



**PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND**

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND**

---

---

Volume 4

4th. Session

Number 23

---

---

**VERBATIM REPORT**

**WEDNESDAY, APRIL 2, 1975**

**SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE M. JAMES RUSSELL**

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I understand we have in the galleries today eight Grade XI students from the Henry Gordon Academy at Cartwright, Labrador with their teacher, Mr. Pittman. On behalf of all the honourable members I welcome you to the galleries and trust that your visit here is most interesting.

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

HON. H.R.V. EARLE (MINISTER OF FINANCE): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition from the residents of St. Bernard's, Jacques Fontaine, Bay L'Argent, Little Bay East, Little Harbour East and Harbour Mille. This is all combined in one petition. The prayer of this petition is that the main road from these settlements to the Burin Highway be upgraded and paved. I, of course, support this petition, but in so doing I should like to say that particular stretch of road, which is approximately twenty miles in length, has had more money spent on it in the past three years than in the past twenty years preceding that. There has been a tremendous amount spent on it. It is a very difficult road and very difficult road to build, a very expensive road.

It is gradually being upgraded to full standard and hopefully when the Department of Transportation and Communications come through with their estimates we may get other work done this year which may go a long way towards completing the upgrading. But I do not think and do not anticipate that it will be paved this year because it will not be ready for paving, but it should by the end of this year be in a position to be paved, in a condition to be paved.

At the present time there are many protests coming in from that area. One of them was mentioned the other day by a member on the opposite side of the House. Because of the usual Spring conditions, this is aggravated by the fact that construction went on last year. Now,

where the contractor left off last Fall, of course, the road conditions are extremely soft and bad. With the terribly difficult and hard winter that we have just experienced, conditions are deplorable there. I have been in touch with the Department of Transportation and Communications I think on an average of once a day for the past couple of weeks and they are doing their utmost to get the road in reasonably passable condition and have done reasonably well considering the conditions under which they are working.

However, the final solution as expressed in this petition, is that the road can never be in top-notch condition until it is finally paved and hopefully with the work going ahead this year and succeeding years, that will be done. I support this petition and ask that it be laid on the table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in supporting the petition presented by the Minister of Finance, the member for Fortune Bay. Certainly the people of Jacques Fontaine, Little Bay East, St. Bernard's and Bay L'Argent have made a legitimate request and a request that is going to be re-echoed by many people around this Province in the next few weeks. A need for paved roads in the area mentioned is a pressing one. I note with interest the statement by the minister that more work has been done in the last three than in the past twenty-three.

Well, first of all, of course, Mr. Speaker, that is one, a matter of opinion and secondly, a very grave indictment of the minister who is also a member of the same district during the period before three years ago. I wonder why he sees fit to mention it, but if he wants to mention it, let us mention it in context, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Jacques Fontaine, Little Bay East, Bay L'Argent and St. Bernard's must take strong exception - I certainly do so on their behalf - to hear that they were neglected during the period during which the minister was the Liberal member for that same area.

That aside, Mr. Speaker, we wholeheartedly support the petition and use the opportunity once again to appeal to the Minister of Transportation to make available to the House the projects that are intended for upgrading and paving this year. I would hope he intends to do it during his estimates. Otherwise, I would hope we would get some indication from him that it will be done within the next couple of weeks so that we can have some idea of what projects are being undertaken this year by his department.

On behalf of my colleagues I take

much pleasure in supporting the petition presented by the minister.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any other petitions?

The Hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

HON. J. R. ROUSSEAU (MINISTER OF TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS): I would like to take this opportunity to support the petition so ably presented by my colleague, the Minister of Finance. I might say that this morning, at the request of the Minister of Finance, I did meet with a delegation from the area. I think there were ten or twelve in the delegation and they were quite reasonable, we explained the situation to them, and it is always nice to meet people and be able to talk to them and explain the situation. They were very understanding, and for my part I appreciate that and we will attempt to give them every consideration possible when the works for the year are carried out. So I have great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in supporting the petition of my honourable colleague, the honourable member for the district and the Minister of Finance who has been on numerous occasions during the past couple of weeks constantly bringing to my attention the plight of the people in that area with regard to the roads and the soft conditions, and has done it with reasonable persistence. He understands the situation and it has not at all deterred him from bringing it to my attention daily and we will certainly attempt to try and do everything we can to improve the conditions down there, and to give every consideration to the people in this area when the programme unveils during the year.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any other petitions. Does the Hon. Minister of Industrial Development have a petition?

