is completely dirty. That observation is, I think, well taken because it has not been insinuated that contractors are or neither should it be considered that the government is. It is just the purpose of making, you know, normal political hay.

Now, I am delighted that this matter has been rescinded, as I say, the agreement has been rescinded. I am delighted also that on the first opening day of this session that the government has come in with a definitive statement with respect to its policy on public tenders which I will come to in just a moment. Before

I do that I would like, and I think it is pertinent, to again re-emphasize again and again the importance of this matter, and I think it is of vital importance, this matter of public tender; why to me anyway it holds such a place of great importance in my view the way public conduct of business should be carried on, in the way that I feel that the government also concurs in enunciating its policy because I have been described alternately from time to time by various people, in various manners, but one of them has been that I am rigid, I am blinkered, I am stubborn, I am unyielding, there is absolutely no compromise with respect to this issue. And with respect to all of these charges, Mr. Speaker, I would plead completely guilty because I do not feel that there can be any yielding or any compromising whatsoever in this Province or anywhere else, but particularly in this Province in the unstinting intention of the government in bringing about and implementing a complete public tendering system. I remember, I have always had this view, and I remember about one year ago that I had the advantage of a student writing his M.A. thesis in history up at Memorial, did me the compliment of asking me to go over his particular thesis that he was going to submit into the affairs of the government and the political defeat of Squires and his government in the eventual collapse of democracy. And I have always felt that one of the major contributions to the fall, of our loss of our self-government in this Province, and the possibility it could happen at any given time again, was the way in which government affairs were conducted by the various powers, the parties in power.

And I quote just briefly from this particular thesis, whose name I am not going to mention, because he is a private citizen, as it were, and it is not really relevant, but one of the conclusions as to why we got in trouble in those days were "Public funds were used for blatant political reasons, and there are numerous cases of political expediency being the foremost consideration in the approval of construction projects. The primary objective of politicians was to get re-elected at any cost. Now I can not remember those days. I have read about them, as we all have. And I have no doubt that this political history of this Province, while we have many things to commend ourselves with respect to our history, has been in many aspects along these lines, probably the most dismal

history in the Western Society right to the extend that in 1933 and 1934 there was a report by the then Lord Amurlee which resulted in our losing completely our self government.

So that is why I must feel it must be - really quite frankly I look at - perhaps I should not say this because the Hon. the Member for Bell Island and the members opposite have been so quiet during my speech and I do not like to motivate them to periods of emotion because I am somewhat afraid of them, of course.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MARSHALL: But the fact of the matter is I sometimes view Commission of Government, really, as being a hiatus between the Squires and the Smallwood Administrations. Mr. Smallwood is a great admirer of Sir Richard Squires and spoke about him from time and time again. And I think really that they had the same view of government with respect to these matters that they did not put the same emphases with respect to the necessity, the dire necessity really of insisting, public people insisting that public tenders be used in all cases with respect to government contracts. It is one, as I say, of the real reasons why we list our self-government. It is also the only way in which government can operate. If you are dealing in construction contracts or others, and you are a private concern, you can rely on the private concern as a matter of self interest to get the best deal he possibly can for himself through private contract, But not so necessarily with respect to government, because governments are not the people who are making the contracts, really it is not really their money, it is the public's money. So the only way to assure that you get the fair price, to avoid an excess of patronage, and to assure that there is full participation in the economic life, and we do not get economic dictatorships growing up in this Province which we have from time to time in the past, as far as I am concerned is fully and completely to have unquestionable open public tenders at which the public can see how contracts are being awarded and which would prevent contracts being awarded other than on a completely fair and rational bases. And I make these statements without -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MARSHALL: - I make these statements without any innuendoes, or imputations to anyone. I am just stating them as a matter of fact, or my impression of the fact.

I feel that perhaps, some people have said to me, have indicated from time to time that to take this particular view is to buck the system. Well I would almost feel like using a few expletives when I hear that, because you buck the system, I feel that this government were elected to buck the system, and it has done a very, very effective job in doing it, and this is certainly one of the ways in which it has done it through the institution, generally speaking, of a full public tendering system. I think I should recount

this little fact that a matter that occurred over the Christmas season where I received information from a person, through a person who was talking with a person and it is pretty authentic was involved with another party, not this party but another party, with respect to the matter that they are supporting the other party because they cannot wait to get in to get back to the tendering system. Now whether that is true or whether that is not true I do not know, or to x out the tendering system that this government has instituted.

The government can be complimented on its policy with respect to public tendering, but my position with respect to it has been, is now and always will be that there cannot be any deviation one iota from that particular principle or else we are going to endanger lapsing back into the area where we were before, a very unenviable era it was too. With respect to this, and perhaps it may be people use it and say, in order to cancel it out perhaps you have got to have public financing of elections, I do not necessarily subscribe to that view. I think first of all you have got to have very tough regulations with respect to the control of election expenses first. Maybe the federal coffers can afford to pay largesses of money out for the purpose of financing political parties but I do not think that this particular Province in its financial state can entertain it.

