



**PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND**

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND**

---

---

Volume 4

4th. Session

Number 42

---

---

**VERBATIM REPORT**

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 30, 1975

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE M. JAMES RUSSELL

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! We have two groups in the galleries today. On an exchange programme with the I.J. Samson High we have twenty-one grade eight students from Westminister Public in Brockville, Ontario with Mr. H.B. Warren and Mrs. Anderson and from the I.J. Samson High here in the city we have twenty-one grade eight students with Mr. Lake. On behalf of all members of the legislature, I welcome you to the galleries today and trust that your visit here is most interesting and informative.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Education.

HON. G. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform members of the legislature of the government's policy with respect to high school bursaries for the academic year commencing next September. In effect, what it is is a twenty-five per cent increase in the amounts available to bursary students.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: As honourable members probably know there are two general categories of bursary students. One is high school students who attend a high school away from their ordinary place of residence and for the previous year that amount was \$800 and for the academic year commencing in September that will be increased to \$1000. Honourable members may recall there was in fact a thirty-three per cent increase last year, and this year a twenty-five per cent increase. So those high school students who attend a high school out of their town of residence, the amount will be increased from \$800 to \$1000. Now, the other category of bursaries is that for students who are required to travel. The first category is for those who usually board in another community. The second category is for those who are required to travel more than two miles from the community of his residence

to attend a high school and there is no regular school transportation programme and there the bursary which last year was \$400 and that as a matter of fact was last year increased by thirty-three per cent, that amount which was \$400 will, starting in September, be \$500. So, what in effect it is, a twenty-five per cent increase in the Bursary Programme for high school students throughout the Province.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for St. Barbe North.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleagues I would like to reply to the minister's policy statement regarding high school bursaries for the students in our Province. Sir, any increase in the bursaries to these students whether they are living away from home or whether they have to travel away from home to go to school during the day is indeed welcomed news, any increase of any kind, Sir. The increase, I understand from the minister, is from \$800 to \$1,000 for those students who have to board in another community in order to attend high school, and from \$400 to \$500 for those students who have to travel from their community to attend a high school in another community.

Needless to say, Sir, the amount of increase really reflects the, I suppose you could say, the increased cost of living and the inflation. So, we on this side are in agreement with any attempts to try to keep up with the increased cost of living and inflation as regards to the cost of education for high school students in this Province. However, Sir, there are still some problems that I would like to bring to the minister's attention without entering into debate which directly affect this and -

HON. A. HICKMAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROWE: At least you can wait and find out what I am going to say.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The honourable Minister of Justice on a point of order.

MR. HICKMAN: May I point out to the House that the honourable

gentleman is only permitted to ask for clarification of the statements made by the honourable minister. Obviously he intends to embark upon, to use his own words, bringing to the attention of the minister other areas of concern, and that surely is outside the rules of the House.

MR. ROWE: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. I submit that the minister is simply trying to anticipate what I am going to say and he may or may not be correct. I think it would be much wiser if the Speaker heard what I had to say and decided for himself whether or not I am in or out of order on this particular matter. I would like to, as the minister suggested I can, ask for points of clarification which I intend to do.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The Chair certainly does not intend to anticipate what any honourable member has to say. The comments made by the honourable Member for St. Barbe North when he said that he intended to bring to the minister's attention some other problems, at first hearing that the Chair was having thoughts that maybe the member was entering into a debate. The Chair will hear him but if it feels he is entering into debate, it will not hesitate to tell him that he is out of order.

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

The thing I would like to bring to the minister's attention and just ask for some clarification on it is really this. In terms of transportation in the South it is my understanding that there is still a difficulty with respect to transportation of the school children to various communities because of the inadequacy of the number of buses in certain areas and because of the road conditions.

The second point, Sir, is the fact that many students have difficulty in finding a boarding home in which to live during that year. So, although we do indeed welcome the increase in bursaries to the high school students, I would like a clarification on these two points. Number one, the transportation problem as still exists, and, number two, the problem that still exists with respect to students trying to find homes in which to stay.

I can give one example if I may, Mr. Speaker -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: - which obviously I cannot.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The honourable Member for St. Barbe North is certainly now entering into a debate on this statement and is out of order.

HON. G. OTTENHEIMER (MINISTER OF EDUCATION): On a point of order, Sir.  
On a point of order.

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Take your seat, please. Take your seat.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Sit down, will you.

MR. SPEAKER: Enough comment has been made on this ministerial statement and we move on to something else.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I have another ministerial statement.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Education has another ministerial statement.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I trust, Sir, that the -

MR. HICKMAN: Any statement that you make is ministerial.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: That is true. That is true.

I trust that the honourable gentleman from St. Barbe North will also be in concurrence with the government's wise policy in this respect as well. I am pleased to inform, Mr. Speaker, honourable members of the legislature and the people of the Province - I heard something from Bonavista North, I am not sure what it was, Sir, -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Do not worry about it.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: - whether it was an allowable remark or an unallowable one, but there was some utterance, Sir, which is - but, you know, the honourable gentleman has quietened down. I wish to announce, Mr. Speaker, the appointment of Mr. Herbert Hellen to the position of Community Music Consultant with the Department of Education. I would think Mr. Hellen is known. Certainly his work is known.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: What is his name, Heller?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: No, no. Hellen. His work would be known to most honourable members of the House. Actually he is the conductor of the band which has played in the Confederation Building, usually Christmas Eve, for the past few years. He will be working with the division of Adult and Continuing Education and will be responsible for advising and encouraging, assisting in the development of community bands throughout the Province. He will also be responsible for co-ordinating music programmes sponsored through the Adult Education Programme Department and he will be available to school boards in the Province who are interested in organizing school or community bands.

Mr. Hellen is a graduate of the Trinity College of Music in London.

He has been a resident of Newfoundland for approximately eight or nine years. He has considerable experience in music education in Newfoundland and elsewhere. Since 1963 - actually that is twelve years. He has been a resident of the Province for twelve years - he has been supervisor of music with the Conception Bay South Integrated School Board and has been responsible for the development of the Conception Bay South School Band which is widely known throughout the Province, and this, in fact, is the band which plays in the foyer of the Confederation Building on Christmas Eve or has done so for the past two or three years.

Now, he will be taking up his duties with the Department of Education in September, next September. Although his appointment does not become effective until September 1 for official and legal and salary purposes, he will be available for consultation with school boards or community groups who are interested in developing school or community bands during the months which are between now and September. So, what in effect that is is that although his appointment is affective in September, he will be available for consultation between now and September.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for St. Barbe North.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I stand here in praise of the government on this particular policy statement. On behalf of my colleagues, Sir, I would like to wish Mr. Hellen, I believe it is if that is the correct pronunciation, wish him every success in his new duties when he takes over in September, 1975, Sir. Music education, Sir, is obviously a very important aspect of our cultural education in this Province which has been lacking to a certain degree over the years. This is welcome news indeed.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Do we keep dancing?

MR. F. ROWE: Sir, I imagine that my friend from Hermitage would be happy to avail of the services of the gentleman when he gets his appointment in September. Sir, this is a motherhood policy statement. It is not the kind of election bait that we saw in the first policy statement.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! We have another

group which has recently arrived in the galleries from Chance Cove Elementary School at Chance Cove, forty grade five, six, and seven students with Mr. Mugford and Mr. Smith. On behalf of all honourable members I welcome you to the galleries and trust that your visit there is most interesting.

Are there any other ministerial statements?

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

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

MR. HOWARD: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of sixty-four voters of the Southside of Western Bay and the prayer of the petition reads as follows: "The prayer of our petition is for the Department of Highways during the coming months to pave the road in our community, locally known as the Southside Road, on the following grounds; number one, this road is used by a large number of people including many tourists during the summer months and pavement would eliminate the ever present dust problem. Number two, more important still is the fact that in addition to the many private cars using this thoroughfare the school bus makes five trips daily over this particular road.

"This Spring the bus became bogged down on several occasions and required assistance from the Highroads equipment and for several days the roads could not be used at all by the bus making it necessary for the pupils to walk to the highroad. This problem can only be eliminated by pavement. We trust that you will give our petition your serious consideration and that action will be forthcoming during the present year."

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of these sixty-four residents of Western Bay I support this petition. I understand that this road is about one mile long and, as pointed out in the petition, I am sure pavement could become available this year and it would eliminate all these problems and I ask that this petition be placed upon the table of this House and that it be related to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bell Island.



MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the prayer of the petition presented on behalf of the people that live on the Southside of Western Bay, Sir, the prayer of that petition is a reasonable one. The request strikes me as being most reasonable indeed, Sir, and we on this side of the House have no hesitation whatsoever in supporting the petition and I will make you a prediction now, Sir, that the Minister of Transportation and Communications will stand after I take my seat and say that he is glad to welcome this petition.

Well, Sir, we would expect more than that from the Minister of Transportation. We would expect the minister to rise in his place, tell the people over in Western Bay, on the Southside, that their road will be paved this year and it will be made safe for the school buses to drive over this next Spring and Sir, I would hope that the honourable Member will be able to convince his colleague, the Minister of Transportation and Communications to have this short stretch of road included -

MR. ROWE: One mile.

MR. NEARY: - only one mile, Sir, included in his five year programme and that that particular piece of road be paved in the first year.

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. THOMS: There is \$110 million -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

HON. J. ROUSSEAU, MINISTER OF TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS: It is rather difficult, Mr. Speaker, you know in the face of the remarks of the honourable Leader of the Opposition, to hold cool. you know -

MR. ROBERTS: To a point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker, I take very real offence, if the honourable gentleman, Sir, finds it difficult to hold his cool, Sir, I would suggest that is an internal problem and not one affecting the Opposition. If the honourable gentleman, Sir, has no right under the rules of this House to debate, the most he can do is support the petition and I would ask too that Your Honour urge the honourable gentleman not to disgrace himself by losing his cool in the House. It is his colleague directly behind him who loses his cool in the House, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Chair submits also that the point of privilege raised by the honourable the Leader of the Opposition is not really a point of privilege at all but an opportunity to clarify a point that he did not particularly agree with and the honourable minister, by the honourable the Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. ROUSSEAU: If there be a nastier man in the Province, Mr. Speaker, point him out to me.

MR. DUNPHY: God help him if I lose my cool.

MR. ROUSSEAU: But anyway, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. NEARY: Is that a threat?

MR. DUNPHY: That is a threat.

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

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, we are not going to give any commitments or assurance. We will give it sympathetic consideration as we do with every other one and if we had to do the roads that we are asked for in petitions in this House during this session of course just about the total budget would be expended. We will give it sympathetic consideration and see what we can do. We have a number of petitions presented in the House and this will get as much sympathetic consideration as any other we had and certainly that is the only commitment I can make.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if I may say a word in support of that petition so ably presented by the gentleman from Bay de Verde. I regret that the Minister of Transportation is unable to give the House an assurance. As one of my colleagues pointed out, with a budget of well over \$100 million at his disposal this year I find it astonishing that the minister who is daily calling contracts for millions of dollars worth of road projects is unable to give such a small contract and assurance that it will be done this year. I hope it will be done, Sir. It is not a great deal of money to request. It might cost several thousand or possibly even more than \$100,000 to pave a mile of road, depending on the circumstances, but Sir, I think the case is warranted. I would say further to the Minister of Transportation and Communications that whether or not this one mile of road on the Southern side of Western Bay is paved this year will be regarded by people all up and down the North Shore of the Bay as a test of the political efficacy of the gentleman from Bay de Verde. Sir, if the gentleman from Bay de Verde, the present Member from Bay de Verde cannot get a mile of road paved, then, Sir, his colleagues will have let him down, humiliated him, exposed him.

So, for that reason, in addition to the very good reason of the merits of the case I support the petition, Sir, and I earnestly urge the minister not just to give it sympathetic consideration. He has given sympathetic consideration to everything, but that I urge him to take some meaningful action and insure that that road is paved this year.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Harbour Grace.

MR. H. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I would like to support this petition so ably presented by my colleague and seating partner. Sir, this petition refers to tourists, Sir and I am sure at this time of the year the tourists are starting to flow back to Newfoundland and it

is only right and proper that this road should eliminate the dust. Last night, Sir, we had one great tourist back from Clearwater, Florida over there and I am sure that this road really needs to be paved. Also, Sir, it states there that the buses are bogging down and, Sir, there again I think probably it is one thing that this road should be paved because, like the fellow said last night at that meeting - I know I am not - I would like to relate to this, Sir - that when anything gets bogged down someone has got to come and lift it up. Sir, I think that the Minister of Transportation and Communications should give these people in South side of Western Bay a little lifting up.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

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

HON. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I have answer to question number forty-six given by the honourable Member for Bell Island with respect to whether any payments have been made by the Department of Mines and Energy to Cabot Group 4 Limited, whoever they are. The answer is, no payments, and the other questions therefore are non-applicable.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: I have no idea who they are.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if I cannot get any information out of the minister on that question, Sir, perhaps the minister can give me some information on the question that I am about to ask him. Would the minister tell the House if the company referred to in the Throne Speech and referred to by the minister on a number of occasions called NORDCO Limited has yet been incorporated?

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, yes, I understand that this company has been incorporated and I understand that there should be further announcements in this regard in the fairly near future.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question to the minister, Sir. Is this company, this new company a private company or a crown corporation?

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, while it has been incorporated under the Company's Act to my recollection, I presume it would qualify under the definition of crown corporation seeing as the shareholders are members of government. The shareholders are, if I believe correctly, the Minister of Industrial Development, the Minister of Fisheries and the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Would the minister tell the House whether or not this new company NORDCO has yet hired any staff?

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, in this respect the only information I can give the honourable member here is that the Department of Industrial Development has had a very able individual working on its staff in the preliminary work leading up to the formation of this company, a gentleman by the name of Mr. Jan Furst who is very knowledgeable in the field of marine technology -

MR. THOMS: He is from Carbonear is he?