HON. C. W. DOODY (MINISTER OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT): No, yes, Mr. Speaker, please. I have a petition here that I would like to present to the honourable House, Sir, on behalf of the residents of Brigus Junction, in the district of Harbour Main. There are forty-eight signatories here to this petition, Sir, and the prayer of the petition is simply that the residents would like to have the road paved from the Trans-Canada Highway into Brigus Junction. The road has very rarely received any attention. Most people think of the area, or Brigus Junction as being

a Summer cottage area primarily and almost exclusively, but indeed, Sir, there are, as the petition demonstrates more than more than forty, there are forty-seven residents who have signed this petition.

So, Sir, I would ask that the Department of Transportation and Communications give this petition every possible sympathy and do what they can this year to upgrade and pave the road for the people in Brigus Junction. And I ask that this petition be tabled and presented to the appropriate department.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if there ever has been a petition brought into this honourable House worthy of more support from honourable members than the one just presented by the junior Member for Harbour Main in the new provincial district of Harbour Main-Bell Island.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. NEARY: It gives me a great deal of pleasure, Sir, in behalf of my colleagues -

AN HON. MEMBER: And your future constituents.

MR. NEARY: and my future constituents in that great and historic district, Sir, to support the petition presented by the honourable member. I know, Sir, that in the past couple of years the people in the Head of the Bay have managed to get a little sprinkling of pavement here and there, and I know that my honourable and good friend and sparring partner in the next provincial election, because, Mr. Speaker, make no bones about it, the battleground in the next election will be the district of Harbour Main-Bell Island.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: And I am sure that my colleague and friend will work tooth and nail to try and get that bit of pavement from the Trans-Canada down to Brigus Junction, especially, Sir, to look after some of the people over there who have these Summer cottages.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any other petitions? The Hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

HON. L. R. BARRY (MINISTER OF MINES AND ENERGY): Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a petition on behalf of my constituents in the community of Petit Forte, Placentia Bay. The prayer of the petition is as follows:

We the people of Petit Forte petition you to provide us with a better coastal boat service -

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. BARRY: than we are receiving.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: The service which our present boat offers is deplorable. There have been constant delays of one or two days, and we feel that the recent delay of eleven days is inexcusable.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: And I agree, Mr. Speaker.

Since we depend entirely on the CN coastal boat for mail, freight and passenger service we think that to say the least we are being treated unfairly in comparison to other outport areas of Newfoundland. We want a more convenient and modern vessel like the Petit Forte rather than the Bonavista. Also whenever a delay occurs we want the captain to phone our community and let us know about it. And whenever a lengthy delay of more than two days is happening, we request a replacement boat.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this petition is signed by approximately seventy residents of Petit Forte. And anybody who knows the good people of this community knows that they are far from demanding, Mr. Speaker. They are very gentle people. I suppose they are a little too quiet and undemanding in light of the way -

MR. NEARY: They need a new member.

MR. BARRY: events -

MR. DOODY: A federal member.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. BARRY: In the way government attention used to be provided to communities, which was often based on granting services to the people who made the most noise or caused the most trouble, Mr. Speaker. But I can say from my experience that the people of Petit Forte, and I think, anybody, as I say, who is familiar with this community knows that when the people of Petit Forte feel that they have to bring a petition to the House of Assembly, to bring to the attention of the House of Assembly then there is a very serious problem, Mr. Speaker.

It is not just your normal inconvenience. It is a very serious problem and I have great pleasure in supporting this petition. We know, Mr. Speaker, that this is a responsibility, of course, of the federal Crown Corporation and I ask that this petition be forwarded to CN, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MURPHY: Paddy Canning 1952.

MR. BARRY: It is the CN coastal boat service, Mr. Speaker. I will be making representation myself to the Crown Corporation but I would like to ask that all honourable members join with me in supporting this petition. Petit Forte has been a neglected community. It was that and Southeast Bight, the community directly across the mouth of Paradise Sound from it, were the only two communities left in the Province when this administration came in that were entitled to electrification under the existing policy and did not have it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: What about the roads you promised them?

MR. BARRY: There has been no roads promised, Mr. Speaker, but I am doing my best to try and see that the funds can be provided for this very essential hookup -

MR. NEARY: Do not dream on it.

MR. BARRY: But, Mr. Speaker, in the meantime they do not have a road, they are totally dependent upon the coastal boat service and I think that they are entitled to expect better service than they have been receiving up to now.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure that I on behalf of my colleagues support this petition from the seventy or so residents of Petit Forte. It touches on an issue that is of concern to not only the people of Petit Forte but certainly to people in my District of Hermitage and people generally along the South Coast of the Province.