But in any event, even if there are to be some changes, some compromises in that area of public financing of election campaigns by payment of agents or provision of halls or what have you, carefully controlled expenses, there is no doubt that an essential prerequisite of all of it at the first are items such as public tendering.

Now as I say I see no reason whatsoever to look at, Mr. Speaker, to have an enquiry into this. As far as I am concerned the matter was resolved on the first regular day of sittings when the honourable the Premier speaking on behalf of the government said that the government had decided to issue a public call for tender proposals with reference to space needs so that every possible interested party should have their right to submit proposals and in the hope that better terms and conditions may be received.

Thirdly, that the government will decide when tender proposals are received in response to tender calls whether to proceed to rent or build to meet its additional space requirements, and fourth, which is the most important one to me, of course, is that the government felt and still feels that the Dobbins proposals were reasonable and competitive but because of the strong views of some concerned parties, will in all instances, proceed by public tender on proposals called for long-term leases even though this procedure is not common practice elsewhere in Canada, either in the Provinces or with the federal government. So I do not necessarily need to, or it is not pertinent really to debate the ancillary points or observations that were made in that fourth one but as far as I am concerned the matter has been decided and this government can be complimented in reiterating its policy that it will in all instances proceed by public tenders and public proposal calls for any long-term leases or public works of this nature. So as far as I am concerned there is no need of this negative outlook and to have an enquiry into something which did not happen, these are the boys who did not, or boys is not the word to call them in this honourable House, Mr. Speaker, and I withdraw that and I apologize, these are the gentlemen or the, although it might be apt, these are the gentlemen that the honourable crowd, as they like to call us, on the other side who were after yours truly when he was in a position that they thought he was such an evil man at conducting witch-hunts who now want to bring witch-hunts into and unto the floor of the House of Assembly itself. I am all for witch-hunts if there is something to look into, Mr. Speaker, but it is sort of a rather a vain and purposeless activity to have an enquiry or a witch-hunt, as it were, into something which actually has not happened, did not happen, is not going to happen, and this government will not allow to happen.

Now, Mr. Speaker, instead of looking at this so negatively I want to make a suggestion to this House, if I could, I would like to propose an

amendment to this, I think it is a much more sane and sensible amendment, and I move it, seconded with the consent of my good friend the honourable Member for Grand Falls, to read as follows: and before I just put the amendment I say, would the honourable members opposite and the members of this Chamber notice, and I shall wait until the honourable assistant - assistant Leader comes into the House to hear it, will they all listen please very carefully to it because it puts this on a much more positive basis rather than the negative and purposeless basis which - here the honourable Member for Bell Island comes - that the Opposition would like to put it.

Anyway, I move this amendment, a substantial one, Mr. Speaker. It reads as follows:

that all words after "that" be deleted and replaced by the following words, that this House endorses the government in its expressed policy to call open public tenders for all public works whether such public works are effected pursuant to long-term leases, purchase agreements or otherwise. This House further urges the government to cause buildings needed for additional accommodation of the public service to be constructed upon Confederation Building grounds. That is the amendment that I have a great deal of pride, Mr. Speaker, in recommending to the House for discussion. I would hope it would be accepted so that I can continue on for another forty-five minutes of my speech.

MR. NEARY: Do you have to rule on the amendment first, Mr. -

MR. MARSHALL: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Well, I want to speak in favor of it.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Oh, good.

MR. NEARY: I was just wondering -

MR. MARSHALL: Very positive.

MR. NEARY: - if we are going to get a ruling now.

MR. MARSHALL: I think I should reconsider it, Your Honour, if the honourable Member for Bell Island is going to speak in favor of it.

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Does Your Honour need five minutes recess?

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Maybe not.

The wording of amendments and whether they are actually negative - the original proposal, or whatever, has been the subject of some controversial rulings in the past, especially last year. I believe I was the person who made a couple of these rulings myself. Consequently, rather than make a hasty ruling, I will retire for a few minutes to consider the precedents as well as the authorities in the books at the table.

MR. MARSHALL: Does Your Honour wish to hear any argument on it?

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): I will hear some argument on it, yes.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. MARSHALL: Oh, I have extra copies, yes.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Well, send one over here.

MR. MARSHALL: An extra copy, that is all. I am now privately employed so I have to watch the expenses of paper and other items.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MARSHALL: Your Honour, if I may, you know, the only basis, Your Honour, on which I can see, and subject to correction, on the authorities in Beauchesne - I have not got it handy here - I must confess I thought Your Honour was going to accept it really out of hand. But, the only basis on which I can see that this particular amendment might possibly be ruled out of order would be on the basis that it negates the motion. I think that that is the question, whether or not it negates the motion.

So, we have to look then first to what the motion is; 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. This particular endorsement says, or this particular amendment says that this House endorses the government in its expressed policy to call open public tenders for all public works whether such public works are effective pursuant to long-term leases, purchase agreements or otherwise and this House further urges the government to cause buildings needed for additional accommodation of public service to be constructed upon Confederation Building grounds.