MR. BARRY: - employment relating to, or employment opportunities relating to shipyards, shipbuilding, ship repair, marine technology generally, and this individual I will assume will be also associated with NORDCO. And NORDCO, for honourable members who are not aware of it, stands for Newfoundland Ocean Research and Development Corporation. And the objective in the formation of the Company, of course, as has been mentioned before is to develop whatever opportunities exist in the area of Ocean Research and Development to develop these opportunities within the Province of Newfoundland, to ensure that any employment opportunities, for example, or any contracts that may be done here in the Province relating to either offshore oil and gas, Arctic shipping or any other area where we as an Island on the East Coast of Canada should have a particular advantage, to ensure that these opportunities stay within the Province.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Would the minister please tell the House then if this new company, NORDCO will be letting contracts or have they let any contracts? And if they will be letting contracts will they be following the procedure of the Public Tendering Act? Have any contracts been entered into? Have any consultants been employed yet? And would the minister also while he is on his feet indicate to the House whether there has been any loans or guarantees approved for this company? And will there be an annual report made to the House of Assembly on this company?

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, on this matter I think the honourable member has it just completely backforemost, as normal. The objective in creating this company is to ensure that this company obtains contracts from either the oil industry, the shipping industry and so on, obtains contracts and keeps the employment benefits and so on

within the Province -

MR. NEARY: No.

MR. BARRY: - for such developments. Now I would assume, Mr. Speaker, that there would also be, and that the normal procedure would be for this company to go out, obtain contracts and then make arrangements with respect to either industry within Newfoundland or the University of Newfoundland because this Corporation is contemplated as a partnership of three distinct elements within the Province, government, the University and industry. And once they obtain contracts or have the possibility of obtaining contracts I assume that they would then make arrangements either with the University or with industry for the carrying out of such contracts, and I would assume that they would follow, and they would follow normal government policy in this respect.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. The minister did not answer the part of the question -

MR. BARRY: Part of the second part.

MR. NEARY: - will the company or crown corporation or whatever the minister thinks it is, will it be reporting to this House? Will it be responsible to the House? Will it come to the House before giving any loans or guarantees or awarding any contracts or employing any consultants or giving out any - or calling public tenders? Will they report to this House?

MR. BARRY: No, Mr. Speaker, I do not expect that it will come to the House before carrying out any contracts or before -

MR. NEARY: Awarding contracts.

MR. BARRY: - retaining any consultants -

MR. NEARY: Loans?

MR. BARRY: - or any more than the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation comes before awarding any contracts.

MR. NEARY: But will we get an annual report?

MR. BARRY: That is utter nonsense. But, Mr. Speaker, I expect that the corporation will report to the House probably through the Minister of Industrial Development -

MR. NEARY: Can we have that as another -

MR. BARRY: - with any other crown corporation does. I am not going to undertake, Mr. Speaker, until I have an opportunity to check, I can get the information for the honourable member as to the procedure that is contemplated to be followed here. But my understanding at the present time is that it would report through the Minister of Industrial Development who would in turn report to the House in the normal arrangement of any crown corporation.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister. I hope I can get the information as quickly as possible.

Sir, I wonder if the Minister of Transportation and Communications could tell the House now that we are getting into the warm season again, and our thoughts are turning to forest fires, are the water bombers back in the Province yet, the government's air force back from Winnipeg yet, could the minister tell the House?



MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. ROUSSEAU: We have two in the Province that have been refurbished. We had one that went to Toronto for painting. The work was done here but it has gone to Toronto for painting. I do not know if that one is on the way back, but it will be imminently, one of the two that were in Calgary. The pilots went out yesterday, I believe, to take the first one back. The other one will be ready within the next week or so. So we do not anticipate any problems in having the five water bombers available on the dates that are indicated each year. There will be no lateness in the availability of the five planes.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a further question. Is the minister aware of the circumstances surrounding the decision to award that contract to the Field Aviation Company in Calgary for the maintenance and conversion work on the two bombers which were sent to Calgary?

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

MR. ROBERTS: I do not understand the question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the question quite simply was: Is the minister aware of all the circumstances surrounding the decision to award the contract to Field Aviation to carry out the work that was carried out or presumably has been or is being carried out in Calgary?

MR. ROUSSEAU: I recall there was quite a bit of discussion on it. I do not know whether or not, because apparently or maybe the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has something in mind that I do not know. But I would never say that I know all. I do not. I know what was necessary to know, and in consultation with my colleague, the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture and in consultation with federal and provincial officials, the decision was made. And, you know, if I said, yes, I am aware of everything then it is quite possible that I may not be aware of everything. What I had to know I was satisfied and my colleague was satisfied and the Federal-Provincial Liaison Committee

were satisfied that we had the information. A decision was made and agreed to by all involved.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, is the minister aware that the aircraft were sent to Winnipeg? The contract was awarded, the aircraft were sent West, were halted by ministerial order for a period of days, possibly even weeks while some frantic consultations and discussions went on. Is the minister aware of the circumstances underlying that decision to award the contract, the further decision to stop the aircraft en route and then the still further decision to award the contract to the Field Company?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes, I am, Mr. Speaker. The airplanes were dispatched from Newfoundland without departmental approval, be it the Department of Forestry and Agriculture or be it the Department of Transportation and Communications. It is actually under use of the Department of Forestry and Agriculture. They had the agreement signed with the federal government. The airplanes were dispatched out of the Province without authority. They were stopped in Toronto because they wanted to attempt to determine whether the work could be done in this Province. That was brought to our attention after the airplanes had left. We held them up in Toronto until we had further meetings on it, further discussions on it and again we met with the Federal-Provincial Liaison Committee and verified their original decision and the planes were dispatched to Calgary for the work to be done on them.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary. The cost, and the minister might indicate to us the cost the government have incurred, was it borne by this Province by Ottawa or by some combination of the Province and Ottawa? And if so, what was the combination?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Now, here I do not know. It was the majority if not all from Ottawa. I think it was an agreement. I do not know that. I would have to take it under notice. But I know the majority would have been, if not all, paid for by Ottawa.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, Mr. Speaker, if the minister would undertake to get that information, I should be very grateful. Meanwhile could he tell us who then dispatched the aircraft; if they were dispatched without proper permission? I was not aware that government aircraft could be sent anywhere and especially outside this Province without proper permission. And secondly, if they were sent improperly, as the minister says, what action has been taken against the individual who authorized their dispatch?

MR. ROUSSEAU: The authorization to send them was done by the chief pilot, Captain Ted Piercey and the matter was brought to Mr. Piercey's attention, Captain Piercey's attention.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I could go on on that one in view of the action that has been taken in respect to other employees of the government air service who had not lived up to their undertakings, but let me turn to a different thing. Was the contract awarded to the lowest bidder, Sir?

MR. ROUSSEAU: I, you know, again, and I would like to understand what I am saying is as accurate as I recall because this was a number of months back. Whoever it was awarded to it would have to be awarded on the okay of the Federal-Provincial Committee. Now whether it was awarded to the lowest tender or not, I do not think it was as a matter of fact, I do not think it was. But the company that had the lowest bid that would fulfill the specifications, in the consideration of both, I should not say both committees, a single committee, the committee representing the federal and provincial government felt that the best overhaul could be done with the prices by the Field people who had originally built the airplanes in Calgary. So it was not a

unilateral provincial decision, the decision recommended to the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture actually rather than - of course we control it but it is through the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry. Their recommendation was that it be awarded to Field. Field was not the lowest tender. No, there was one tender lower but there was some concern expressed whether the people had the ability to finish the job on time and it was quite important, of course, in their opinion - I am telling you what we were told - that it be done on time and that a good job be done because these water bombers are quite old. So, on that basis of the information and other technical advice, of which I do not have, the decision was made, a recommendation was made to the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture to award the contract to Field Aviation.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact the minister does not have all the facts readily to hand, but I hope he will permit me, Your Honour, to ask another two or three supplementary questions of this somewhat curious turn of events in connection with this contract.

First of all, Sir, would the minister indicate, please, the federal-provincial agreement under which the monies have been made available to the Province?

MR. ROUSSEAU: First of all, Mr. Speaker, let me stand here and say there is in my own personal opinion and the personal opinion of both committees nothing curious about it, nothing whatsoever. Now, that suggestion is unsatisfactory. You know, it is just not acceptable. There was nothing - in other words what the honourable Leader of the Opposition is saying, Mr. Speaker, is that there was a deal amongst a committee who made the recommendation. I think the honourable - you know, I do not think that is what the honourable the Leader of the Opposition meant. I certainly hope he will clarify that when he stands up.

The agreement was made, as I understand it again - and I am only going back. I do not want to be held to - I am saying to the best of my knowledge, I should say, it was made under the Forestry and Agriculture DREE subsidiary agreement.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I find it curious that there is nothing listed

in the estimates. Now, let me say although I am not allowed to make a speech that I have no quarrel with the committee, but it is cowardly of the minister to attempt to hide behind the skirts of a committee of officials.

MR. ROUSSEAU: But, I am not -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted -

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: If I may be permitted a further -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HICKMAN: Oh a point of order.

MR. ROBERTS: Is he going to sit down? I am not going to sit down unless he does, Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Justice has risen on a point of order.

MR. ROBERTS: All right. Let him make it then.

MR. HICKMAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The honourable Leader of the Opposition is totally and absolutely departing from the rules of questioning. He is starting to make a speech. The insinuation that the honourable the Minister of Transportation and Communications is hiding behind anyone or hiding anything is totally inappropriate and totally out of order in this House.

MR. BARRY: The word cowardly is unparliamentary.

MR. NEARY: Do not have a stroke.

MR. HICKMAN: And the word cowardly, I suspect, is unparliamentary, but I would have to reach for Beauchesne, I would submit.

MR. ROBERTS: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. I began my remarks by saying that I realized I was not allowed to make a speech. But, since the minister invited me to make a comment, I felt sure his colleagues would wish me to have set the matter straight. If the word cowardly is unparliamentary I withdraw it, but I still feel it is cowardly of the minister. He was the one who introduced the federal-provincial committee concept into this. I am asking him some questions. Once Your Honour rules on the point of order, I would like to ask one or two other supplementary questions in relation to a

series of events that I consider to be highly curious. I use a neutral word. I could use stronger.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

While it is true perhaps that the honourable Minister of Transportation and Communications did say in his comments that he would like for the honourable Leader of the Opposition to clarify a point, that still does not give the honourable Leader of the Opposition the right, as he said when he got up, to make a speech. Only the Chair perhaps can decide what the ruling will be with regards to any member asking a question and making a speech in doing so. As regards to the word cowardly, the Chair feels that perhaps it is a little unparliamentary and would prefer that the honourable the Leader of the Opposition, or any other member for that matter, not use it.

MR. ROBERTS: I thank you, Sir. If a little bit of it is unparliamentary, I will withdraw a little bit of it and we will consider the matter of that word settled.

Now, Sir, I wonder if the minister would indicate whether he is willing to lay upon the table of the House the federal-provincial agreement under which monies were paid out in respect to this, if he would also lay upon the table of the House, Sir, a copy of the minutes of any official committee which approved this series of transactions. And further, Sir, would the minister tell us whether he has investigated the events - whether he considers them curious or no is a matter of debate - the events which surrounded the award of this contract. I have one other question, but let the minister have a chance at these, Sir.

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, I

would not because it is not within my jurisdiction. I just told the honourable the Leader of the Opposition that it falls within the Forestry and Agriculture subsidiary agreement and I think that question would be directed to my colleague, if he were here.

But I cannot say that I can table an agreement.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, I will not.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, Mr. Speaker, since the Minister of Forestry is not with us, I will direct a question to the Deputy Premier, the Minister of Justice. Would he undertake to lay upon the table of the House an agreement, which is a public agreement, I am sure, nothing hidden about it, a copy of the agreement, the subsidiary agreement under which the Government of Canada contributed some or all of the money in respect of this contract. Furthermore, Sir, would the minister lay upon - It was the Minister of Transportation who raised this question of committees, would he lay upon the table of the House the records, the minutes of this committee relevant to this decision.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would be more than happy to direct the enquiry and the question from the honourable the Leader of the Opposition to my colleague the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture. There is one thing I am certain of, that if the Government of Canada has not imposed any rule of secrecy with respect to that agreement that we on this side will be delighted and proud to table the agreement and with the consent again of the honourable the Minister of DREE, because it was his joint committee, I am sure that we will be very, very proud of - we were very, very proud to table in this House the signed approval of the joint federal-provincial committee.

MR. ROBERTS: Hear! Hear! Well, that is good. Now, Sir, that will be interesting to see if we get it. The words will be in Hansard. Now, Sir, a further question for the Minister of Transportation. Is he aware of the fact, and if so, what has he done about it, that a Newfoundland company supported heavily by the financial backing

of this government is qualified to do this work and was the lowest bidder?

MR. ROUSSEAU: It was taken into consideration and, as I say, the recommendation that was put before us from technical people - I do not know who can do what in the field of technical work - the recommendation that was put before us was put before us by a committee was that the work to be done at Field Aviation and that was done, you know. A Newfoundland company, I believe, was low bidder. But low bidder now, the honourable the Leader of the Opposition, that is not quite apt when you say low bidder. There was certain work, certain highly technical work that had to be done which I understand that may or may not have been done, I do not know, or could have been done in this Province. I do not know but I know it was a - you know, do not ask me matters of a technical nature - all I can say is what the technical people tell you and in their opinion that Field Aviation could do the job for the amount, the best job to be done and it was awarded to them.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I find the minister's answer profoundly dissatisfying. I would like to raise the whole - it is time we went into this whole scandal, Sir. I would like to raise it tomorrow on the late show.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HICKMAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I am not going to sit here and listen to these innuendoes and scandalous -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! The Chair would certainly direct the honourable Leader of the Opposition to withdraw the word scandal. He is inferring that there is something, in the Chair's opinion, criminally wrong with this agreement and the Chair feels that the word scandal is certainly unparliamentary and would ask the honourable Leader of the Opposition to completely withdraw that.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, in view of that I shall completely withdraw



it. What I may feel about it is another thing. The events will speak for themselves and I wish to raise the matter on the late show tomorrow.

I have no hesitation -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: - in saying, Sir, that the government have acted improperly in this entire incident.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Tourism, did he rise on a point of order.