I believe it is also a well know fact that the service along the coast is from all reports and from a little first hand knowledge, and I did use the coastal boat service a couple of



times this winter just to see what it was like once again, and from all reports I gather it has deteriorated considerably and I quite agree with the minister that it is time for us all to gang up on those responsible to see if the service cannot be improved, not only in terms of frequency of service but in terms of the kinds of boats presently being used on the service.

On behalf of my colleagues I am delighted to support this petition. It should be noted, of course, that transportation services to Petit Forte insofar as CN is concerned is one thing but the road that my friend from Bell Island reminds us of is quite another matter, and the minister chose to ignore this matter, but here is an area where the government can do something. I quite agree this is a federal Crown Corporation but I would like to hear the minister address himself to the things that his government can do, has promised to do and has not come through on.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any other petitions?

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

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

HON. J. ROUSSEAU, MINISTER OF TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS:

I have an answer, Mr. Speaker, to question no. (17) on the Order Paper of March 11, 1975, asked by the honourable Member from Bell Island. To ask the Minister of Public Works and Services to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

- (1) What is the nature of the arrangements which have been made by government for the telecommunication of press releases, statements and bulletins both in written form and in verbal form by manner of voice tapes by the Newfoundland Information Service to radio stations, television stations and newspapers in the Province?

The second question -

- (2) On what date did this telecommunication service commence?

The third question -

- (3) For each radio station, television station and newspaper office which has a telecommunication linkage with the Newfoundland

Information Service of Government:

- (a) What is the name of this station or office;
- (b) What is the name of the town or city in which it is located;
- (c) what is the quantity, type, make and model of the telecommunications equipment that has been provided it for this purpose;
- (d) what is the monthly cost to that station or newspaper or to the company or corporation which owns or operates it for the operation of this telecommunications equipment and for the information service which is provided it by means of this equipment?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Should I answer it or table it?

MR. NEARY: These are the questions. What about the answers.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Do you want the answers?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: No, table them.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Why?

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Yes, well I would like to know the answers too.

MR. NEARY: All of us would like to know the answers too, but table them.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I will table them. I have not got the energy to stand up that long today. I am tired. Here are some for the press if they want them.

ORAL QUESTIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Social Services, my good and loyal and faithful friend would be good enough and kind enough to inform the House when the poor, unfortunate people of Bell Island who are unemployed and in distress because of no fault of their own, will be getting some of these chips and pies that are being delivered by McCain's.

HON. A.J. MURPHY (MINISTER OF SOCIAL SERVICES): I would be only too happy, Mr. Speaker, as I told the member about ten minutes ago. They are unfortunate in one respect. I think we can all look at that aspect tonight. As far as Bell Island is concerned, Sir, I am very happy to say that the trailer truck is in St. John's but unfortunately due to size and weight cannot cross to the island on the ferry. Three citizens of Bell Island have volunteered their trucks, Messrs Kelloway, Hunt and Slade to bring these products over to Bell Island and they will be in three locations. I am not quite sure just where they will be, but that will be decided by the welfare officer over there.

Actually they were planning to go to the Diamond Club in one location, but I think we are going to try to split her up.

MR. NEARY: That is the Tory headquarters. The Diamond Club is the

Tory headquarters.

MR. MURPHY: I really do not know.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Coincidence.

MR. MURPHY: I did not think we had a club now. The last one was on Military Road eight years ago. While I am on it, Sir, if I may at this time, perhaps for the information of the member for Hermitage, the trailer for Harbour Breton - Mille Town area unfortunately can only go to the end of the paved road on the Bay D'Espoir Highway. So, we have arranged with a truck to come up from Harbour Breton, one from Belleoram, one from Hermitage - Seal Cove area and another one to do the area of Mille Town-Bay D'Espoir. So, I hope, Sir, that that will be the information that has been requested by the member for Bell Island and also gave me a chance to tell the member for Hermitage that his district will be looked after. The exact times I am not sure of, quite frankly, on it, but Bell Island might be tomorrow or perhaps tonight.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: I thank the honourable minister for the information, Sir. I can provide him with the time schedule of the trips of the ferry if the minister would care to have it.

Sir, would the minister also inform the House if any arrangements have been made for the poor, unfortunate residents of Southern Labrador to get any of these chips or pies.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Social Services.