Now, Your Honour this is complimentary really. It does not negate, it does not say that there is not going to be an enquiry, it does not say that the House is not going to consider it, it does not say that the enquiry is unnecessary, it does not fly in the face of any public enquiry that has been advocated by the honourable the Member for Hermitage, but merely puts the motion, I would say, instead of negative, it puts it in a much more positive fashion, saying the the House endorses the provision of calling public tenders at all times.

It goes on something ancillary which is also necessary with respect to the construction of the building on the Confederation Building grounds, but I think that is also complementary. It does not negate any possibility of enquiry. So, with the greatest respect to Your

April 16, 1975

Tape 1513

IB-3

Honour I would suggest to you that the only basis on which under the rules of Beauchesne that this could be ruled out of order would be if it negated the main motion. I think the honourable members of the Opposition concur really that it does not, although I am surprised to say that they would support it. I expected a little bit of flak from them. But in any event, it certainly does not negate the motion of the honourable Member for Hermitage but rather is in a more positive frame and gives us something to debate rather than debate the fact we have an enquiry into nothing.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that I have to disagree with the member, Sir, that this amendment does negate the original motion put on the Order Paper by my colleague, the Member for Hermitage. As much as I would like to support the amendment, Sir, I would submit to the House that this should be a separate motion altogether and if it were brought in as a separate motion, Sir, the member would have no problem at all to get my support. But, Sir, it is an entirely new matter that has been introduced into the debate and I would submit to Your Honour that it completely negates the intention of the original motion, 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 accommodations by rental purchase or otherwise since January 1, 1973. This deals, this motion deals with a specific case, Sir. My colleague is asking to have a select committee set up. This motion is merely motherhood, Sir. It does bring in the fact that any additional accommodations should be constructed here on the Confederation Building grounds. I do not think that the member will find any disagreement on this side of the House with that particular aspect of his amendment.

Sir, in my opinion, it is a new matter. If this amendment was accepted, Sir, it would completely negate the original motion and I would submit to Your Honour that the amendment is out of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): As I stated before I intend to take a few minutes to consider this, although I must say that my first impulse is to reject the amendment but before rejection gets out of hand I think it is only fair that I consider the authorities on the subject. I would also suggest to honourable members when they are planning to pose amendments of this type which are going to have to cause some consideration by the Chair, that they might give the Chair a little more warning before - sitting here flat footed -

MR. NEARY: The element of surprise.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): - having to otherwise adjourn the House. Well, I will have a few minutes to consider this.

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

Well, this is an example of why a person's instinctive reaction should always be subjected to further scrutiny. And I refer in this case to section 201 of Beauchesne, page 168, dealing with amendments, and I read this in its entirety or just about in its entirety. "The object of an amendment may be to effect such an alteration in a question as will obtain the support of those who, without such alteration, must either vote against it or abstain from voting thereon, or to present to the House an alternative proposition either wholly or partially opposed to the original question. This may be effected by moving to omit all the words of the question after the first word, "That", and to substitute in their place other words of a different import. In that case (I ask honourable gentlemen to take particular note of the next sentence) the debate that follows is not restricted to the amendment, but includes the motives of the amendment and of the motion, both matters being under the consideration of the House as alternative propositions." The section goes on to say, "A motion may be amended: (a) by leaving out certain words; (b) by leaving out certain words in order to insert other words; (c) by inserting or adding other words."

Also on page 170 of Beauchesne, article 202, I will quote from three subsections of that section. Section(12)says: "An amendment proposing a direct negative, though it may be covered up by verbiage, is out of order." Well this amendment is not a direct negative and consequently is not out of order for that reason. Section(13) or subsection(13): "An amendment to alter the main question, by substituting a proposition with the opposite conclusion, is not an expanded negative and may be moved." This is what this proposal basically is. And section (14): "An Amendment which would produce the same result as if the original motion were simply negatived is out of order."

Consequently, this amendment is in order but debate on this amendment will be as I outlined in section 201, the debate on the amendment or on the motion. So consequently all that has happened is that the relevancy has been expanded. We can now talk about more

than we could before. So I will entertain the member for St. John's East.

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you, Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Stagg): He now has forty-five minutes from this point.

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you for a very detailed and responsive ruling.

This puts this question, I think, on a much more positive perspective, Mr. Speaker, because I do not really choose to discuss the possibility, I have already dealt with the question with respect to inquiry, I would rather deal with the position of endorsing a positive policy of this government and go into the reasons and the rationale with respect to it, And also it relates also to the building being constructed upon the Confederation Building grounds.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. MARSHALL: There are various matters that relate to that that I would like to bring up. In the first case the Hon. Acting Minister of Public Works, the Minister of Transportation and Communications, has indicated that the purpose of seeking space, additional space, was for the purpose of consolidating together all of the office facilities that are scattered throughout the city and certainly there are many of them, points East, West, North and South, all over the place, everywhere, government departments are scattered. Indeed there must be a tremendous amount of overhead, additional overhead, by reason of the offices being scattered all over the place everywhere. And this is because, of course, of necessary messages that must be going back and forth and communications from time to time from one department to another, the loss of man-hours, the loss, from the point of view, of actual expenditure in communicating back and forth.