MR. HICKEY: A point of personal privilege, Your Honour. I have sat and I have listened to this charade for the last half hour now. I was the Minister of Transportation and Communications for most of the period of time which concerned itself with this particular project. I wonder, with Your Honour's permission, if I could offer the information to the Leader of the Opposition. He is labouring to bring forth a mountain again and he is not going to bring forth even a mouse if I am permitted to give the information.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The honourable Minister of Tourism rose on what he called a point of privilege. In making a few remarks he wondered if he would be permitted to explain something. The Chair submits that the honourable Minister of Tourism does not have a point of privilege and can only be permitted to continue by leave of the House.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I know for my part I am not the least bit prepared to give the honourable Minister of Tourism leave unless, Sir, the government -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: - unless, Sir, the government will agree to allow a debate on the matter today, if need be, and if not, tomorrow.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Chair feels then that the honourable Minister of Tourism certainly does not have leave to make an explanation as to this matter.

The honourable Minister of Transportation and Communications,

MR. ROUSSEAU: Look, Mr. Speaker, if I may on a point of order, or on a point of clarification. You know, there are two departments involved in this, There is nothing that we want to hide. I would like to consult with my honourable colleague, You know, the information - you know the suggestion that there is a scandal there is -

AN HON. MEMBER: Scandalous.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, to a point of order -

MR. ROUSSEAU: You know, and nobody here is saying that we are not prepared, Mr. Chairman -

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROUSSEAU: Nobody here is saying that we are not prepared, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROUSSEAU: I am on to a point of order right now.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, you said a point of order or a point of something else.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Chair permitted the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! If honourable members persist in interrupting then the Chair suggests that perhaps they can leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Well, I am not asking a question.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if honourable members to my right and to my left are deliberately ignoring calls from the Chair, If they are the Chair will certainly name them.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sir, you had better get the Sergeant to speak to the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: If honourable members were quiet then they would hear what is

being said.

MR. ROUSSEAU: How is the Civil Service, how are they involved in the scandal?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege, Sir.-

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: To a point of personal privilege, Sir, the honourable the Minister of Transportation just accused me in this House of having -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: - having accused me, Mr. Speaker, of having accused any or a number of Civil Servants of being involved in a scandal. Now to begin with that word -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: To begin with, Sir, that word is not parliamentary. Secondly, Sir, the minister should know, having drawn the Queen's salary for two years as a minister, any actions taken by public servants are answered for by ministers. He is the minister responsible for Transportation and Communications. Any actions which he or his officials may or may not have taken are his responsibility and furthermore to that point, Mr. Speaker, I would again repeat that it is the minister who has hidden behind the skirts of a federal-provincial committee. I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that the minister be directed to withdraw that remark and to apologize. I made no accusations. I merely wanted to get the truth. He seems to be trying to hide it.

MR. BARRY: To that point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY: To the contrary, the honourable Leader of the Opposition did make not only insinuations, innuendoes, he also directly accused government in this case, and the minister in particular, of engaging in what he labelled a scandal. However, when the information was to be given by the honourable Minister of Tourism, he did not want to hear it. Now I submit that that point of privilege is completely spurious, unnecessary and should

be totally ignored.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! A few moments ago the Chair was trying to get honourable members to remain quiet and perhaps this is a good reason why honourable members should remain quiet when a member is trying to speak. There were several members to my left and to my right talking across the House and comments allegedly made by the Minister of Transportation and Communications to the honourable Leader of the Opposition certainly escaped the ears of the Chair. Perhaps that was the reason why. The Chair feels that this matter is now over with and any comments made are merely differences of opinion between honourable members.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, before we go on to Orders of the Day, I move that when the House adjourns at six this evening it adjourn until tomorrow Thursday, May 1, at ten o'clock in the morning.

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved and seconded that when the House do adjourn at six o'clock it adjourn until tomorrow, Thursday at ten o'clock, Carried.

It being Private Members' Day we continue with motion five as it appears on today's Order Paper. I think debate was adjourned by the honourable Member for Bell Island last day and he has twenty minutes left to speak.

MR. NEARY: Thank you very much, Your Honour. Mr. Speaker, my honourable colleague to my right here, the Member for Bonavista North informs me I have ten minutes because we are leaving for Bonavista shortly, so I am not going to hang her down, Sir.

CAPT. WINSOR: You can have an extension.

MR. NEARY: But Mr. Speaker, last week when I was dealing with this matter, Sir, I spent a great deal of time talking about the behaviour and the action of the three honourable gentlemen who apparently threatened to resign because of this, what they consider to be a serious matter. Now I also mention, Sir, if honourable members will remember, I listed all the members who have either resigned or threatened to resign over similar matters in the last two or three years. And believe it or not,

I mentioned the Minister of Health. I said last week, last Wednesday, I said, the Minister of Health had threatened on a number of occasions to resign and lo and behold, the day before yesterday, if the Premier did not come into this House Monday morning and announce the minister's resignation. So the member for Bonavista South has threatened to resign over issues similar to this one, the member for St. John's South, the member for St. John's North, the member for St. John's East, We are not quite sure whether he got the flick or whether he resigned. It is a matter of opinion, Sir, between two honourable gentlemen on the opposite side of the House.

Now, Sir, the member for St. John's East, who has been most vocal about this matter and most critical of the government did not have the courage of his convictions.

CAPT. WENSON: Did you mention the member for St. John's South?

MR. NEARY: Yes, I mentioned the member for St. John's South.

But the member for St. John's East, Sir, especially did not have the courage to go all the way and to come across the House to separate himself from the party. If he disagreed with the Premier -

AN HON. MEMBER: And sit with you.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, not necessarily sit with me. Maybe he could go and sit with the People's Reform Party when it is formed, or sit with my colleague, the Leader of the New Labrador Party, or sit independently.

MR. SIMMONS: He could start his own party.

MR. NEARY: He could have started his own party. But, Sir, he did not have the courage of his convictions.

MR. SIMMONS: He could even start a Tory Party.

MR. NEARY: The honourable member appears to be too cowardly to go all the way. Now, Sir -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The Chair already today has reminded the Hon. Leader of the Opposition about the use of the word, cowardly.

MR. NEARY: Your Honour, I did not say, Sir, that the member was too

cowardly, and I do not know if this is parliamentary, I need Your Honour's guidance. I said, the member appears to be too cowardly to go all the way.

MR. SPEAKER: The member is saying the same thing really, and is just changing the words around somewhat.

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

MR. NEARY: If it is unparliamentary, Sir, I withdraw it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for St. John's East on a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: I think what the Hon. Member for Bell Island means actually is not that I was too cowardly to go over on the other side but really that I have not quite got the stomach to go over on the other side.

MR. NEARY: The honourable member, Sir, must have a pretty strong stomach where he is located now, because this was one of the punishments, one of the punishments, Sir. The seating arrangement was one of the penalties -

MR. BARRY: Order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - that was imposed on the honourable -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The Chair fails to see the relationship between this particular motion and the amendment and to the seating plan in this House of Assembly.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, so what did the honourable member do? The honourable member, Sir, did not have the courage to separate himself from the leader and from the honourable gentleman who he was afraid was going to get him into trouble. He did not have the courage to go all the way. So what did he do? He moved out and stayed on that side of the House, Sir, and then in order to sort of satisfy his own conscience, he brought in an amendment to a motion brought in by my colleague, the member for Hermitage, and the amendment, Sir, reads as follows in case honourable members have forgotten what it is all about:

This House endorses the government in its expressed policy to call open public tenders for all public works, whether such

public works are affected pursuant to long-term leases, the purchase agreement or otherwise. And this House further urges the government to cause buildings needed for additional accommodation of the public service to be constructed upon Confederation Building grounds.

Now, Sir, therein I would say lies the reason, the real reason for this amendment, the last part. The member says that if this amendment is carried by the House unanimously that he urges the government, instead of going out and putting up - Mr. Speaker, I do not know, I get a drone, Sir, a hum in the House, I can hardly hear myself talking.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The Chair feels, too, that there is maybe a little too much noise in the corridors.

MR. NEARY: I got to shout, Sir. Get the government members, Sir, tell them to go down to the tavern or go in their common room.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Why? Are there two different places?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the member hopes, through this motion, to be able to appease his own conscience by putting the members on either of the House in the difficult position, in the embarrassing position to having to vote in favour of this motion, this amendment to the motion, because it has motherhood overtones. And in so doing the member is hoping to accomplish through the backdoor what he could not do through the front door. He is hoping to get a vote on this little, innocent recommendation that will put the government in a strait jacket as far as - that is right, Sir, he is nodding his approval, he is saying, yes - that will handcuff the government that if this motion is approved unanimously by the House that the government will not be able to make any deals whether it is with Craig Dobbin or anybody else. But, Sir, but in trying in accomplish that and in trying to accomplish what the member could not accomplish through his resignation or by being flicked out of the cabinet, he is trying

to accomplish it in another way, but in so doing, Sir, is very wishy-washy in his wording. Because if the member was genuine and sincere in what he was trying to accomplish, and that is to force the government to expand Confederation Building or put office buildings here on the grounds of Confederation Building, if the member was sincere and genuine in that attempt then he would use stronger language. But all he is doing is giving the Premier and the government a little flick on the wrist in saying that the House if they pass this motion will urge the government.

Well, Sir, I am going to move an amendment -

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. NEARY: - to my honourable and learned friend's amendment.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. NEARY: I am going to move an amendment to the amendment, Sir, called a sub-amendment, I suppose, under the rules of the House. Be It Resolved, Mr. Speaker, that the word 'urges' be stricken from the amendment and substituted with the word 'directs', so that the amendment to the amendment or the sub-amendment would read as follows: That this House endorses the government in its expressed policy to call open tenders for all public works; and whether such public works are effected pursuant to long term leases, purchase agreements or otherwise, and this House further directs the government to cause buildings needed for additional accommodation of the public service to be constructed upon Confederation Building grounds.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Chair has certain reservations about something pertaining to that amendment so I will recess the House for a few minutes to take a look at it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

The House recessed.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Chair is willing to hear argument with regards to the amendment, the sub-amendment I suppose. The Hon. Member for St. John's East.

MR. MARSHALL: Well, Mr. Speaker, I might just pass this out to you for Your Honour, as far as I am concerned the word 'urges' is in effect the same as 'directs'. But with the greatest respect



to the Member for Bell Island, which is not the same respect that he reciprocates over here, I wonder whether the - I will just put this for Your Honour's consideration that the word 'direct' would appear to me to require the expenditure of money and make a definite requirement with respect to the expenditure of money that a private member's resolution is not allowed. As I say, I feel the word -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MARSHALL: - you know, I mean they can get picayune with their wording all they want to, but I feel that the word 'urges' myself really accomplishes the same end anyway. But the word 'directs' I would think contrary to parliamentary practice in that it requires the expenditure of money. However I hasten to add that I would - in my understanding the word 'urges' has the same import in my poor mind as the word 'directs' any way.

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

MR. ROBERTS: If I may to the point. My understanding is that my colleague has in effect moved that the word 'direct' be substituted for the word 'urges' in the amendment moved by the honourable gentleman from St. John's East.

Now, Sir, with great respect I do not think the word 'urge' and the word 'direct' are the same word at all. I think they are alternate. The word 'direct' is much stronger than the word 'urge' and it would give the House an opportunity to record a far different feeling. And I think that is the first point, Sir, in looking at a sub-amendment or an amendment whether it, you know, offers what amounts to an alternate proposition, one that cannot be achieved by negating the matter to be voted upon, i.e., the amendment itself. Well, Sir, obviously putting the word 'direct' in instead of the word 'urge' is not something that could be achieved by a simple vote in the negative. It does not expand it. It just refines it and presents an alternate.

The second point as I understand it, the second objection taken, Sir, is that the word 'direct' would require the expenditure of funds, Sir. And if that is so, if this motion would require the expenditure of funds then, Sir, it would be out of order. Now, Sir, to that I say that the honourable gentleman from St. John's East I do not think can carry his point because he says it is out of order because 'direct' requires the expenditure of funds, and then he says that 'urge' as the same effect as 'direct', and yet he himself proposed a motion that had the word 'urge' in it.

Sir, this motion as amended, if the amendment were to be accepted, if sub-amendment I am sorry, were to be accepted and the amendment were to carry the motion would not require the expenditure of any money by the government. It would merely record the House's opinion that any accommodation which is provided, any additional accommodation to be provided in the public service should be built here upon the Confederation Building grounds and not elsewhere around St. John's or for that matter anywhere else.

MR. MARSHALL: Just before Your Honour leaves the Chair to consider the matter, I would like to point out that I did not raise - the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was not in the Chamber at the time - I did not raise the point that it was a direct negative because I feel it is one in the same thing. But I think the terminology is important because the word 'direct' is imperative and consequently it would require the expenditure of money. And as I say the word 'urges' accomplishes the same thing with other words. And I would just like to point out that I consider the word 'urges' to be quite satisfactory and it does exactly the same thing as the word 'direct' but in the realm of the parliamentary precedence.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair will now recess -

MR. ROBERTS: If I may say -

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

MR. ROBERTS: I did not mean to do the gentleman from St. John's East any disservice. I was listening but I was in a conversation outside, and if I misheard him I apologize to him. I was merely stating the general case that often is stated against amendments or sub-amendments.

Sir, the word 'direct' in this context as Your Honour I am sure will agree when looking at the motion as it would have been amended if my colleague's amendment is accepted that motion - the word 'direct' does not require the expenditure of any money at all because the motion would be to cause buildings needed for additional accommodation, Sir. It would be up to the government to determine whether any additional accommodation is needed or not. There is nothing in the motion which says that further accommodation is needed. It merely says, Sir, if the government decides further accommodation is needed then that accommodation shall be provided here. The 'if' Sir, is entirely within control of the government. The 'if' is a matter that would require the expenditure of funds.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that, you know, the amendment - the sub-amendment to the amendment is quite in order.

MR. SPEAKER: The House will recess for a few minutes to consider the sub-amendment.

The House recessed.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I wonder if some honourable member would direct the gentleman in the corridor there to my left to keep the noise down to a dull roar.