MR. MURPHY: No, I am afraid not, Sir. As I told the member a week or ten days ago, that unfortunately due to ice conditions, transportation difficulties, that it will be impossible to put anything into Southern, Northern, Western Labrador at this particular time, but should there be some food arrive the Summertime of the same nature, I am sure that we would look after Labrador first.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Has the minister investigated the possibility of having the airline - I think it is NAT it is called - the airline that flies into Souther Labrador, volunteer one of its

aircrafts to bring some of these chips and pies -

MR. ROBERTS: There is a regular freight service.

MR. NEARY: There is a regular freight service. Is the minister aware that there is a regular freight service and subsidized by the government? Has the minister approached the airline to try to get some of these chips and pies into the poor unfortunate people in Southern Labrador.

MR. MURPHY: Well, after the member's description yesterday of the soggy chips, I do not think they would want any, Sir, but quite frankly I do not know if that has been looked into. I just want to state now that up to the present time this distribution has not cost the Province of Newfoundland one cent because of the fact it is all done by McCain's. Transportation has been provided and I think that was one of the reasons that the Premier accepted on behalf of the Province that we do not get into any great expense on the thing. There might be a little incidental expense but I doubt if it is going to mean flying anything anywhere in any part of the Province.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, would the minister undertake then to investigate the possibility of having this airline bring some of the chips and pies into the -

MR. MURPHY: Yes, Sir. If McCain's have another fire, or anybody else, and there are more chips available after this week, we will see if we can get some into other parts of the Province because this is the last of it now, actually. There are only two truck loads, one for Twillingate and one for Lewisporte. Is it Lewisporte? Lewisporte, yes, that is all. There are only two more and they are all booked for the different parts of the Province.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Industrial Development, Sir, could give us an up-to-date report on what is happening concerning the promised fish plant to the community of Burgeo?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Industrial Development.

MR. DOODY: Yes, Sir. The fish plant situation in Burgeo is as it was just prior to the trawler strike. We had at that time reported to the House in answer to a question, I think by the same honourable member. The Province of Newfoundland has made a commitment to the people of Burgeo that it will do everything that it possibly can to build a fish plant down there. We have got the engineering done. We have got the management arranged. National Sea Products are willing to go in there and do the work. The Province of Newfoundland is committed to putting its share of the money in there and we are simply waiting for an official offer from DREE for their share of the funding. As soon as that arrives the work will start.

If DREE does not participate, then we will just have to assume that they are not interested in what is going on in Burgeo and we are going to have to try to take another look at it, but the plant down there is going to cost something in excess of \$9 million. That is a huge amount of money for a small plant in a small community. The Province of Newfoundland would never be able to finance it all on its own. We are willing to put in, through investment, through equity, through one form or another, at least half of that amount and perhaps a little more if it is necessary for the survival of the community. We have impressed this fact upon DREE, upon the honourable Mr. Jamieson who has assured us that he has the interest of the community and the people in Burgeo at least as much in mind as we have. He has promised to do everything that he can. What he has to do is send us an offer of \$4.5 million and we will put the people to work down there right away and get on with the building of the plant. We think it is essential for the survival of Burgeo. We think the people down there are worth a great deal more than that.

It is a viable community. It is an active, industrious community. They deserve an opportunity to make their own living. We are willing to give it to them. We wish that the people in Ottawa would get moving on it so we can get started. Thank you, Sir.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: Is the minister, Sir, aware that Ottawa has taken precisely the same position as the minister just outlined, that is the provincial position, and how can this impasse be resolved? One cannot just keep passing the buck to the other. How will it be resolved?

MR. DOODY: Sir, there is no buck being passed at all. If the honourable member was at all familiar with the incentive programme that is in operation through the Department of Regional and Economic Development, he would know perfectly well that a company makes an application to DREE with a performance statement of its projected sales, expenses, costs. The full bit and piece is presented to DREE under their terms. When they examine it, they decide whether or not it is worthy of a DREE offer. If they decide that it is, then an official offer is made. If any start is made by the company or the Province or the crown corporation prior to the offer from DREE, the official offer, DREE under its terms of reference has no alternative but to consider it as a prior commitment. They will say that there is no point in putting money in, the province has started it, or the company who started it - in this case it would be Burgeo Leasing Company who started to build it - therefore, under our act we are not allowed to put any money in. We will withdraw and we thank you for your attention.

We have made our formal application. It is on the desks of the people in Ottawa. It has gone through all the formal channels, through the official ranks. It is now sitting somewhere between, I would assume, Mr. Jamieson's desk and Treasury Board up there. I do not know. It is one or the other. There is no buck passing at all. We have made our commitment. We have said that the money is available. There is a half million dollars in this year's estimates for the initial

equity investment in the existing Natlake premises down there.