So, certainly it is a very reasonable situation to want to consolidate the public service into as small a space as possible and to prevent them from being put in the position of having to expend an awful lot more money unnecessarily. I would agree with that but I would also suggest that this reasoning also applies if you had all of the places now so scattered in a building, but in a building that is fairly far removed from the Confederation Building. Certainly, the expenses will be cut down somewhat and to that extent it is a wise decision. But it would be even more beneficial to the people of this Province and it would certainly seem much more logical to the efficient administration of the administration of this Province if the building were built on the Confederation Building grounds.

Now, I am no expert in construction but I think it is quite obvious that there is a lot more space with the framework of the acreage here that the government owns. Now, whether the government owns it, or whether it belongs to the Pippy Park or some other organ of government, I think it is immaterial, even if it belongs to a private citizen, any of it, although there is substantial acreage included in the crown corporation that owns this building because the government can expropriate and should expropriate, if necessary, and satisfy the requirements of space as space requirements by either extending the Confederation Building which seems to be the most logical manner in which to do it, or else, if this proves to be impossible because of structural or other reasons, by constructing a building on the grounds in reasonable proximity connected with this building, on this we will save a substantial sum of money.

Now, let there be no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that it is vitally necessary in this Province for monies to be saved. Perhaps the money that may be saved over a certain period of time in administrative expenses as a result of the large space and distances existing between a building or a group of buildings, perhaps that may be able to fund the bridge across the Conne River which government is hoping to build, and will build in the near future as soon as it gets money or provide

a decent access across the Northeast River or North West River, I forget the name of it, up in the Member for Labrador North's district. Perhaps that will result. Certainly there is a lot of money needed in my own district with respect to housing. So, it would seem the only sensible, rational way in which to deal with this problem is to have a building constructed upon the Confederation Building grounds.

I mean, if we were private individuals and we owned this complex I do not think that if you asked yourself the question and you had land to the eastern, western or southern extremities separated by quite a distance, an appreciable distance that required you to go from one place to another by car, and you had this land here, as an efficient businessman I think you would say that if you got to build we are going to build it on the same grounds which the existing building is on and we will use that land for something else. I think the government can do nothing else. So much, at present then, Mr. Speaker, for the location of the building itself.

The next thing we come to is who constructs, who constructs it? I could not care less, Mr. Speaker, who constructs it. I could not care, I would like to see a Newfoundlander construct it. Obviously, jobs must be provided to Newfoundlanders with respect to it. I do not care who constructs it but I am adamant and congratulate the government in its expressed intention of continuing its policy with respect to public tender so that the person who builds it, if it is to be built by a concern other than government which is a matter that I will get to in a moment, if it is built by a third party, that third party should get the contract as a result of bidding fairly, openly on a tender proposal that has been called. It should be the best tender provided, of course, that that person is able to, or that company is able to demonstrate that he can respond to it.

For instance, if some person like myself, if I were not connected with government, bid on it, I could not respond to it because I do not have the resources. That is what I am talking about. The person has to have the resources, but the person who gives the bid, the lowest bid, and is

April 16, 1975.

Tape 1516

RH - 3

able to respond and carry it out is the one who should get it. Now, with respect to that, there have already been and the government has not only just carried out the Premier's intention on the first opening day of calling public tenders with respect to leasing or otherwise,

but it has also called, actually called tenders. And the Hon. Acting Minister of Public Works, I am not sure what day it was, but he read a ministerial statement in this House around about the middle of March, I believe it was, to this effect with respect to the calling of tenders and appended thereto a notice with respect to a public notice that appeared in the press. Now I do not want to get into that particular notice at this time because I notice that it is not really decided whether or not the tenders which are invited pursuant to this proposal or tender call that come in, if any of them are to be accepted, maybe none of them will be, because the government are now looking into the possibility and feasibility of constructing a building itself.

Now here again I am no expert in construction. Here again I have never - I know there is an awful lot of work that goes into the engineering and feasibility and construction requirements of a building such as this. But I do believe, I have been informed, and I believe, I have not looked into it, now mind you, that it is more economically, particularly in these days of spiralling inflation, and it certainly makes it more sensible for the government itself to do the building. After all government have access to the Department of Public Works in the first place, it has engineers there, and there is a lot of construction going on in this Province over the past two years. And the capacity of the personnel in the Department of Public Works has been tested to the utmost. But government have been known to employ project managers to carry out the functions that would normally be carried out by the Department of Public Works. And I am told, and it makes very good sense, and in these days of spiralling inflation - and if we look at the paraphernalia or the papers that were filed we can see that all of the contractors were very concerned with the escalations as a result of the increase in the construction index, as they well might be, but they are also concerned when they do this, they also have much more of a cushion than they normally have at other periods of time.

So I would suggest that very, very careful consideration be given, first of all to constructing the building on the Confederation Building grounds, secondly, the government doing it itself, and if it

proves feasible, then this be done.