MR. ROBERTS: Well said, Mr. Speaker.

Your Honour's authority runs through the precincts of the House. You could have them dragged before the bar and beheaded.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair has considered the sub-amendment as proposed by the Hon. Member for Bell Island and certainly feels that the word 'directs' if accepted, would direct government to an expenditure of money and thus to rule the sub-amendment out of order.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have left? I presume the time -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: I still have about fifteen minutes, I believe. I presume that time will not be deducted from my speaking.

MR. SPEAKER: The time the House was just recessed will not be deducted from the honourable member's time.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I certainly agree, Sir, that any future accommodations for public servants should be built here on the grounds of Confederation Building. Confederation Building should be either expanded or a new building, Sir, connected by either an underground tunnel or an overhead tunnel should be built near Confederation Building, possibly over here, Sir, on this vacant lot. The plans have already been made, Sir. The plans were made and the foundation was laid by the former administration. It is only a matter of dusting off, taking the plans off the shelf, dusting off the plans and calling public tenders.

AN HON. MEMBERS: The files are gone.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, the files are not gone. Well the plans are still there. You can get the plans from the company who built this building

in New York. Possibly my colleague, my learned friend, the Minister of Fisheries may be able to get a set of the plans. But, Sir, the plans are available and, Mr. Speaker, I certainly agree without reservation, Sir, without any hesitation, that any accommodation to house the public service in the future should be constructed here on the grounds of Confederation Building.

And, Mr. Speaker, I still think, Sir, that an amendment should be made to this motion because it is so wishy-washy. And I would like to make the following sub-amendment, Sir, following amendment to the amendment. Be it resolved that the word 'urges' be stricken from the amendment and substituted with the word 'directs' so that the amendment to the amendment would now reads as follows: -

MR. ROBERTS: You cannot have direct.

MR. NEARY: Oh.

MR. ROBERTS: Rule that out.

MR. NEARY: All right.

MR. ROBERTS: It would read, states its view.

MR. NEARY: Oh yes, okay, Sir. That after the word 'urges' -

MR. ROBERTS: The word 'urges' should be struck out.

MR. NEARY: - be struck out -

MR. ROBERTS: Urges be struck.

MR. NEARY: - and that this House further -

MR. ROBERTS: States.

MR. NEARY: - states its view that any additional accommodation needed for the public service must be constructed upon Confederation Building grounds. And I have a copy of the amendment for Your Honour.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry my writing is bad.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The Chair will have to recess for that one too.

It has some thoughts about the exactness of that particular wording.

MR. ROBERTS: Would, Your Honour, like to hear any argument on it?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The Chair after consultation with the table in discussing the sub-amendment finds that the sub-amendment is in order.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, the amendment now, Sir, will be, be it resolved that the word urges be stricken from the amendment and substituted with the following, that the House further records its view that any additional accommodation for the public service must be constructed upon the grounds of Confederation Building.

Now, Sir, I think this amendment now, the amendment to the amendment, makes more sense. It makes a great deal of sense. Now, Sir, if the House votes in favor of the sub-amendment, the amendment to the amendment, then the government has no choice. The House is directing the government that if they should require accommodations for public servants in the future, if they should take the decision to go ahead to provide additional accommodations, that it is the view of this House that the members of the House feel and direct the government once they take this decision to either enlarge Confederation Building or put up a new building on the grounds of Confederation Building.

Now, Sir, I have no doubt at all that this amendment to the amendment to the motion, will get the unanimous approval of the House. At least, Sir, I would think that if the Member for St. John's South and St. John's North and the Member for St. John's East who is in trouble enough now with his colleagues over the first amendment, if they are genuine and sincere, Sir, if they do not want to see any wheeling and dealing done outside, if they are interested in providing service to the people of this Province, that they will vote, they above any other members of this House because of the fuss that they have kicked up, because of the noise they have made about this issue, because of the importance that they have placed on this matter, that they above anyone else, Sir, will vote in favor of this sub-amendment because, Sir, it makes a great deal of sense indeed to have all our government departments concentrated in one area.

As it stands now, Mr. Speaker, ordinary people of this Province who come in from outside of St. John's who live beyond the Overpass who come into St. John's, are running around St. John's trying to find

ministers, trying to find government departments, trying to find government officials, trying to find this agency of government, that agency of government, running around, Sir, like roosters with their heads cut off. They come up to Confederation Building. The obvious place for them to go the moment they see the lights of St. John's, the obvious place to head for is Confederation Building. When they arrive in the lobby of Confederation Building, nine chances out of ten they are told by the security people down in the lobby that this department or that department or this minister or that member or this official or that agency of the provincial government is no longer in this building but is down at say, the Phillip Place. So, that means that poor ordinary person, Sir, then has to, if he does not have transportation, he either has to go down to the back door and take the bus or -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: What bus?

MR. NEARY: The bus at the back door, the St. John's Transportation Company down at the back door.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Reid's bus.

MR. NEARY: No, it is not Reid's bus, not my friend from Port de Grave, the Member for Juniper Stump. No, Sir. He would have to go down if he does not have transportation. First he would have to go on shank's mare, walk over

to the Philip Building, take the bus or call up a friend or a relative in St. John's, inconvenience them and get them to come over and pick them up or he would have to hire a taxi. I would submit, Sir, that the average person in this Province, the ordinary person who comes into this Building cannot afford to hire a taxi. So, they either have to get the bus, go it on shank's mare or call up a friend or relative to take them over there and then when they get there, Mr. Speaker, nine chances out of ten they are told that the government department, the officials, the minister or the member they are looking for has now been relocated in the Crosbie Building over on Crosbie Road. This has happened, Mr. Speaker. Or over in the Viking Building over on Crosbie Road, not in the - what is the name of that shipping company?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Not in the Chimo Building. Do we have any government departments in the Chimo Building? We do not have any in the Chimo Building, I do not think. But they would either have to go over to the Viking Building or over to the Crosbie Building on Crosbie Road immediately behind Carnell's Funeral Home. So, that would involve another hour or so, more expense, more inconvenience and when they get over there they probably have to wait a half an hour or an hour before they can get to see whoever they wanted to see. By that time, Sir, it is coffee break or the newspaper has arrived and the day is shot and they have to go back home disappointed, unable to do their business only to have to return to St. John's a second or a third or a fourth time in order to transact maybe in most cases just a simple piece of business with some government department.

Now, Sir, this is not good enough. This is a very strong argument, Sir, in my opinion, for this House to direct the government, although I was not allowed to put that word in my motion, Sir, but certainly with the way the motion is amended, the amendment is amended now the government will certainly get the message. I would



hope, Sir, that we could have directed the government if they are going to provide additional space for the public service that it be done here on the grounds of Confederation Building so that when the ordinary person, Sir, of this Province comes into St. John's from the outports, from the outlying areas from around the bay that he will come straight to the Confederation Building and then within a matter of minutes be funnelled off to whatever department of government, whatever minister, whatever official, whatever member he wants to see. This whole complicated situation now, Sir, that has seen government departments scattered all over St. John's is the direct result of restructuring that was carried out by this administration back some three years ago in their first year in office.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what other reason should there be apart from the convenience of the people who wish to transact business with the government, apart from the convenience of these people, what other reason should there be for merely expanding Confederation Building or putting up a new building linked to Confederation, a twin building if you like, linked to Confederation Building by a tunnel.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Called Neary.

MR. NEARY: Well, you could call it that, Sir. I need a monument erected to me somewhere in the Province. I cannot call the hospital over on Bell Island after me because it is already named. But, Sir, the other reason is an economical one. Sir, it is only ordinary simple economics that it would cost less, it would cost the government less for heat, it would cost the government less for lights, it would cost the government less for security, it would cost the government less for parking, it would cost the government less for snow clearing, it would cost the government less, Sir, to expand Confederation Building or put up a new building here adjoining Confederation Building. It would cost the government less than paying out these huge rents that are being paid out now to landlords scattered all over the, all over Peel's little acre, hell's half acre.

Sir, the honourable the Premier sometime ago talked about a new House of Assembly. Now, Sir, I do not know whether the honourable the Premier was serious or not when he raised this matter, he said that this present House, and this suggestion I must confess, was made before they gerrymandered the districts, this suggestion was made, Sir, even when we had forty-two members in this honourable House. The Premier said the House of Assembly was too small and the honourable the Premier felt that if we expanded Confederation Building, or put up a new building, that we should include in the plans a new House of Assembly.

MR. EVANS: Too bad you will not be there.

AN HON. MEMBER: Are you abdicating -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am not advocating that we do that, Sir. As a matter of fact, in that particular debate that I referred to, the gerrymandering debate, I suggested that the number of members in the House of Assembly be reduced and not increased, because of these days of galloping inflation.

AN HON. MEMBER: Reduce it by one.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, reduce it by five or six or seven. There is no need of fifty-one members in this honourable House. And so, Mr. Speaker, I am not in agreement, Sir, that included in any plans should be a new House of Assembly, not especially in these days of galloping inflation, when there are too many other things that need to be done, when there are too many other things that should get top priority. Our number one priority should not be building a luxurious House of Assembly with wall to wall carpeting and all kinds of push buttons and gadgets and-

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: I am expected in Bonavista by eight o'clock tonight and I do not know if my colleague breaks the speed limits or not.

MR. EVANS: There are quite a few wind bags over there as well.

MR. NEARY: But, Sir, we will get there.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: No special dispensation.

MR. NEARY: No special dispensation, but Sir, and - so at this moment, Sir, I do not believe that this should be used as one of the arguments for expanding Confederation Building or putting up a new building on the grounds of Confederation Building. This should not be used as one of the arguments. That is the Premier again daydreaming, Sir, having illusions of grandeur. And so, Mr. Speaker, while there is great need, Sir, with the way the public service is being built up in the last three years, with the number of Crown Corporations, government agencies that we have now, Sir, just about every ounce of space in the City of St. John's is being utilized by the present administration and at rents, Sir, that would make the hair stand straight on your head in some cases. I would like to see every rental agreement in the City of St. John's and in other parts of this Province, but especially in the City of St. John's, tabled in this honourable House, Philip Place, Sir, included, Crosbie Building on Crosbie Road, the Viking Building, what other buildings?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: What one?

AN HON. MEMBER: The Crosbie one.

MR. NEARY: The Crosbie Building, Sir, it would put some of the rentals charged, Sir, would put the liquor store leases to shame. Put them to shame.

AN HON. MEMBER: I do not agree with you.

MR. NEARY: Well I agree with it. I do not agree with the rentals, now mind you, but I agree with my statement, otherwise I would not make it.

Mr. Speaker, all the agreements that have been entered into in the last three years, Sir, to rent office space for government agencies, Crown Corporations, government departments, ministers, members of the House, should be tabled in this House, Sir.

MR. HICKEY: The only thing is wrong with you people over there is you have a bad mind.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, we have not got a bad mind. Mr. Speaker, how can a member -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, how can a member say that we have a bad mind when all we are doing is asking -

MR. EVANS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - is asking to have the information tabled so that we can scrutinize it, so that we can go through it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, no witch hunt, Sir, not a judicial enquiry, not a royal commission, just Sir, in accordance with the Standing Rules of the House, in accordance with traditional procedure in the House, table all the rental agreements. Why not?

AN HON. MEMBER: That is what they always did.

MR. HICKEY: That is why you fellows tabled everything.

MR. NEARY: But, Mr. Speaker, this is the honourable crowd that were going to change all that.

MR. ROWE: That is right.

AN HON. MEMBER: We have changed it.

MR. NEARY: They have changed it, Sir. Mr. Speaker, I remember when the honourable James Greene was Leader of the Opposition in this House and I remember, Sir, when the honourable Minister of Education, present Minister of Education, was Leader of the Opposition in this House and when the honourable Minister of Social Services was Acting Leader of the Opposition and when the honourable former Mayor of Corner Brook was Leader of the Opposition, all these honourable gentlemen, Sir, argued at one time or another that all government

departments should be concentrated in one area of the city and not scattered all over St. John's. I do not know but my good friend the Member for St. John's East Extern often made that suggestion in this honourable House himself. The honourable member was frustrated on more than one occasion.

MR. HICKEY: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Sir.

MR. HICKEY: But you did such a bad job of providing space.

MR. NEARY: But, Sir, we - Mr. Speaker, here is what we did, here is what Joey did. Joey, Sir, -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - one night had this great vision. Joey had this great vision of providing one building to house all the public servants in Newfoundland, this great dream of a Confederation Building.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: There is nothing wrong with it.

MR. NEARY: There is nothing wrong with it, Sir. And, Mr. Speaker, the honourable the Premier of that day wanted to put Confederation Building -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: In Harbour Grace.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, wanted to put it up on a hill as he wanted to put all -

MR. EVANS: And you wanted it on Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: - all public buildings in Newfoundland he felt should be up on a hill with lights shining on them so that the people who paid for these buildings could see what they were paying for.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: The light is shining on them now.

MR. NEARY: So he came out at that time, Mr. Speaker, he came out here in what was at that time a wilderness area - this was nothing but trees, not even the new part of St. John's was there then. Everybody said, well, now for sure Joey is gone mad. He is cracked. He is gone off his head.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Going to put this beautiful building out in the sticks,

out in the country. The man is mad.

MR. EVANS: Do you believe it now?

MR. NEARY: Sir, I remember when Confederation Building was opening, on opening day, the first session of this honourable House. The Leader of the Opposition was the honourable James J. Greene, Esquire, O.C., now the president of the Tory Party in Newfoundland. I remember, Sir, - now there was supposed to be no politics on opening day, traditionally there was supposed to be no politics although that tradition apparently has been changing over the last few years.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: The first time, Sir, that that tradition was broken in this honourable House, it was broken by the honourable James J. Greene who was Leader of the Opposition, who stood on opening day and condemned former Premier Smallwood and the administration for spending the taxpayers money to put this beautiful building out in the woods, in the sticks. Nobody could get out here.

CAPT. WINSOR: He referred to it as our mortgaged home.