We are simply waiting for the opportunity from DREE to get started on the thing. We do not want to be put in the same position as happened up in Bide Arm when the gentleman up there started a fish plant with a DREE offer than never came through, nor do we want to get these people in the same position as the Roberts people down in Hermitage who are in an unfortunate position with the DREE offer than never came through. What we want to do is get the thing done properly and we cannot do it outside the terms of reference of a federal department. We have to abide by their rules and regulations. This, Sir, is what we are doing. There is no buck passing involved. We have made our commitment. We have made our offer. We have made our application and we are simply waiting for the formal acceptance and the offer from them.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary: Would the minister then care to inform the House whether or not when the original commitment was made to the people of Burgeo and the old fish plant was purchased and the promise to build a new plant was made originally, was there any strings attached, that the minister or any member of his administration say that this was hinging on whether or not, subject to or whether they get a DREE grant or not, or was it a commitment made with no strings attached?

MR. DOODY: No, Sir.



MR. DOODY: Each and every time I discussed the matter with the people in Burgeo, with George Coady, the President of the Union, with the Mayor, with the other people down there, it was always done on the assumption that there would be DREE participation. It has always been contingent on a DREE grant.

The pro formas that are looked at down there, the projections that have been made and the put-through of the plant in terms of the economics of the operation would indicate that anything in excess of a \$3 million to \$4 million investment can never be recovered. What goes in in excess of that will very likely have to be a grant. That has been accepted by all people involved including the people, the officials of DREE.

The people of Burgeo are quite familiar with that. I have been down there, I have spoken to them. It is only about a month ago or a month and a-half ago that we had representation from them. There was a group came in representing the union, representing management and representing the town council. They met in the Premier's office and at that time we had conversation with Mr. Jamieson. The Premier phoned him from his office, the representatives of the community of Burgeo were privy to the conversation, they are quite aware of the province's position and they know as well as we do that the situation is as I have described it. At no time were they ever misled. They were told that the building of a new plant in Burgeo was contingent on a DREE grant because after all, if that is not what DREE was intended for, maybe somebody can explain to me what it was intended for.

If ever there was an opportunity for a government department, set up expressly for the purpose that DREE was, to participate in the survival of a community, then certainly they should leap at the opportunity to get involved in Burgeo and we think that they should.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary: Would the minister undertake to table all the correspondence and documents in connection with the negotiations that have taken place, that are taking place

concerning the construction of the new fish plant at Burgeo?  
Would the minister table all these letters and documents and requests in the House?

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, the minister would not undertake to trundle in the departmental documents on this correspondence or any correspondence for the honourable Member for Bell Island to look at. If the people of Newfoundland wanted him to examine departmental documents they would not have flung him out of office a few years ago. I am not going to be the one who brings them in here now.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health. Would the minister indicate, please, whether the government have as yet accepted the principle of compulsory arbitration in their negotiations with a group of their indirect employees, and I am referring particularly to the interns and residents at the hospitals in the Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Minister of Health.

HON. A.G. ROWE (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of my colleague the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations, I would have to say that it is my understanding that the Internes and Residents Association accepted the plan of the Conciliation Board. The matter now rests there and in the interim I do not think there is anything which can be said.

The answer is yes. They have gone to a conciliation Board and we will perhaps have to await the result of that before we can know what exactly is going to transpire.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the minister did not answer the question. I asked him whether or not the government have accepted the principle of compulsory arbitration. Since he will not answer the question may I raise the matter tomorrow under Standing Order (31)?

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Transportation

and Communications, Sir, - I just saw him ducking out the door there, he is probably listening to me - I wonder if the minister would care to inform the House what roads are closed in the Province now as a result of the Spring thaw? What roads are impassable, what is being done about trying to get these roads reopened again? If the minister does his homework he probably has the list with him. And as emergencies do exist in certain parts of the Province, Sir, I wonder would the minister let the House know if they are hiring any outside equipment to help during this emergency or if they are just relying on the equipment in the minister's own department to get these roads open again?

AN HON. MEMBER: Do you want to -

MR. NEARY: SOS for the Minister of Transportation and Communications. SOS, SOS, Minister of Transportation and Communications.

AN HON. MEMBER: He will not show up.

MR. DOODY: He is gone out to check on the equipment.

MR. NEARY: He is gone out to check on the equipment, is he?