With respect to the tender calls itself, I do not wish to comment on them, but I have read the notice, the public notice that appears, and it certainly is a very obviously a very fair notice, but there are certain items with respect to it that if it were a final call for tender, which is really not what it is not, if it were a final call for tender that might be looked at. I feel that the tenders are to be sent to the Deputy Minister of Public Works with the words "Tenders for Office Accommodation" written across the face of it. Now I do not see here, and I am subject to correct, any provision in there, and I have no objection to tenders being opened by the Deputy Minister of Public Works, and there is never any intention or any desire on any party, certainly not myself or anybody to cast any innuendoes against the capacity of otherwise of the Deputy Minister of Public Works, or the officials of the departments or private individuals, or for that matter members on the other side of the House, but what I say is this, that it would certainly appear to me to be more logical or better if the tender calls in future, and in this case, were perhaps specified that they were to be opened in public and inviting the people who submitted tenders to be there. And perhaps, I know that the honourable minister would perhaps wish to address himself to that, and I know perhaps when the tenders are opened that they will be there to open them.

As I read it -

AN HON. MEMBER: Is not that understood?

MR. MARSHALL: Well I think it is probably - I think it is understood, and, of course, it will be done because this is the practice and the policy of this government. But the fact of the matter is not, I am just saying it is not in the notice, and it is not the honourable minister, it is probably just an oversight in the thing.

So those are the factors then, Mr. Speaker, with respect, as I can see that this is the only sensible way to respond to the necessity of space. I will not get into the necessity of space in the first part because it is not strictly relevant or germane to this motion. But I would say that there is perhaps unavoidably as in all governments and as

April 16, 1975

Tape 1517 (Afternoon)

PK - 3

in all large concerns probably a very heavy application of what is known as the Peter principle throughout the

public service over the many years that we have been here, particularly in the past twenty-five years. And, I do not know if perhaps the time has come because we are under dire fiscal - we are under heavy, not dire, dire is probably too severe a word to use and probably be misinterpreted - but we are under heavy financial constraints. Perhaps the time has come to look even more closely at the numbers of the public service who as essential as they are, and the rate at which it is rapidly growing within this Province because we cannot forget the fact that we are only a country really of about 500,000 people which is something which does not seem to be in perspective with most people here. The whole of the Province of Newfoundland is one-quarter the size of the City of Toronto as far as population goes. So, we cannot always be affording all these things.

But, it is necessary for a new building, we are told, to be built. I feel that this building must be built on the Confederation Building grounds, must, if it is to be built by a third party, be done pursuant to open public tender calls and thirdly, that very, very careful exploration should be done as to the feasibility of constructing one's own building.

Now, I would not like the time to expire today, Mr. Speaker, without going into - I have to refer to the Opposition because they instituted this particular motion themselves. There are certain items that I think have to be gone over and certainly should be gone over with reference to items that were mentioned by the Member for St. Barbe North and the Leader of the Opposition. I want to repeat it because he was not here when I started. He was here a moment ago, and I looked up and he is gone again - that is the honourable Member for St. Barbe North.

When they were making up, because we are discussing this business now as well as Your Honour's ruling with respect to the public enquiry, the feasibility of a public enquiry and the necessity of it. Without going and regurgitating all of the items that I mentioned with respect to my own position with respect to it which is that a public enquiry is not really necessary, I cannot for the life of me really understand - and I do not think that this should be overlooked - I cannot understand the zealotry with which the Leader of the Opposition and the Member for

St. Barbe North particularly went to impute that this government was attempting, or anybody on this side was attempting, to take the character of any person be he Mr. Craig Dobbin, be he the Lundrigan Interests, the Crosbie Interests or the Seaboard Construction Interests. That was not done.

As I say, and I add again, it is not my intention to act like they did and canonize and lionize and eulogize the individuals concerned. They are ordinary human beings with flesh and blood. I think it is very significant, very significant that the Leader of the Opposition particularly went to such great straits as he went with respect to pretty well dwelling for most of the time in his speech - he went into a great degree, I must say, on the analysis of the documents and the various significance that he saw in the documents himself. Perhaps I will have a few words on the documents before closing.

But, he did make statements that I found very curious, very curious indeed. He said there was no stench of corruption with Mr. Dobbin or Crosbie or Lundrigan, that the corruption lies with the government. Now, in the first place I would concur with what the Minister of Transportation and Communications said when he ended the other day -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I wonder if Your Honour could clear up a matter that is bothering me at the moment, Sir, concerning the remarks of the honourable member.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: You have had it too long I believe.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: I believe when Your Honour gave the ruling that the amendment was in order, Your Honour indicated that there were now two proposals, two alternatives before the House, but the speaker had to indicate which one he was speaking to, whether it was the amendment or the original motion. I would submit, Sir, that my learned friend who introduced the amendment has no right now to go back to the original motion. He has no choice but to speak to the amendment.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Oh, no.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Sir.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, I did not misunderstand it. So, I would like to get a ruling from Your Honour. If you are speaking, do you have to speak to the amendment or to the original motion? If you have to speak to the amendment, Sir, you have to indicate to the Chair whether you are speaking to the amendment or the motion. If the member is speaking to the amendment, then he is out of order, Sir, because he is now speaking to the original motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The present Speaker was not occupying the Chair at the time when the ruling was made, but be that as it may I again quote page 168 of Beauchesne 201, and the latter part of that section says, "In that case the debate that follows is not restricted to the amendment, but includes the motives of the amendment and of the motion, both matters being under the consideration of the House as alternative propositions."