MR. NEARY: Our mortgaged home he referred to it. My honourable friend was sitting in the House that day, our mortgaged home. The man is crazy, he said, look, how are the people going to get out here? No bus service. No parking space. Out in the woods, in the sticks. What foresight Mr. Smallwood must have had, Sir, not only in this matter but all other matters in this Province.

Mr. Greene and all the other people who criticized Confederation Building were proven wrong in a very short time. Now, Sir, you do not have room up here to park your car. There is no parking space up here, and Confederation Building in a matter of five or six years was bursting at the seams.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: What is the point?

MR. NEARY: The point is this, Sir, that we made a courageous and valiant attempt to house all the public servants under one roof so that the people from the ourports, from the outlying areas when they came into St. John's would not have to go to the expense of hiring taxis and travelling around St. John's on foot and in buses, inconvenienced,

to find a minister or some government department that was hid away somewhere in some dark little dingy building outside of Confederation Building.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the former Premier of this Province, Sir, then went to the trouble to have plans drawn up. As a matter of fact when Confederation Building was constructed, Sir, it was constructed with the intention in mind of making provision for expansion. These two wings, Sir, that you see, these two low wings. Confederation Building is up like this and then you have the observation tower and there are two wings going off. Well, Sir, both of these wings are the foundation on which to build up. That is the way it was planned, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Sir, and not only that, Mr. Speaker, plans were made. Plans are in Confederation Building. A model was put on display down in the lobby.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Not up, out.

MR. NEARY: Well, out, up.

But, Sir, my understanding was that you could build up -

AN HON. MEMBER: Extend.

MR. NEARY: Extend Confederation Building, build out, up, sideways, anyway you wanted to, Sir. The foundation was laid. And Mr. Smallwood and the administration of that time, Sir, said that even though we are forced temporarily to go out to find office space for our public servants in other parts of St. John's, there would only be short-term leases, no longer-term leases, because the former administration had committed itself to expand Confederation Building. That was a commitment, Sir, that was made to the people of this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, public tenders would be called.

And so, Mr. Speaker, we are now getting right back to square one.

We are getting back, Sir, -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: - we are getting back -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - we are getting back to the thinking, to the philosophy, to the ideology of an administration, Sir, that developed this idea, this concept of having all the public service under one roof. About how long ago? Was it fourteen or fifteen years ago?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: About fifteen years ago. And it is a good sound policy, Sir. It is, and I congratulate the member for St. John's East in recommending that this is the course of action that the government take. I am all for it, Sir. But the only thing is, Sir, that the member in making his amendment was a bit wishy-washy because he felt, Sir, that he was in trouble enough with the leader of the party and his colleagues.

MR. DOODY: If you are going to Bonavista you had better get going.

MR. NEARY: Yes, I know, Sir, and we will get there eventually. It will only take us three hours to drive down there. I am prepared to give up my supper this evening. But, Sir, my learned friend -

MR. EVANS: (Inaudible).



AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: I am in demand.

My learned friend was too wishy-washy. My learned friend was afraid that he was going to further offend the leader of the party and his former colleagues in cabinet. He had already gotten a flick. They already had a caucus and disciplined the honourable member.

MR. REID: How can the member do any more damage?

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

MR. REID: How can the member do any more damage?

MR. NEARY: The Hon. Minister of Rural Development, Sir, who was so naive, in his simplicity asked me, how can the member do any more damage? Well, Sir, here is how the member can do more damage. By having this House instruct the government to construct any future accommodations that they may need for the public service to construct them here on the grounds of Confederation Building. That is how my honourable colleague is trying to get back without saying so indirectly through the backdoor at the administration for giving him the flick. He is saying, put the accommodations here on the grounds of Confederation Building. And if the House passes that, if the Minister of Rural Development, in his simplicity, in his naivety, if he votes against the sub-amendment and votes in favour of the amendment, then what the minister is doing is putting himself in a strait jacket.

MR. REID: Oh, guaranteed.

MR. NEARY: Because he can no longer then go out, join his colleagues and go out and give contracts to anybody to build other than on the grounds of Confederation Building. Okay, has the minister got it straight now?

AN HON. MEMBER: The Premier has got -

MR. NEARY: I would submit, Sir, -

MR. REID: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: I would suggest, Sir, that the government -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: No, the government will not vote in favour of the sub-amendment or the amendment. And then my learned friend is going to be in a tight spot. My honourable friend is going to be backed up in the corner. What does he do then if they vote against his amendment? What he will say then, Sir, is, oh, this is democracy at work. I made my point. I was not flung out of the party. The Premier will say, oh, this is democracy. You can have different views than the administration and you do not have to leave the party. Oh, Sir, what nonsense -

MR. EVANS: All you need was Joey's sympathy.

MR. NEARY: what

nonsense. How wishy washy can you get, Sir! How soft, Mr. Speaker, how soft can you get and still stay in within the framework of that party?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, it will be very interesting indeed to see how honourable members are going to vote on this sub-amendment. Do they or do they not agree with the House, the elected representatives of the people recording its view and telling the government, look, Mr. Government, if you need additional accommodations for the public service please construct them here on the grounds of Confederation Building. It will be interesting to see how the Member for St. John's East is going to vote on this matter. Will he be consistent? Will he be sincere? Will he become a hero? Tune in tomorrow, no, next week at the same time, Sir, to see the continuing story of -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir.

MR. EVANS: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: - of can a man who once had convictions, ever have convictions again or will he stand on his head, will he do the Highland Fling, will he do the hand springs, will he do political gymnastics. Tune in next week for the next episode in the life of the honourable Member for St. John's East brought to you by Ex Lax. Ex Lax presents the Member for St. John's East.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: It is not only Ex Lax that acts that way.

MR. NEARY: Well, Sir, Mr. Speaker, it is going to be very, very interesting indeed, and I do not think, Sir, somehow or other that the debate is going to wind up today. The member has the right, no, he does not have the right now because we are on the sub-amendment, the member has the right to speak again but only to the sub-amendment, the amendment to the amendment, Sir, which, in my opinion, is a good one and it will eliminate entirely, Sir, any wheeling and dealing.

It will eliminate any possibility of the government going out and making sweetheart agreements with anybody. It will eliminate all this.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: I get the impression you do not trust us.

MR. NEARY: Do not trust who?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Sir, a very good reason for not trusting the minister, for not trusting the minister in the government. Mr. Speaker, let me say this, let me say this, Sir, -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, there is no criticism on my part of any of the firms or individuals who submitted proposals on the -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: The government is wrong.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Sir, the system is wrong. The government is wrong.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: No criticism on my part of any of the individuals, Sir. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I will say this, that if a contract was awarded to construct accommodations here on the grounds of Confederation Building I would like to see it go to a Newfoundlander. I would prefer to see it go to a Newfoundlander than to go to a firm outside of Newfoundland. - Pardon?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Who would you like to see -

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, I do not have any relatives in the construction business, fortunately. I would even, Sir, be glad if my honourable friend, the Old-Conflict-of-Interest were to submit a tender. I would like to, Sir, in accordance with the sub-amendment, I would like to see the government call public tenders in accordance with the Public Tendering Act that was passed by this House and then, Sir, go on and construct the facilities that are so badly needed to house an ever expanding public service right here on the grounds of Confederation Building. Sir, nobody can be against that. To be against that kind of proposal, Sir, is like being against motherhood.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: When do we get -

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: When do we get it finished?

MR. NEARY: When do we get what finished?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: I do not know, Sir. With this crowd, Sir, you will never get it started let alone get it finished. That building, Sir, expansion to Confederation Building or a new building here on the grounds of Confederation Building will be like every other project. It will be started and finished when that honourable crowd are flicked out by the people of this Province and we start our great march forward that was started under the Liberal Party, the Liberal administration in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I would submit that is probably why the Hon. Premier would like to get rid of this present House of Assembly that we are standing in here today. Because every time that you think of Confederation Building, you think of the House, you immediately identify it with Joey, like you do so many other things in Newfoundland. And they would like to, Sir, to be able to remove the Joey image, the Joey identity altogether.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: That who is behind him.

MR. NEARY: And I would say, Sir, that is the reason for that foolish idea that was made - the suggestion made by the Premier sometime ago that we need a new House of Assembly. If we are going to put up a new building -

AN HON. MEMBER: A good, strong editorial supported it too.

MR. NEARY: Well, Sir, maybe so, Mr. Speaker, maybe so, but, Sir I can think of at least three or four other things, other projects in Newfoundland that should rank top priority than a new House of Assembly.

AN HON. MEMBER: I got them all listed here.

MR. NEARY: You have got them all listed have you?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Have you got the cost of living listed? Have you got vandalism and crime listed? Have you got record unemployment listed? Have you got fish markets - markets for our fish listed? And I could go on and on, Sir.

MR. EVANS: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I was just reminded by my colleague the Leader of the Opposition that I had to get to Bonavista. They are waiting for me down there, Sir. John Cabot, Sir, is down there now, I suppose, turning over in his grave at the very thought of this administration continuing in power for another few months. But I will put -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: - I will put the late John Cabot at ease tonight, Sir, I will guarantee you that.

MR. ROBERTS: Hear! Hear!

MR. NEARY: I will put his -

MR. ROBERTS: He will probably cause a rebellion going down ....

MR. NEARY: -I will put his mind at ease, Sir. He has been turning over in his grave now for three years.

MR. EVANS: Are you taking guns with you?

MR. NEARY: But, Sir, with the great tide of Liberalism that is sweeping across this Province -

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. NEARY: - and tonight when I make my few remarks in Bonavista -

AN HON. MEMBER: When you were Leader they ....

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - tonight John Cabot will be able to rest in peace, knowing in his heart, Mr. Speaker, that within a very short time Bonavista South will come back into the Liberal fold.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. NEARY: And in this House of Assembly, in the new Confederation Building, Sir, we will have a Liberal member from that, as Rossie used to say that great and historic district of Bonavista South.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. EVANS: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, -

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: - in conclusion, Mr. Speaker,

MR. BARRY: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: - in conclusion, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Sir, to sum up my few remarks, and I believe, Sir, I still have about ten or fifteen minutes left -

MR. ROBERTS: Forty-five minutes on the amendment.

MR. NEARY: - on the amendment.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: To sum up my few remarks, Sir, I would urge honourable gentlemen to give very serious consideration to voting for this amendment

to the amendment. And what is the amendment to the amendment, Sir, just for those who may not realize what the amendment to the amendment is? Well, Sir, the amendment to the amendment is this - it merely records the feelings of elected members in this honourable House to the government.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is the purpose of it?

MR. NEARY: The purpose of it - well I am coming to that.

That any additional accommodation to house the public service must be constructed here on the grounds of Confederation Building. That is the amendment to the amendment, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: The amendment says that.

MR. NEARY: No, the amendment does not say that. The member just did not want to further aggravate his colleagues, The Member for St. John's East did not want to further aggravate his colleagues so gave the administration a little flick on the wrist. Well, Sir, we are prepared to go all the way and if the honourable member is genuine and sincere and does not want to appear to be hypocritical about this matter or insincere, wants to show the people of this Province that there is a little honesty in politicians, that there is a little honesty in politics then the honourable member and all honourable members on either side of this House will vote in favour of the amendment to the amendment to construct any future additional accommodations that we might need to house the public service in this Province right here on the grounds of Confederation Building, and that would accomplish what my honourable and learned friend started out to do in the beginning.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY) The Hon. Member for Burin.

MR. T. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear'.



MR. HICKMAN:

This undoubtedly is going to be the longest debate in the history of this House of Assembly on a private member's motion.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: After the denturists.

MR. HICKMAN: We had speeches ad nauseam, drones ad nauseam on the main resolution. Then we had that very statesmanlike amendment that challenged the imagination of the Opposition, that called forth the - I realize I cannot speak on the amendment right now - but I was very impressed with the way it called forth the tearful support of the honourable the Member for St. Barbe North. He nearly broke down he was so carried away by the amendment that we will be debating a little later on.

But we are now on this sub-amendment, this sub-amendment which really says nothing. We have not seen it yet, but as far as I can see it says very little. May I say at the very beginning, at the outset that to the surprise of the honourable gentlemen opposite the government will vote in its majority, you know, the majority government, the people who were elected by the people with a very overwhelming majority will vote against the sub-amendment.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: The proper thing.

MR. HICKMAN: Do you think - I am wondering if the honourable the gentleman from St. Mary's feels that it is now appropriate to indicate how we are going to vote on the amendment or should that be the subject matter of the continuing debate?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. HICKMAN: Suspense will continue.

Mr. Speaker, there have been some points made. At one point I find myself in absolute and total agreement with the honourable the Member for Bell Island. That is when he refers to the agitation that went on in the City of St. John's and only in the City of St. John's when this Confederation Building was erected. But that has been tradition. I am told - I was not living in St. John's at the time - I am told that when Elizabeth Avenue was constructed, it was the brain child of the late Sir Brian Dunfield, that when Elizabeth Avenue was constructed the council of the day and other dignitaries in St. John's refused to go to the official opening because it was a concept, that it was away beyond the wildest dreams of man, that Elizabeth Avenue would never but

never be used. It was outside the city. Three years later with the accolades of everyone in St. John's, Sir Brian Dunfield received a well deserved knighthood for amongst many other things, his foresight in setting up the St. John's Housing Corporation which again would never be occupied. But, that has been traditional.

I can recall very vividly when the harbour development was starting in St. John's. Again we had statements galore coming that if these old fallen down historic wharfs were destroyed that St. John's Harbour would disappear as a commercial center. But, lo and behold, it was done. Lo and behold, ships could still turn around in that harbour. To the surprise and chagrin of those who opposed it, the disappointment of those who opposed it, shipping in the harbour increased. Very seldom can you find these people around when you want hope. So it goes.

This building served not only a worthwhile purpose, it was the kind of thing where once in a while a government has to make a decision and do it. The same sort of argument is being advanced with respect to the Harbour Arterial Road. When that vital link to the City of St. John's is completed you will not find anyone around who opposed it. It always seems to be whenever there is any real progress imminent for our capital city for some strange reason there is always a minority of well-meaning people who want to oppose it. Fortunately people who are elected have to exercise their responsibility and proceed with what is for the greatest good for the greatest number.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not certain at all that an extension to this Confederation Building is, beyond all reasonable doubt, the best way to provide the additional accommodation. There are some very strong arguments indeed in favor of an extension to this building.