Well, Sir, while we are waiting for the minister to come back to his seat perhaps I could ask the Minister of Mines and Energy a question about my own district, and I would hope that the minister will give me a non-partisan, non-sectarian answer. Would the minister please be good enough to inform the House in specific detail, not just a vague general answer, tell the House what kind of negotiations are going on concerning storing oil in the Bell Island mine? Who these negotiations are being carried on with? Who is conducting the negotiations? Is it on behalf of the Province or the Government of Canada? Could the minister give us some specific details about any negotiations that are taking place concerning the use of the Bell Island mine, Sir, for storing crude oil?

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated some time ago there have been various approaches made by a number of companies, a number of large, respectable companies who are seriously interested in the potential of the concept of restoring petroleum products in the abandoned Bell Island mines. At this stage, Mr. Speaker, it would serve no purpose that I can see to make public the names of the companies that are making these approaches. It is still at a very preliminary stage. We do not, Mr. Speaker, want to in any way endanger the possibility of arriving at a satisfactory agreement with any of these companies. I do not believe that these companies would appreciate having to negotiate publicly. It is not my experience the normal method of putting together a deal or an agreement. I can say, Mr. Speaker, that as this government have demonstrated up to now and as we have clearly enunciated as our policy that the full details, the full details, Mr. Speaker, of any arrangement made with respect to the Bell Island mines will be brought before this honourable House in due course.

And, Mr. Speaker, I think that is as far as I can go at this time, other than to say that there is a great amount of interest being exhibited by companies all over the world, Mr. Speaker, in the potential asset we have at Bell Island. It is an asset, Mr. Speaker, and it is unfortunate that we did not start working on this concept \* many years ago when the mine was first closed down. It is unfortunate that it took this administration to development this concept because, as you know, Mr. Speaker, it is a very complex concept. Very many details have to be looked at very, very closely, and it is going to take - well I would only be guessing, Mr. Speaker, but I can say it is going to take many months, if not years, before you will see the complete package put together. And again I say it is only unfortunate that the honourable member had not pushed that concept instead of the mushroom growing concept for the mine when he was in a position to do -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: something for his constituents on Bell Island.

Other than that, Mr. Speaker, I know that the Minister of Industrial Development has been involved in this area. I do not know if he has anything further to add.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate it if the Minister of Industrial Development had anything to add, Sir. But before the minister does add anything to what the Minister of Mines already said perhaps the minister might -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: inform the House if negotiations are actively being carried on at this moment? How close we are? Are we on the hitch? Or

AN HON. MEMBER: On the hitch to go out.

MR. NEARY: do we have to just accept the vague general statement that was made by the Minister of Mines and Energy there a few moments ago.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

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

MR. DOODY: I would just like to reiterate what my honourable colleague, the Minister of Mines and Energy, said. I do not know what the gentleman for Bell Island means about being on a hitch. I assume that is the sort of economic industrial policy that was followed in the previous administration. We are trying to be a little bit more technical and precise about this. We are currently carrying on discussions with at least three companies, all of whom have expressed an interest. None of them, as the minister has indicated, would be very pleased to have the discussions brought forth at the present time openly. If the time comes when they develop to a stage where they can be announced and there is some purpose in making them public, then it will certainly be done.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary for the minister then. Sir, does the minister and his administration have enough faith in this concept to proceed with phase two of the recommendation that was made in the report that was done for the Government of Canada by this American

April 2, 1975

Tape 942 (Afternoon)

PK - 3

firm? Phase two being putting in the bulkheads and cleaning up the mine, the old timber and so forth. Does the government have enough faith to go ahead with phase two?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Industrial Development.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, this administration has absolute faith in the entire Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. To get into specifics of phase one and phase two, of bulkheads and shoring up of various compartments and so on is simply inviting myself or my colleague, the Minister of Mines and Energy to supply the kind of detail that we have just said that we are not in the position to supply at the present time. When it becomes available it will be made known, but the Member from Bell Island is far too clever and far too cute to think that he is going to get us involved in a little game like that this afternoon.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary: Would the Minister of Mines then, Sir, care to tell the House -

MR. DOODY: Do you think you will get more out of him?

MR. NEARY: Yes, he is a little softer. He likes to get up and make a speech. Would the Minister of Mines tell us if number four mine then will not be sealed off because the minister called tenders there a year or so ago. Number four mine will be left open in the event that there is the possibility of storing oil in the mines. If it is not feasible or if the minister cannot attract a company to come in to store oil there, has the government given any consideration to turning number four mine into an underground tourist attraction?