The Chair therefore rules that when an honourable member is speaking he does not have to declare whether he is speaking to the amendment or to the original motion but the rule of relevancy has been expanded somewhat with regards to this particular amendment and to the ruling in section 201 of Beauchesne.

MR. NEARY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, would Your Honour then indicate to the House whether or not the Speaker has forty-five minutes or ninety minutes, Sir. If he is going to incorporate both the amendment and the motion, should not the member be restricted to forty-five minutes instead of being given ninety minutes, Sir, or are we now creating a new precedent in the House?

MR. MURPHY: On a point of order if I may -

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Social Services.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, this is the rule that when the member began he now began his forty-five minutes and that is the only thing he can accept the ruling from the Chair. I heard the speaker distinctly say that, on the amendment.

MR. MARSHALL: I mean I am speaking now, Mr. Speaker, on the amendment. I spoke for a certain period of time on the main motion. I am now speaking on the amendment which I have introduced and I have forty-five minutes to do it. I do not know why the honourable member -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MARSHALL: I am not through with my point of order yet, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The honourable Member for St. John's East is speaking to the point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: I do not know why the honourable member - the only time

he got excited was when I got on the last refrain. He does not seem to want to hear it.

MR. NEARY: It is only wasting the time of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The honourable Member for St. John's East has spoken for forty-five minutes to the main motion, He then made an amendment, it was accepted, and ruled accepted by the Chair and he has forty-five minutes to speak to the amendment although the content of the amendment itself and the subsequent ruling made allows, as the Chair has already said, a considerable amount of leeway with regards to most amendments when you are pretty well restricted to the amendment itself. So the person speaking now, the Chair has to be very cautious about the rule of relevancy because it certainly is expanded.

The honourable member for St. John's East has whatever is left of the forty-five minute period since he introduced the amendment.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a point of order, Sir, Your Honour, may I point out to the House that when the Member for St. John's East introduced the amendment, Sir, he had not completed his forty-five minutes. He had not gone longer than about twenty-five minutes, I would suggest, about twenty-five minutes and then the member moved an amendment. Now, Sir, this is a new precedent in this honourable House and I would suggest, Sir, one that has to be ruled on very, very carefully because in future, Sir, anybody who is speaking to a motion can bring in an amendment after he has spoken for twenty-five minutes and then carry on for another forty-five minutes. Now is this the ruling Your Honour is making, that the member after speaking for twenty-five minutes on the original motion, now has another forty-five minutes to go on and speak? If that is so, Sir, it is a new precedent in this House and I would submit violates the rules, the Standing Rules of the House, Sir, limiting debates to forty-five minutes.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for St. John's East.

MR. MARSHALL: On that point of order, Mr. Speaker, and I am touching sensitive subjects, that is why he is raising it, but I refer Your Honour to 42 (a) of the Standing Rules, which says, "No member, except the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition, or a minister

moving a government order and the member speaking in reply immediately after such minister, or a member making a motion of no confidence in the government, (God help me, I am not) and a minister replying thereto shall speak for more than forty-five minutes at a time in any debate. So that means that a member is allowed to speak for forty-five minutes in any debate. I choose to speak for twenty-five minutes on the main debate, on the main motion, this is an amendment now, Mr. Speaker, which is another debate on which I am allowed the forty-five minutes.

It is standard practice, Mr. Speaker, and it is not only just standard practice, it is engrafted in the rules and if the honourable Member for Bell Island does not know them I will send him over an autographed copy of the new Standing Orders.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! That is correct. The maximum of forty-five minutes is a maximum, if any honourable member chooses to speak for, say, twenty-five minutes, then he has forfeited the other twenty minutes of that period. He has made an amendment to which he is entitled to speak for a total of forty-five minutes.

MR. NEARY: It is a new precedent and I -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

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

MR. NEARY: I wanted to get it into the records, Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Chair perhaps has not quite accepted the fact that it is a new ruling. The Chair is willing to provide precedents where this has happened before.

MR. NEARY: I wonder if Your Honour would provide the House with precedents where it has happened before because it has not happened since the new rules have been brought into this House, Your Honour, and I am not questioning Your Honour's ruling, Your Honour said he would provide precedents and I am asking Your Honour to provide them.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: If I may make a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I think

Mr. Speaker, the amendment, for example, to the Address in Reply, people may speak up to forty-five -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: But it is still an amendment. What we are speaking about is when there is a question before the House people have forty-five minutes to speak to it. Now a person can speak on the Address in Reply and after twenty minutes or forty, but it has got to be before forty-five, make an amendment and then keep on going for another forty-five on that amendment. As long as it is an amendment, it is a new position whether it is one of confidence or not one of confidence, and I would suggest that this has happened even in this session with amendments to the Address in Reply.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Is the Member from Bell Island suggesting because of the sixty mile speed limit on the Trans Canada Highway that you should always drive sixty? He probably should try with a big trucking firm doing thirty.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! Order, please! The Chair remembers very distinctly that the same precedent took place when the honourable Member for Hermitage introduced the amendment to the non-confidence motion.