My first reaction would be to favour it, but I do not know whether or not it would be cheaper to do it that way. I do not know if the financing can be arranged on a building that is already still the subject matter and will be for a few more years of a mortgage in favour of whoever it was built this building. I do not know these things. I do not know whether the public will be completely and better served by being in here than in a rejuvenated downtown St. John's. I do believe that there are certain Crown Corporations that, for instance, should never - Crown Corporation is not the word - quasi judicial bodies that should never been within the confines of a provincial building. The Workmen's Compensation Board and the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities, in my opinion, should not be housed in a provincial building. That concept is not new with me. I did not dream it up today. That concept is contained in the report of the late Mr. Justice Winter on the Workmen's Compensation Act that was tabled in this House in the 1966-1967 sitting when he recommended a separate building for the Workmen's Compensation Board. And I recall that I was a very enthusiastic supporter of that report and recommendation. And Mr. Clyde Wells and I were asked to get on with it, because I wanted the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities to go in that same building. And I wanted to see that building down somewhere where City Hall is because most of the people who go to the Workmen's Compensation Board, who come in to see the doctor or for a further assessment stay in that part of the town and that is where it is convenient for them to get around, the same as for a lot of people who come in making applications for licences to operate taxis and buses and trucks and all that sort of thing. We were full of enthusiasm but greater powers than us intervened and it never came to pass. The next thing we heard they were over in Phillip Place, which was a tragic thing from the point of view of these two boards.

So I do not know, Mr. Speaker, whether or not the public are better served. I do know this that there is no way that we can logically say that the public of Newfoundland are receiving adequate service today with departments of government all over the city. Whether the people

can be best served by putting an extension on to this building, I suppose on balance one would feel that that is probably right. But I do not think it would be in the best interests of the public for the government's hands to be totally tied so that they have no choice. But do you think would happen to us then? We got to go here. Then we are in the hands of the bidders, the tenderers, the architects, the people who are going to draft the design. They got to go here. They got to go on this site here. There is no maneuverability. I would think, Mr. Speaker, that if the price is the same that this is probably the best site for accommodating the growing Civil Service. There is no way of stopping. You might as well give up on it. You cannot stop it. This administration imposed a freeze. I do not know how many people are aware of this. In 1972 in, I think, July there was a freeze. The Hon. Member for St. John's East will correct me if I am wrong. I think it was July of 1972. There was a freeze imposed on the Civil Service. From July to December 31 there was to be no new posts created. If a man went to pension or a lady went to pension, if someone died or if someone retired you would replace them, but not increase the size of the Civil Service. There were to be no new posts for that eight month period or six or seven month period unless it could be shown convincingly that it was in the public interest that a post be declared.

MR. NEARY: I hate to interrupt the honourable minister but there is no quorum.

MR. HICKMAN: I would be delighted to call it quits for this afternoon.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. HICKMAN: Quorum call, great. It is your day. It is Private Members' Day. If you would like us to go home, boy, I am all for it. Call in the members.

Where is the whip? Let us go out and get him in.

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): Do we have a quorum? Would you count the House?

MR. HICKMAN: Now, Mr. Speaker, where was I?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Perhaps start all over again, Minister of Justice so that we could follow the trend of -

MR. ROBERTS: Was there a trend?

MR. HICKMAN: Oh there was a tremendous trend. The honourable Member for Bell Island -

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): Order, please!

MR. HICKMAN: - inquired as to why we had not gotten on with putting up this building. I note that he admits and says that no one could vote against the -

MR. ROBERTS: Is the minister aware that there is a story in the paper.....

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): Order, please! The Chair has inquired from the Clerk whether or not we have a quorum in the House. I have not back that report as yet.

AN HON. MEMBER: I do not interrupt people.

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): We have a quorum. The Hon. Member for Burin.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I advise you we now have a quorum.

The honourable the gentleman from Bell Island, you know, voiced the sentiments of everyone in this House when he says that additional facilities are badly needed and to vote against the concept of additional facilities to house the public servants would be like voting against motherhood. But he did enquire as to as to why we had not gotten on with this before? Well, Mr. Speaker, I would love to be able to take the time of this House to indicate why.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. HICKMAN: I can tell you one reason why. How could we, for instance, put up the building last year or since this administration took over when, for instance, we paved every street does the honourable gentleman from St. Barbe North realize this? every street in the Town of Burin in the last two years.

AN HON. MEMBER: St. Barbe North.

MR. HICKMAN: And Burin and Burin Bay Arm and Burin Bay and Black Duck Cove and Port aux Bras and Salmonier and Salt Pond and Lewin's Cove and Greater Salmonier -

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Very impressive.

MR. HICKMAN: That is one reason why we could not do it, Mr. Speaker, because we were paving these streets. We have done the same in Fortune. That is all in my district. We have done all the new ones in Grand Bank and St. Lawrence. We are going to do Lawn this year. We are going to pave part of the Loop Road. Marystown - that is not even in my district - but I just drool when I look at Marystown. And when I see the millions and millions and millions of well deserved dollars being spent in that great municipality, and when I drive through it I stop and I bow and I genuflect -

MR. OTTENHEIMER: What about Parkers Cove?

MR. HICKMAN: and I look at Barry's monuments all over the place, his stadium -

MR. BARRY: Seven million dollars.

MR. HICKMAN: - his water and sewerage. I can see them underground, I see them above ground, wherever I look - that is why we have not been able to do it. But the time has come, Mr. Speaker, the time has come for us to proceed with the construction of a new building.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. HICKMAN: We have called for tenders. It is going to be an interesting exercise. Oh I forgot, I know what I was going to say - I see one of the gentlemen in the press looking at me wondering why I did not tell you - I was going to tell the House what happened when we put the freeze on the civil service in 1972. Re nods.

In 1972 we put a freeze on, no new posts from July 1, or June 1, I think it was, 1972 to the end of the year unless a minister or his senior official could convince the government and Treasury Board, Treasury Board really, that it was in the public interest to have a new post. With that freeze there were still 700 additional people joined the public service during that period. So people who talk about

putting a freeze on the public service of saying the public service should not grow another inch, that there should be no addition to it, they are not just being realistic. Because as governments implement new programmes, as governments become more and more involved in the everyday life of the people, and I wish government's could avoid becoming so involved in the everyday life of the people but apparently they cannot, apparently public demand is such that we have to continue to pass legislation to create more crown corporations, to create more departments, to create more programmes. I wish we could create a programme, a department, a challenge that would improve productivity as the honourable gentleman from Twillingate has so often said in this Province to make us competitive. I have a feeling that we are beginning to lose our competitiveness in the scheme of things. I am looking at great public buildings that are under construction around this Province, and I am sure the pyramids were built in less time, going on year after year, after year and eating up the taxpayers dollars in construction. You drive across Prince Philip Place and look at the Health Science Centre and the Engineering School, you wonder when it is ever going to end. And I am convinced that three or four years ago these building could have been put up in shorter time.

So we do have a responsibility to the public to provide adequate housing for their servants who are hired to implement the programmes that they seem to desire. It would be wrong, whilst the balance of convenience or the balance of probability appears to favour the construction of a building either an extension or a new building on these grounds, it

MR. HICKMAN: would be quite wrong for the government's hands to be totally tied, This is why the amendment of the honourable Member for St. John's East is so eminently sensible as opposed to that of the honourable Member for Bell Island, and there is no doubt that I do not want to disclose that, I do not want to disclose to the House whether or not we are going to vote for the honourable gentleman's amendment for St. John's East, That is a matter of suspense that will be unfolded next Wednesday or the Wednesday after all honourable gentlemen have had an opportunity to debate the sub-amendment that is now before the House and hopefully to vote against it.

Mr. Speaker, we in government have not made any decision. There has never been a policy decision made as to whether this present accommodation known as the House of Assembly, the place where the Legislature sits, is to be replaced. Government has very prudently asked from time to time the appropriate officials in Public Works to indicate what can be done to provide space for members of the House of Assembly. We have now offices all over this building for members, for members who sit on the backbenches. They are in areas for instance on the fifth floor with no windows, difficult to find, not the kind of privacy that a member is entitled to have, no real accommodation for secretaries down there. Any Provincial Legislature today should, in my opinion, and any government should, probably the most serious obligation it has is to provide adequate accommodation for every member elected to the House.

In Ottawa for instance, they provide offices for the Ministers of the Crown in the Parliament Buildings. It has nothing to do with the offices in their departments. As parliamentarians they also have offices. The members of Parliament have offices with adequate staff. You will find the same in the provincial legislatures and we have not got this here. We have not got the facilities or space on this floor to accommodate them, whether or not, Mr. Speaker, we could take over some other floor immediately below us I do not know. But it would be less - Who is immediately below us? Oh that is the Premier, no, no. No, we will leave the Premier. He is all right. He is going to stay. But whatever it is, there is no question at all that we have always been besieged with complaints, ever since this place opened, of inadequate accommodation for members of the House of Assembly. And we



would be less than prudent if we did not look at it to see whether or not the people could be better served by either totally separate accommodation or as part of a new building. Whatever we do with it it should be an area that is more easily accessible to the public than this place is. We were put on high up here and most of the people, maybe they are right in this, most of the people in Newfoundland could not care less where the House of Assembly is located because they feel this is a place that is almost inaccessible in where it is located, and that is wrong.

So that whilst we are not going to, whilst there has been no policy decision, there has been a very prudent practice of having a look to see whether or not this is the best we can provide.

Mr. Speaker, we need in this Province, and I deal with it now because I have heard the suggestion before, about when you are putting up a public building, do not forget the fact that there is a desperate need, which there is, for a new Provincial Court House. Now, Mr. Speaker, let me make it abundantly clear that a court house under no circumstances can or should be housed in a provincial building. The court house of this Province must always be separate so that the people of Newfoundland can see beyond all reasonable doubt that the Crown, the government, and those who work for government have no greater rights, no better rights when they appear before court than anyone else. And I would strongly fight any suggestion, and any attempt to include a new court house in the provincial building and may I say that in that respect I have the full, unconditional and unqualified support of my colleagues in government.

They will not concede one iota to the suggestion that this should be taken into account when we build a new provincial building. We need a new court house. Most assuredly we need a new supreme court building, a building as the center of the court system in the Province. The cost is going to be absolutely astounding to build the court house. Because of our system here of the Province assuming the full responsibility for the administration of justice, we cannot do as they do in Halifax and in Nova Scotia and in other Canadian Provinces, ask the municipality to build our court house for us.

That new court house, as I have said before, in Nova Scotia was built by the city only two or three years ago. We will have to find the \$20 million or \$30 million or \$40 million in time to put up that new court house building to house all the courts that must be found in the capital city of any province.

Government is firmly committed to the acquisition, hopefully by construction itself or construction anyway of proper accommodations, suitable accommodations, not only for those who are in the public service now but those who are projected to join the public service within the next few years or certainly within the foreseeable future. We must have some freedom of action. I welcome the opportunity to hear from the honourable members of this House their views as to whether or not they would prefer to see this accommodation provided on the grounds upon which the Confederation Building is now located.

But I think that any parliamentarian who recognizes the difference between parliament and government, because they are two separate institutions, two totally separate institutions. There are three separate institutions that function in the governing of any Province. One is the caucus of the political parties. Another is the government, that institution known as government, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. And the third is parliament or the provincial legislature. I am sure that no parliamentarian would wish a government to be so bound that it is robbed of the discretionary powers that are conferred on any government that is elected by the people, that no matter what the cost, no matter what the recommendations were, that it would be bound to build this building on these grounds.

The honourable the Member for St. John's East says something far differently. He, and through him and through his motion the honourable members on this side of the House, and I believe on the other side of the House, will urge the government to provide this additional accommodation upon the Confederation Building grounds. But, that is a far cry from saying, you have to do it no matter what the cost. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House will vote against the amendment with enthusiasm and we will then indicate when the debate resumes on the amendment of the honourable the Member for St. John's East as to where we stand on it. I am sure that from what I have been saying that most people know it now.

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

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, on the sub-amendment, the amendment to the amendment proposed by the honourable Member for Bell Island, is - and I have used this term before - is procedural gymnastics. It is what I would call an acrobatic sub-amendment. It is a device and an excuse to talk on and on and on and on. Apparently forty-five minutes is not long enough for him. Apparently ninety minutes is not sufficient. But he must have 135 minutes which this sub-amendment gives him.

Now, I am surprised that he did not get one of his colleagues to bring forth another amendment. There could easily be a sub-sub-amendment indicating what color the proposed building should be. So, this sub-amendment in my view is vexatious and frivolous and certainly I will vote against it, but I will certainly vote for the amendment proposed by my colleague from St. John's East.

One of the reasons I favor the further building of government offices on or near or about the Confederation Building is that I feel that there should be very little extra building go on anyway. The amount of building that should go on should be kept to an absolute minimum and should merely be some rearrangement of the Confederation Building structure itself.

MR. CARTER: The House of Assembly could, and in my view should, go back to the Colonial Buildings. A very wise person said to me the trouble here, with the House of Assembly here, is that there are no ghosts and no memories, no tradition, although perhaps if given long enough time we could build up a tradition.

In my view the former Premier built or established this House of Assembly here on the ninth floor so as to avoid a possible repetition of the circumstances in 1933, which I understand he witnessed. He was very much afraid of the public and the populous and as a result he wanted to have this House in as an impregnable a position as possible. There is lots of room at the Colonial Buildings, if it is just used for a House of Assembly and a House of Assembly only, with some adjoining offices for government and backbenchers and Opposition, plenty of room there and there is also room there on the grounds for some very modest extension should a modest extension be required and I would suggest it could be done in keeping with the existing architecture.