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, it is incomprehensible how long it takes for an idea to sink into the honourable member's cranium, but we have made it clear, I have made it clear at several times in this honourable House, in the media and elsewhere that any project to seal the Bell Island mines are done for the purpose of assuring public safety, to prevent children or misguided tourists from deciding to take a little stroll around the underground workings of this mine, Mr. Speaker, when they will suddenly find that there are hundreds of miles of winding, twisting, turning corridors that they can get lost in. The honourable member could give a better indication of the distance, Mr. Speaker, but we do know that it is a hazard to public safety to



leave the mine open for access by the general public. It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that we have on several occasions, I might mention, sealed the mine. The last time it was with, I think, about an eight inch steel door.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Gate.

MR. BARRY: Gate.

MR. NEARY: That looks like a prison, you know, you are imprisoned.

MR. BARRY: I found, Mr. Speaker, on my next visit to the mine, it had been pryed open by somebody with some ulterior motive. But in any event, Mr. Speaker, I have made it clear right from the beginning that any sealing that will be done will only be a temporary seal, that it will permit future access in the event that access is needed either for storage of oil purposes or for any other purpose, that it is not the intention, it has never been the intention of government to seal it in such a way that it will be sealed permanently.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, to the same minister: What about the surplus now of the DOSCO assets, the accumulated fund that was built up? Has the minister yet arranged to turn this over to somebody on the - the minister told us before it was going to be turned over to the town council? Have the negotiations been finalized yet? Has the check been passed over to the town of Wabana and if so, would the minister tell us what the money is going to be used for?

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, as I stated approximately two weeks ago in the House, the government's decision had been that these funds would be released to the town council of Wabana with discussions being held between that council, the Department of Municipal Affairs, Industrial Development and ourselves -

MR. NEARY: Well, have there been any discussions?

MR. BARRY: - as to the method in which these funds should be disposed of, and I understand, Mr. Speaker, that the Labrador Housing Corporation, I understand from the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing that this matter is now actively being pursued by the Department -

MR. NEARY: How much? How much is involved? How much money are



we talking about?

MR. BARRY: There is approximately \$35,000, \$40,000.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Fogo.

CAPTAIN E. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the honourable Minister of Transportation and Communications. Is there any substance to the rumor or fact that many of the watchmen working with the Department of Highways have been given a notice and will cease work as of April 30?

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

HON. J. ROUSSEAU: The only layoffs that I am aware of now is the winter snow clearing crews and these watchmen would

be involved, I presume, in that operation but there have been lay-off slips given in the past couple of weeks effective through the month of April.

CAPT. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, it has come to my notice that men working there for a period of years as watchmen have received notices that their work will expire on April 3rd. Is there no fact to it, no truth to it?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes, there have been and I will get the details if I can for the honourable member tomorrow.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER: It being Private Members' Day we continue with Motion No. (2) on the Order Paper. I think last Private Members' Day the honourable Minister of Justice adjourned the debate, but not being in his place today I shall have to recognize another honourable member who might wish to speak to this motion, unless we wish to quit the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Harbour Grace.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise to support this motion so ably put there by our honourable Member for Bonavista South who is a friend, Sir, of the fishermen and admired by all on this side of the House.

Sir, this motion deals with the fish stocks on the Labrador Coast and the Northeast Coast of Newfoundland, from Cape Harrison to Cape Race. Probably something could be added to this motion to include stocks on the Bell Island Bank, the Funk Island Bank, because these stocks provide the fishing supplies for the Notre Dame Bay, Bonavista Bay, Trinity Bay and Conception Bay. The St. Pierre Bank supply the fish supplies for Placentia and other bays on that part of the coast.

Sir, the concern of our Premier and the Minister of Fisheries has appointed a Select Committee to look into the troubles or difficulties of the inshore fishery. Well, Sir, I do not know the sole responsibility of these things, Sir, but some of this, I know there was one brief presented which was made public to this Select

Committee by the seasonal processors of the Fisheries Association of Newfoundland. Sir, a part of that brief lays the blame wholly and solely on the federal government and also on the previous administration.

Some of that brief states the rape of our mid,near and coastal waters destroy much of our rich turbot and flounder stocks around the mouths of Bonavista, Trinity, Conception Bays during the 1960's. The greatest destruction of gear and fish ever along the Coast was conducted. Trawls, nets were greatly destroyed. Thousands of tons of flounder, turbot and sole flushed overboard from the decks of the trawlers. There was little to catch after that show of 1960's was over. Through carelessness, indifference and downright ignorance of the farmer-orientated government of Ottawa and a burn your boat policy here at home,with no surveillance, no surveillance, no restriction, no limit, no law, our rich stocks declined under such pressure and now are so greatly depleted that it will take years of hardship, preservation, suffering, regulations and restrictions, and planning and millions of dollars to restore our fishery.