The honourable Member for St. John's East.

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I was saying -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: - get it straight now.

MR. MARSHALL: It is straight now, Mr. Speaker. It is straight now. Everybody knows what is involved. Thank you, Your Honour.

Now, we get on to, as I was saying, Mr. Speaker, some while back, I find it very curious that the Leader of the Opposition could take that particular tack for such a - use so much of his speech for that particular purpose, to say that, to emphasize, he seems to want to emphasize over and over and over again that there was no stench of corruption with respect to third parties but the corruption lies with the government. Now, in the first place, Mr. Speaker, I think that is a dastardly type of statement for a Leader of an Opposition or a member of the House to make

unless he has proof, as I say, proof positive to back it up, in which case he should bring it before this House. There is no proof but I feel, as I say, it is no little significance to me, and I will just leave it at that, the Leader of the Opposition choose and the Member for St. Barbe North. Now, we have had two days. The first day we had the Member for Hermitage and he was making allegations which I do not care to repeat because I do not think they bear repetition with respect to the relationship of Mr. Dobbin and the honourable the Premier. It was along that tack. Then next week, the Member for St. Barbe North comes in and he knows the whole bit and piece and he says that nobody - now bear in mind, nobody was making allegations against anybody. Nobody knows any allegations of anything - but he comes in with bit and piece. He was thoroughly familiar with the business dealings, where the dealings had been carried on and what have you. The Leader of the Opposition picked up the refrain shortly thereafter, spent an incredible, appreciable amount of his time talking about it. There was no and there is no allegation with respect to corruption against any man inside or outside of this House of Assembly. But at the same time, I think we have to be fully cognizant of the fact that the system, as it has been described from time to time, that the system is such that certain individuals who are involved with political parties feel that they can have a certain sway because they have a certain amount of input into that political party, shall we say. Quite frankly, I wonder whether the proof in the pudding was a diversion between the two speeches. I do not know whether it was. I am just putting it forth and asking.

Another thing that disturbed me about the Leader's speech with respect, and this is why I am addressing myself now to the amendment, Mr. Speaker, and the desirability of there being public tenders, that the Leader of the Opposition in his speech, the Leader of the Opposition in his speech and this is Liberalese or Liberal philosophy as far as I am concerned, he said that he did not know. He looked at the letters that were given in and he said, I do not know why they were selected.

April 16, 1975.

Tape 1520

RH - 3

It might be because these are the only four - these were his words - who could bid in Newfoundland and as far as I am concerned, this is one of the very issues in the crux of it. I heard this, Mr. Speaker, on the other side of the House when the previous administration was here. I have done very well this afternoon. I have hardly referred to them. So, you will forgive me for a moment for referring to them. When the Science and Engineering Building was being built down there on the Memorial Campus and at

that particular time the rationale for not calling open public tenders was that - I remember the then Minister of Public Works getting up and saying, oh, we got the same prices we got four years ago with respect to the vocational institute and that was considered a good price then, so it must be a good price now. Oh, we called bids from those who were capable of doing it. And that is one of the whole gists of the whole argument and the whole need for this particular system to be enforced rigidly, enforced uncompromisingly, enforced without any yielding whatsoever. It is because of this arrogant assumption that there are only two, three, four or five people who are capable of bidding. I do not think we can afford, or indeed we should make that assumption in this Province. And this is why public tenders have to be called. But the Leader of the Opposition appeared to be just a little bit satisfied -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL: I am not attacking the Leader of the Opposition.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL: I do not know where he is. He is never here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. MORGAN: He is never in the House anyway.

MR. MARSHALL: I am not attacking -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL: I am not attacking -

MR. NEARY: He will get back, do not worry.

MR. MARSHALL: - I am not attacking the Leader of the Opposition nor the assistant leader nor the assistant assistant leader of the Opposition. What I am showing, Mr. Speaker, is that the words that were uttered from a person who bears a responsible place in this House have no real validity in fact and indeed are dangerous words if they are put into the philosophy of any government. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that he said that there were only four in this Province

who could bid on this and these four were asked. Well, I absolutely and completely refute that assumption. I think it is wrong for that assumption to be taken, and I think it is one of the reasons why - it never ceases to amaze me, you know, that people who are the champions of the free enterprise system in this Province will do, some of them, all they can to localize and discourage competition in these areas and other areas. They will try to localize it all for themselves or for their friends and this is one of the major reasons why we have to have complete, absolute, wide, open public tenders is to assure that everybody in this Province has an opportunity to bid on contracts and to, indeed, participate in the life of this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have another ten minutes and it is getting near six o'clock. I would prefer if I could to adjourn the debate because I, undoubtedly, have just a few more words of wisdom to impart to this honourable House on next Wednesday. So I would like, Mr. Speaker, to adjourn the debate.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I move that the remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred and that the House do now adjourn until three o'clock tomorrow Thursday, three in the afternoon tomorrow Thursday, April 17.