We have got to learn to stop throwing our money around. Because as I pointed out briefly in a speech a little earlier what causes inflation is government overspending. It is probably the greatest cause. In fact there are some economists who suggest that it is the only cause for inflation, that if all governments were to spend no more than they take in inflation would stop. And it is perhaps a simplistic argument, it is perhaps an over simplification, but in my view it is a very powerful argument and well worth looking into and that is to say that no government should spend more on capital and current account than it takes in in any one year. That is not to suggest that governments should lower their spending. They should spend to the full extent of the money they take in but they should spend no more and certainly no less.

Now, another reason of course that the former administration wanted to bring together all government departments. It was not sufficient for them to bring together all government departments, they wanted to bring the Legislature into the same building as well and we can see some, we can

get some idea of the centralizing mania that went on in the last administration when we see the degrading public address system that was put in from the Premier's Office to the ministers and deputy minister's office. Fortunately, although the equipment is still there, it is not to my knowledge being used and it is only there because it would cost too much to remove it. But it is certainly not used. It has fallen into complete disuse, and I think it is a monument to a degrading dictatorial regime.

However, I do believe that any further extension should occur in the immediate vicinity of this building, with the exception, as I said, of the Legislature going back to the Colonial Buildings. And I do feel that the sub-amendment produced by the sub-Member for Bell Island is frivolous, vexacious, unnecessary and merely a procedural device to talk on and on and on and on, and with those few words I will follow my own advice and sit down.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak this afternoon. I had not expected a sub-amendment of this nature but obviously perhaps I have not learned by sitting opposite the honourable members for so many years not to know the fact that they could not accept an amendment to their motion. It was a sensible suggestion without the attempt of bringing in a picayune sub-amendment which does the same thing as the amendment, purely and simply I think for the purpose of the smallest in their own minds of attempting to get "credit" for the general resolution which I hope will be adopted by this House and that is that any buildings to house public servants be housed on the Confederation Building grounds.

Now I

feel that the sub-amendment, Mr. Speaker, means in essence the same thing as the amendment itself. The Hon. Minister of Justice has indicated, you know, what he thought that I may have thought. But I would submit that perhaps I am the only one that can indicate that and that is that as far as I am concerned that I feel that government must really build on the Confederation Building grounds unless there is very good and compelling reasons to the contrary for not so building. And I have yet to see and I cannot really contemplate what these particular reasons may be but we should not be so closed minded not to recognize the fact that if there are compelling reasons, for instance, perhaps the soil here cannot contain a building, I do not know. But that is very far and very remote, because I would like to take the position that as far as the amendment is concerned it is an amendment urging, and when this honourable House of Assembly 'urges' the government to do it, it is not to be taken lightly by any government at any time, and it is to be looked at very carefully, and it is to be followed. And the government will have to, if the amendment is adopted, will have to look very, very carefully at the building of the building on the Confederation Building grounds. As a matter of fact we will have to construct it here unless very good reasons to the contrary are shown and I, for one, will be very interested in hearing any reasons that are shown that make it infeasible to so construct the building, or make it unacceptable or unreasonable.

So, as I say, I look at this amendment as a small amendment proposed purely and simply for the purpose of their own political desires and their own interpretation of their own political gain in their attempt to band wagaon, because we have to ask ourselves a question, if this is what they wanted, why did they not proposed this in the main motion first when the Opposition brought in the Private Members' Resolution in the first instance? So as far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, the urging of the government is good enough. The urging does, to my mind, the same thing as the sub-amendment and it ill-behooves me as far as I am concerned to follow the lead of a group of people on the other side

side who had the opportunity for so many years to do the things that ought to have been done with respect to public tendering and the ordering of public affairs in this Province, and I have no intention of doing it unless, of course, there are very real and compelling reasons so to do. And there have been no real and compelling reasons brought up by the member for Bell Island, only, as I say, crass political reasons of the basest nature so I have no intention of following it.

There are a few things that the honourable member said that I would like to refer to although perhaps I need not really refer to the honourable member's statements to any great degree because I think they are taken really for what they are worth at all times anyway. And one of the statements that I take exception to, because it has been mentioned two or three times in this House, that when I found myself in the very happy position which I now find myself, as a private member of this House supporting the government, that certain statements are made with respect to my present position sitting between the Hon. Member for Burgeo-LaPoile and the Hon. Member for Port de Grave, I would like to make it quite plain that I, myself, am quite happy to be associated with such honourable gentlemen, and they are certainly real gentlemen, and there are no two people in this House that I could not welcome more heartily being associated with in sitting down. I think these remarks are entirely out of order. Certainly I would much more prefer to sit along side the Hon. Member for Port de Grave and the Hon. Member for Burgeo-LaPoile than I would prefer to sit as I have been apparently passively invited with members of, certainly the official Opposition anyway. It might come as a matter of interest, too, Mr. Speaker, I do not think this has been noted before and perhaps it really is not of interest but it happens to be a bit of coincidence because my great grandfather was a member in this House at the turn of the century. He happened to represent the district of Burgeo for twelve years and subsequently the district of Port de Grave for an eight year period. It is a matter of coincidence historic or otherwise that I now find myself between two honourable gentlemen who succeeded him somewhere down the line.

April 30, 1975

Tape no. 1942

Page 3 - mw

He was also a Tory by the way if that is also a matter of interest.

But, as I say, I do not particularly, Mr. Speaker -

MR. EVANS: Give my respects to your granddad .



-do not particularly, Mr. Speaker, I do not particularly, Mr. Speaker, appreciate that type of statement that has been made from time to time by certain gentlemen opposite, not all of them, because some of them obviously are gentlemen, but from one or two courses in respect to where I now find myself situate. As far as my own feelings are concerned I am quite happy where I am right now. I am enjoying my association, as I say, on the right hand of the honourable Member for Burgeo-LaPoile immensely, and on the left hand of the Member for Port de Grave. I think the type of insulting innuendo that has been put across the House is unworthy of any member of this House and it should really cease.

MR. EVANS: It is only a comment "Bill". It is coming from over there.

MR. MARSHALL: But then, Mr. Speaker, there was another item that the honourable Member for Bell Island referred to and this was the fact that - I know there was some amusement, that we should go back to the concept of the administration which had the concept of everybody being under the one roof. I will agree that that was an admirable concept and one that justifies the amendment but not necessarily the sub-amendment. But I also note with a certain amount of whimsical irony that that was also the administration that not only believed in putting the civil service under one roof but also believed in giving out contracts to one or two or three particular contractors. This is what this whole issue was about and one thing that we are, or certainly we certainly should be, determined to end forever and a day. So, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to vote for the sub-amendment. The Member for Bell Island gave the opinion and he gave the reason for it. He said he did not think that on the other side here that anyone would vote or I would vote for the sub-amendment or the amendment. So by his own words he is really admitting that the sub-amendment are really one and the same thing, which is really what they are. I can say

this, that I will publicly and privately, as I am now, I will have to be convinced that there is very compelling reason that I cannot see now for constructing a building to house the civil servants anywhere other than on the grounds of the Confederation Building.

Now, the honourable Minister of Justice in speaking for the government indicated the government would vote against the sub-amendment. I assume from his words that he means that the government is perhaps, although he is going to keep us in quote "suspense" for a period of time, that the government is going to vote as well for the sub-amendment because he did make a couple of statements. He is not sure if the extension would be the best way and if we can get financing. Would the public better be served by Confederation Building or rejuvenated downtown St. John's? These are points that I went into last Wednesday and I do not particularly, I do not think it serves any interest to go into it again further because I think most definitely the interests of the public are served best by building an extension to the Confederation Building or housing the additional building here, quite obviously.

So this I am adamantly sure of, Mr. Speaker, that whatever is done we must have free, complete and absolute open tendering, and this must be the mode of which any building is built. I do not believe that it is a good procedure to go by way of lease, something else I also mentioned last week. But there is, as I say, we must have open public tenders and as far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, that there will have to be as far as I am concerned good and compelling reasons, which I cannot see now and I would very surprised if they existed, why the building should not be built on the grounds of the Confederation Building.

The sub-amendment, as I say, is just a repetition of what the amendment achieves because there is no doubt in my mind with the wording of the amendment, if this amendment is passed which says that the House urges the government to construct it here on the grounds

of Confederation Building, and as I say there is going to have to be very compelling reason for the government to act otherwise.

So consequently for these reasons I shall vote against the sub-amendment but obviously I am going to vote and whatever the outcome, continue to advocate the substance of the amendment to the main resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, just a few words on the sub-amendment.

Pardon?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Well, I got my orders, got my orders, yes. All straightened out now, I tell you.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it seems every time I stand up I am immediately following the Member for St. John's East. It would begin to appear that somehow I have been designated to respond to things he says. Well, that is not so, Mr. Speaker, I want to assure him. But I find that what he has to say is first of all worded so well, and two, very often and so direct. It is a direct contradiction with some of the things I feel about the same subjects, that I feel constrained to reply. I make it clear that I reply to his arguments and not to him personally. I cannot muster, if even I tried - I see no purpose in trying - but I cannot muster the kind of disdain which he can for people who sit in various parts of the House. I cannot allow the accident, in some respects, of an election to decide who gentlemen are.

MR. BARRY: We love you "Roger".

MR. SIMMONS: I love you too "Leo". I happen to think that some of the people on this side of the House can act from pure motives despite what the Member for St. John's East said. If I were not in such a good mood this hour in the afternoon I would begin to get resentful with the suggestion that everything we do on this side is done with some conniving, under the table motive. Listening to the Member for St. John's East one would think that somehow he had a particular grudge against people who sit on this side of the House. He is always very cautious of course to exclude my very dear friend from Labrador South.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: But, anyway, the Member for St. John's East thinks you are a gentleman, thinks the Member for Labrador South is a gentleman, Mr. Speaker. We agree on that, Mr. Speaker. We agree on that. We agree not only on that but on a number of other issues that the Member for St. John's East has been involved in. He does not like the idea of being

associated with us in any particular venture, but I plead with him in the quiet of the evening when he gets alone with himself to have a chat and go over each of us in his mind and ask himself if we are just as bad as he has again painted us here this afternoon. Perhaps somewhere there is a little spark of goodness in at least one of us. If he would be so good -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: There must be a little bit of good -

MR. SIMMONS: - so good as to admit to it, I am sure he would not only do us a favor to know that he thought that there was some good in us, but I am sure he would do himself a favor in that he would recognize that he is too capable of doing some soul baring at times. He talked about his seating. Well, I agree with him. I agree with him. Perhaps the coincidence of being where he is is somewhat historical. I was delighted to hear the little anecdote involving his forebearer.

MR. F. ROWE: Did you not know the Premier was a historian?

MR. SIMMONS: The coincidence, Mr. Speaker, I suggest is historical, but the history behind his being there is not coincidence, no coincidence. It was a planned move, a very planned move as my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition has said. The history of his being there is no coincidence although the coincidence, as he thinks of his being there, may be historical.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, to the sub-amendment. It has been suggested by the Member for St. John's East that there is no difference in meaning introduced by my colleague from Bell Island. I would say there is a big difference. I say if we are not sure of what the difference is, let us look back to another incidence in this House where we had a private members' resolution where the word urge was used in that resolution. I refer to a private members' resolution of last session introduced by the Member for St. John's South in which he urged with all within him for the government to take some action on election expenses.

Now, the Member for St. John's East says that no, urging is not to be taken lightly. Well, this government takes it very lightly as is shown in the past. He, that same member, urged the government before he left the cabinet to undo the agreement over which he left. He urged the government to call public tenders on the matter. It took

MR. SIMMONS: not only his words in and out of the House of Assembly, it took his resignation from Cabinet to get government to change its mind, So I say to him in his own experience of the past few months he has proven the difference between urging and directing. He has proven that urging is of no avail with this government and you have got to put the gun to their head as he had the courage to do and that is what my colleague has done in his sub-amendment. He is asking to put their money where their mouth is. My colleague knew and I knew that with the term 'urge' everybody on the opposite side of the House would get up and support what he had to say, knowing that they were not being bound to do anything anyway.

But we equally knew that when they were asked to put their money where their mouth is with a word like 'directs,' which did not get accepted but the essence is in the sub-amendment that I did get accepted, when that kind of a term is introduced, when the gun is put to their head then they begin making decisions awfully fast.

You know, Mr. Speaker, what I found most curious about the whole affair this afternoon was that the gentleman, the Member for St. John's East who insisted there was no difference in the sub-amendment and the unamended amendment, who insisted that, could not restrain himself at all when the original sub-amendment was introduced this afternoon, he was the first on his feet. The very first on his feet to cite reasons as to why it should not be ruled in order. If it were the same what was he afraid of?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have been accused before of having a suspicious mind. That is for others to judge but just let me allow that mind to work again or to divulge to you some of the things I have been thinking since the Member for St. John's East introduced this amendment. You see, Mr. Speaker, if you go back to the original motion, and the Member for St. John's East has suggested in his comments that if we were in favour of what we are purporting to be now with the sub-amendment, we would have introduced this in the beginning he says, but of course he fails to recall what was in the original motion, conveniently forgets what was in the original motion because I do not think he forgot it at all, I think he remembered it all too well and it was to get

this motion of mine effectively off the Order Paper that he introduced his amendment in the first place. Because he knows full well, as Mr. Speaker knows, that the minute that this amendment of his is carried, the whole matter of rentals will be irrelevant to the debate on the amended motion.

And so the assignment was this, Mr. Speaker, insofar as I am concerned, let us find- and before I go into that, Mr. Speaker, let me say also that the Order Paper is equally open to the Member for St. John's East as it is to any other member. If he wants to put on a private resolution about what he feels about public tenders, or what he feels about the location of additional office space for the public service, sir, he could well, it was his privilege to introduce that as a separate motion. But he did not do that because I say to him this afternoon that the real assignment in concocting this amendment was to find an artful way of effectively removing this motion from the Order Paper. I say that was the assignment, without at the same time committing the government to any particular course of action.

Now the member is to be commended because he did that in a most artful way with the amendment he brought in, And things were going well for him and whoever he consulted on the matter before he brought in the amendment or on whoever may have advised him to bring in that amendment, - that is for him to say - going very well until my colleague from Bell Island got up this afternoon and kind of complicated the issue by introducing an amendment that asked the government to put its money where its mouth is, asked the government to make a decision, not just to give support to some pansy resolution, or some pansy amendment, but to take a decision on this particular matter. And so while he does the double talk of saying, well it is all the same anyway but I cannot vote for it anyway,

I think he has finally realized that he has got himself in a dilemma that he cannot quite talk his way out of. Mr. Speaker, let me respond in speaking to the sub-amendment to one or two other things that were said by persons in this debate this afternoon.

I think I dealt with most everything on the first page so I will come quickly to the second page before I clue up. Before getting away from the comparison, the analogy I was drawing to the resolution of last Spring with the motion that had been introduced by the member for St. John's South, he introduced the motion which urged the government to come to grips with the election expenses thing. Of course, we all know that nothing was done on that at all until my colleague from Twillingate introduced Bill No. 10 at the beginning of this session, a bill, "An Act To Regulate Political Party Financing And Election Contributions And Expenses." And then, lo and behold, within hours of my colleague from Twillingate having introduced his notice of motion, lo and behold, we hear from the government that they are going to have a Select Committee on election expenses. Now mind you that is all we have heard from them. We have not heard much since except another notice of motion that they are going to set up this committee. Again, Mr. Speaker, I believe this is a clear example of why we have got to do something a little stronger than urge. We got to give this crowd orders as the member for St. John's East found out. We got to tell them exactly what to do. Because if there is either shade of interpretation left open, they will take the other way out.

I read the debate, Mr. Speaker, in which the member for St. John's East participated and in which the Leader of the Opposition participated and particularly I read the comments of these two gentlemen in the debate when the Public Tendering Bill was debated here last Spring. And one of the things my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, pointed out was the possibility, and he was kind of enough to say, well it is probably a remote possibility - I do not know if it is going to happen with this administration or that kind of thing - but he said there is the possibility that the following kind of thing will happen, and he then spelled out a set



of circumstances. And if you read that debate, Mr. Speaker, you will find out that the set of circumstances that he put out then as being hypothetical, which they were at that time, are paralleled very closely by the set that brought about the resignation of the member for St. John's East from the cabinet. My colleague predicted last Spring not that it would happen, but that under the legislation which we described at that time as being very loose, and it has certainly been proven that it has been like that, he predicted not that the event would happen, but he did predict that the possibility was there. The member for St. John's East, as he will probably recall, in that same debate conceded that, yes, this could happen and no, you could not take care of everything in legislation and yes, he was sure that the government would not do that kind of thing anyway.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: No, Mr. Speaker, he found out that the government would do that kind of thing and did do that kind of thing and did seek to, on the Wedgewood Park proposal, enter into an agreement. Now much has been said about that agreement as to whether it is an agreement or whether it is not an agreement. Since I last spoke on the matter someone suggested that I misconstrued the matter somewhat. Well let me refer once again to the letter that was written to Omega Investments on November 15 and signed by Mr. Farrell, Dr. Farrell, as the Minister of Public Works and at that time it said: "Your proposal to rent to the government of Newfoundland and Labrador space in an office building to be erected on Torbay Road, St. John's, in accordance with the terms and conditions set forth in your letter of November 13, 1974 amended as agreed, copy attached, is accepted."

that letter, those documents, including that letter, to two persons who are in the construction business and whom I understand, I do not know, Mr. Speaker, whom I understand would probably be in the ball league, the league to be bid on this kind of - to make this kind of space available - two people who are therefore able to pass a judgment on the matter. And they say, if I were Omega Investments, if I were Mr. Craig Dobbin - whom I am pleased to see in the gallery this afternoon - if I were Mr. Craig Dobbin I would have an agreement; I would have an agreement. That letter would be my agreement. The government has committed itself to paper.

Well far be it for me to advise Mr. Dobbin or Omega Investments how to run their business. Mr. Dobbin has proven already that he can run a business extremely well, very successfully to the benefit of a lot of Newfoundlanders. That is not our point here. Unfortunately the Member for St. John's East tried to misconstrue that as the point. And because in my first speech I did not particularly eulogize Omega or Mr. Dobbin, and indeed, Mr. Speaker,

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: - indeed, Mr. Speaker, -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: - indeed, Mr. Speaker, not only -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: No, I am trying to set the record straight on something that the Member for St. John's East badly misconstrued, Mr. Speaker. And I say that he was most irresponsible and misconstrued in that way. He was using the red herring approach once again, and had he addressed himself to the method that I raised or has he changed his mind on this rental bit, Mr. Speaker. A curious thing has happened to the Member for St. John's East. He bared his soul a month or two ago and he got out of the cabinet, or was he flung out?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: We will take his word that he got out on his own. And he told the country at that time that he got out on a matter of principle. And he has been ever since, Mr. Speaker, -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: - doing knee bends. He has been ever since, Mr. Speaker, showing the people of this House, and those who come here - I can only assume he is showing them how sorry he is for leaving. Has he had second thoughts? Did he over react in the first place?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Well that, Mr. Speaker, is for him to answer. But it is for me to clarify when he gets up, Mr. Speaker, and badly misconstrues something that I have said. And going back to the speech which introduced this, which opened the debate on this particular motion, Mr. Speaker, I did not particularly eulogize the developer who was involved. Nor did I, Mr. Speaker, if you will check the record, nor did I say anything, not one solitary word unkind about that gentleman, because I had no reason to, Mr. Speaker. My few personal -

MR. BARRY: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: - the Minister of Mines is needing enlightenment again.

MR. BARRY: I would like to see the Hansard ....

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I do not have the Hansard because I do not think it is out yet, but if it is I will sit down and read it with the minister and I will repeat for the record so he can compare the two. The speech of two Wednesdays ago was this speech.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: And I repeat, one, I did not eulogize that developer, and two, I did not say one unkind word about him, because, Mr. Speaker, that was not the issue.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: That was not the issue, Mr. Speaker.

And so when we heard the Member for St. John's East get up and misconstrue my comments, I said to my friend here from St. Barbe North, set the record straight. This is not a witch hunt.

And we have heard that term applied to a particular member of this House, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: This is not a witch hunt.

MR. F. ROWE: No way!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker - what was that? What was that?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Placentia West -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: - says that I had to do something and suck back or whatever the term is. I will tell him, and I will tell you, and I will tell anybody who wants to listen to me, I will tell him this, Mr. Speaker, that I am prepared to suck back or whatever he calls it, I am prepared to do anything that has to be done if in making comments publicly I leave any impression that I did not intend to leave. And I do not care how much, in his term, sucking back, has to be done. I am prepared to do anything that will set the record straight because my - the thesis, the whole central argument that I was pursuing in introducing this motion was that the government should have called public tenders. And we say where there is smoke there is fire.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: No, Mr. Speaker.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: At least I can wiggle.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Come on now.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: At least I can wiggle.

MR. YOUNG: You are darn well right.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: At least I can wiggle.

MR. YOUNG: You are darn well right you can wiggle.

MR. SIMMONS: You would know.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Honourable members to my left seem to persist in not paying attention to calls of order from the Chair. Again the Chair repeats that when a member is speaking he does have the right to be heard in silence. If honourable members choose not to regard that rule, then further action may have to be taken.

MR. F. ROWE: Give them a drink of formaldehyde.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes. My colleague reminds me that the Member for Harbour Grace of course deals normally with the people who do not wiggle.

MR. YOUNG: (Inaudible) N.T.A. (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: Oh, Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege. Mr. Speaker, I have never suggested, never suggested that the honourable gentleman from Harbour Grace is not an honest businessman, never suggested it. I would ask him to retract any inferences that during my term with NTA I did anything which was either dishonest or improper as can be read from the inference. I do not think this kind of thing is called for and I ask him to retract it without any qualification.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: (First part inaudible). Stand up and say it.

silence, the honourable member does not have the right to refer to another honourable member as a Yahoo. I would certainly request the honourable Member for Hermitage to withdraw that comment.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the accurate but unparliamentary comment. I now again request that the Chair give me some protection so I can speak. I have been here trying for a half hour. Well, I will not use the term -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Okay, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The rules with regards to honourable members that an honourable member has the right to be heard in silence, of course, applies to both sides of the House.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, we should not forget the central reason we introduced that particular resolution two weeks ago, the original unamended motion. We still need a select committee to find out exactly what went on, not only in respect to the agreement that was mentioned in the green and incomplete document intended for obviously green people because it is not complete. There are other bits of correspondence that the government did not put in there. Not only that agreement, Mr. Speaker, but other agreements. What else has gone on? What about the curious Trizec deal which the Premier announced one day in the House was all off and the next day -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

While the motion was proposed originally by the honourable Member for Hermitage, it would certainly be relevant if he was speaking to the main motion. We are now speaking to the sub-amendment as proposed by the honourable Member for Bell Island. The Chair submits that the honourable Member for Hermitage is not at all relevant to the sub-amendment.

MR. ROBERTS: Your Honour, may I speak to that point, Sir. I am not challenging your ruling but the point of the sub-amendment is to direct the government to erect some buildings here at Confederation Building. I would submit that references to proposals by the government to erect buildings other than that at Confederation Building, Sir, nothing

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Do not be so cowardly, boy. Get up and say it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Again, for the second time this afternoon, if honourable members were quiet and observe the rule that when a person is speaking, he does have the right to be heard in silence, it would certainly give the Chair an opportunity to hear what was being said. For the second time this afternoon, when three or four person are talking when they should not be talking, the Chair failed to catch the comments made by the honourable Member for Harbour Grace.

MR. YOUNG: I would like to make a statement, Mr. Speaker. May I Sir? I think it is not fair to bring a departed loved one, if they are loved ones of someone on the floor of this House of Assembly and used like -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. YOUNG: I think it is a disgrace, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: What has that got to do with us?

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

The Chair has made a ruling. I recognize the honourable Member for Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, in the humor of the occasion, I was being light with the Member for Port de Grave or Harbour Grace. I do not apologize for the business he is in. If he is apologizing for the business he is in, well he should get out of that particular business.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I will not comment on that. Mr. Speaker -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: I have all the time in the world, boy, all the time in the world.

Mr. Speaker, the central argument of what I had to say -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, do I have the right to be heard in silence or must I listen to that Yahoo over there, Yahoo.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

While the honourable member does have the right to be heard in

could be more relevant to the sub-amendment than that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair has made a ruling. If honourable members feel that the Chair is wrong, then the honourable member has the right to appeal the Chair's ruling.

MR. SIMMONS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I can get back on the immediate subject at hand. I had thought the other was relevant. But if Mr. Speaker says it is not so it is not.

I think the point needs to be made though for people who are not knowing how to vote on this one including the Minister of Justice, Mr. Speaker, including the Minister of Justice who does not know how to vote on this sub-amendment. I would suggest that the appropriate thing to do now is to vote for the amendment which my colleague has brought in because that would direct the government in effect - or let me say it would not direct, no. That was unparliamentary or not unparliamentary but it was not allowed under the -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

It now being six of the clock I do now leave the Chair until ten o'clock tomorrow as by the previous motion which has been carried.



## CONTENTS

April 30, 1975	Page
<b>Statements by Ministers</b>	
Mr. Ottenheimer announced a twenty-five per cent increase in high school bursaries for the academic year starting in September 1975. Mr. F. Rowe responded.	5572
Mr. Ottenheimer announced the appointment of Herbert Hellen as Community Music Consultant with the Department of Education. Mr. F. Rowe responded.	5576
<b>Presenting Petitions</b>	
By Mr. Howard on behalf of residents of the Southside of Western Bay asking that the Southside Road in the community be paved. Supported by Mr. Neary, Mr. Rousseau, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Young.	5578
<b>Answers to Questions for which Notice has been Given</b>	
Mr. Barry replied in the negative to a question from Mr. Neary as to whether Cabot Group 4 Limited has received any payments from the Department of Mines and Energy.	5582
<b>Oral Questions</b>	
Incorporation of NORDCO. Mr. Neary, Mr. Barry.	5582
Query as to whether NORDCO is a private company or a Crown Corporation. Mr. Neary, Mr. Barry.	5582
Query as to whether NORDCO has hired staff. Mr. Neary, Mr. Barry.	5583
Query as to whether NORDCO has let or will be letting contracts, if the Public Tendering Act was followed, whether loans or guarantees have been approved, and whether NORDCO will submit an annual report to the House. Mr. Neary, Mr. Barry.	5584
Query as to whether NORDCO will be responsible to the House. Mr. Neary, Mr. Barry.	5585
Query as to whether the Canso water bombers have returned to the Province. Mr. Neary, Mr. Rousseau.	5586
Query as to ministerial awareness of the circumstances surrounding the decision to award the contract for refurbishing of two water bombers to Field Aviation. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Rousseau.	5587
Ministerial awareness that the Cansos were halted en route west while consultations continued, why the decision was reached and the contract awarded to Field Aviation. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Rousseau.	5588
Cost of the project and participation of Ottawa in financing it. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Rousseau.	5588
Query as to who dispatched the aircraft. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Rousseau.	5589
Query as to whether the contract was awarded to the lowest bidder. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Rousseau.	5589
Federal-Provincial Agreement under which the project was financed. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Rousseau.	5590
Request that the Federal-Provincial Agreement under which the project was financed be laid on the table of the House as well as a copy of the minutes of the Committee which processed the project. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Rousseau.	5592

CONTENTS - 2

Oral Questions (continued)	Page
Request that the agreement and the minutes of the committee be laid on the table of the House. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Hickman, Acting Premier.	5593
Query as to whether the Minister was aware that a Newfoundland company was low bidder on the project, and if so what Ministerial action followed. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Roussea.	5594
Mr. Roberts expressed dissatisfaction with the answer and gave notice that he wished to debate the matter on the adjournment.	5594
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.	
Debate on the amendment moved April 16 by Mr. Marshall continued by <u>Mr. Neary</u> who had adjourned the debate April 23.	5598
Mr. Neary moved a sub-amendment ruled out of order by the Chair.	5602
Mr. Neary moved a sub-amendment.	5607
Mr. Neary spoke to the sub-amendment.	5608
Mr. Hickman	5627
Mr. Carter	5637
Mr. Marshall	5639
Mr. Simmons	5646
Adjourned the debate.	5658
Adjournment	5658