MR. SPEAKER: Before putting the motion to adjourn, I would remind honourable members and the staff that there is a function which they are invited to attend this evening.

It is moved and seconded that the House do now adjourn until tomorrow Thursday at three o'clock. Those in favour "aye." Those against "nay." Carried.

I do now leave the Chair until three o'clock tomorrow Thursday.

CONTENTS

April 16, 1975	Page
Statements by Ministers	
Governments' offer to dispense with Private Members' Day to continue debate on the Estimates of the Department of Mines and Energy rejected by the Opposition. Mr. Crosbie, Mr. Neary.	4387
Presenting Petitions	
By Mr. Earle on behalf of the citizens of Wreck Cove (Tibbos Hill) F.B., asking for pavement in the community and that the side road leading to the main road be paved. Supported by Mr. Evans, Mr. Simmons.	4388
Point of Privilege	
Mr. Rousseau protested that remarks made by Mr. Simmons indicated that the Minister of Transportation and Co-munications had a list of all road upgrading, reconstruction and paving projects available but refused to distribute the list to Opposition members.	4391
Mr. Simmons replied.	4392
Presenting Petitions (resumed)	
Mr. Rousseau spoke to the petition presented by Mr. Earle.	4394
By Mr. Howard on behalf of twenty-nine fishermen of Grates Cove asking that some pavement be laid at the community to make their work easier. Supported by Mr. Young, Mr. Woodward.	4396
By Mr. Aylward on behalf of some 1,000 parents in the Placentia-Point Verde-Southeast area seeking immediate improvement in the primary and elementary school in Placentia. Supported by Mr. Ottenheimer, Mr. Neary, Mr. Barry.	4397
Oral Questions	
Article in <u>The Northern Miner</u> suggesting that mining companies will avoid Newfoundland if recommendations of the Royal Commission on Mineral Revenue are implemented. Mr. Neary, Mr. Barry.	4402
Co-operative union amongst the Atlantic Provinces in matters of energy and transportation. Mr. Neary, Premier Moores.	4403
Target date for completion of the Health Sciences Complex. Mr. Neary, Dr. Rowe.	4404
Use of the old General Hospital when the Health Sciences Complex is completed. Mr. Neary, Dr. Rowe.	4405
Location of a regional dump for the St. John's area. Mr. Neary, Mr. Dawe.	4406
Query as to whether government institutions have been instructed to purchase surplus Newfoundland Potatoes. Mr. Neary, Premier Moores.	4406
Developments for a third mill at Come By Chance. Mr. Neary, Premier Moores.	4406

CONTENTS - 2

Oral Questions (continued)	Page
Progress report sought on conditions at the elementary school at Forteau, and a query as to how long government is prepared to allow the Straits of Belle Isle School Board to ignore the problem. Mr. Martin, Mr. Ottenheimer.	4407
School board leeway, and how long must a school be closed before government decides a crisis has developed. Mr. Martin, Mr. Ottenheimer.	4408
Query as to whether the Minister of Education is prepared to make political decision and order the school board to take action. Mr. Martin, Mr. Ottenheimer.	4409
Consultation with the Minister or officials of the Department of Transportation and Communications by Eastern Provincial Airways re location of a major facility at Halifax, N.S. Mr. Neary, Mr. Rousseau	4411
Query to Mr. Rousseau as to his knowledge of the statement made in the House the previous day on this subject by Premier Moores. Mr. Neary, Premier Moores.	4411
Government efforts to influence Eastern Provincial Airways decision to locate the facility in Halifax. Mr. Neary, Premier Moores.	4412
Query as to incentives offered Eastern Provincial Airways by government. Mr. Neary, Premier Moores.	4413
Communications or objections from Hodge's Cove residents protesting \$12.00 water fee. Mr. Rowe, Mr. Peckford.	4414
 Orders of the Day	
Private Members' Day - moved by Mr. Simmons 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 accommodations by rental, purchase or otherwise since January 1, 1973 etc.	
Mr. Rousseau Length of time remaining in which he may speak in the debate. Point of order spoken to by Mr. Crosbie, Mr. Neary, Mr. Simmons.	4416
Mr. Rousseau resumed the debate.	4418
Mr. Marshall	4438
Moves an amendment.	4451
Argument on the amendment.	
Mr. Marshall	4452
Mr. Neary	4454
Adjournment to consider ruling.	4454
Amendment ruled in order	4455
Mr. Marshall resumed debate on the amendment.	4456
Point or order raised by Mr. Neary, spoken to by Mr. Murphy, Mr. Marshall, Mr. Neary, Mr. Marshall, Mr. Neary, Mr. Ottenheimer, Mr. Evans.	4466
Mr. Marshall resumed the debate.	4469
Adjournment	4473