Mr. Speaker, I would say, Sir, that our federal government should be charged with rape and the previous Liberal Government, Sir, as guilty of arson,

because this was their attitude and the honourable member, Sir, just said it was shocking to get gear. No wonder, Sir, that that gentleman who was the Minister of Fisheries, the member for Fogo, who was Minister of Fisheries, Sir, got sick last night. Sir, yes, I know some of the stuff he heard the fishermen tell us fellows yesterday, Sir. If I was in his boots, Sir, I would be on the verge of suicide. Yes, Sir, the rape and the neglect, Sir, of the fisheries by our past administration.

Mr. Speaker, in my district of Harbour Grace we have one of the largest fishing plants on the East Coast. Sir, this was brought about, this fish plant by the genial father of our present day Premier, a man who had concern for the fishermen and who was a shrewd businessman. But, Sir, in the early 1960's the man who was Premier of that day got out and oh, it is going to be - I can remember the saying, Sir - that when the Birdseye came to Harbour Grace, there were going to be thousands of people living in - 17,000 people in Port de Grave, thousands of people extra in Harbour Grace. You could not find a piece of land to build a house anywhere, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, this was the attitude of the previous administration. Last year our herring stocks in that part of the bay, fishermen had very good catches, but we have quite a few fishermen who go to Labrador and fish off the Labrador coast. Sir, their catches are in the same decline as the inshore fishery. Mr. Speaker, much more can be said concerning this motion, but, Sir, I support the motion, But probably again referring back to that brief by the Seasonal Inshore Fishery Processors, probably when they said the responsibility lies here - this is what they say about the federal government:

Despite the many studies instituted by Ottawa, the warnings given by the Province to plant owners, to politicians and the fishermen, and their own vital statistics, the federal government has allowed one of Canada's most valuable facilities and the life blood of the Newfoundland's rural economy, the fishery, to be plundered by foreign nations. This is their main responsibility and we urge them even at this late hour to heed what could be their last series of studies and our final

clearance.

Mr. Speaker, to be shown the esteem that our illustrious Minister of Fisheries has held, these processors say this about the provincial government. That is the provincial government today, Sir. Most of the energy extended by a provincial Fishery Minister since Confederation has been used to lay the blame on Ottawa, rightly in so many cases, for all our troubles and to justify the lack of action by the provincial authorities. At this late date the Province can no longer sit by and see the inshore fishery die.

The social implications of the close out of this segment of the Newfoundland fishery and with the mass resettlement programmes we are encouraged by the present Minister of Fisheries, the Honourable John C. Crosbie, assurance that the inshore fishery as we know it, will be kept alive.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the honourable members on the other side criticize our Minister of Fisheries but I am sure, Sir, that,

I know, Sir, that he is a very capable man and I feel sure that when the Select Committee that was appointed comes back and reports to this honourable House, that they too will support this motion so ably put by the honourable the Member for Bonavista South. I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Minister of Finance.

HON.H.R.V.EARLE (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a few words in support of this motion. I note that it has been amended now that it is to be referred to ICNAF. In commenting on that I would hope that ICNAF, which as its initials indicate is an international organization, would be persuaded to take proper note of this motion.

Back in the 1960 - 1962 period, I was the Canadian Commissioner on ICNAF at that time and the thing which annoyed me and distressed me about that organization was that it was heavily influenced by the scientific approach to the fisheries without sometimes, in my opinion, the necessary practical approach to the fisheries. It seemed that during that period, the early days of ICNAF, it was dominated by scientists who gave endless talks and lectures at their annual meetings on populations of fish, the breeding habits, the temperatures of water and all sorts of things which are dear to the hearts of scientists, and there was very little discussion on an international basis on what was happening to the fisheries.

Even in those days the scientists did not predict the failure of the fisheries which we have witnessed in recent years. They cautiously said that catches were declining but they would not predict what has come about. Yet, practical fishermen of all nations who were fishing on the Grand Banks and off the shores and on the Hamilton Bank did indicate that, not only were the catches declining but that the size of the fish being caught was also declining very, very considerable. But that warning on an international basis went unheeded. It went unheeded for ten or twelve years and we see the drastic results which are happening in our fisheries today.

Now this motion, in my opinion, is coming a bit too late. Hopefully, it might make the international body sit up and take notice but it is going to take a lot more than a motion from this House to influence sixteen nations sitting together in some part of the world discussing the fisheries. The fact is, of course, it is a step in the right direction but the pressure has to be put on and very heavily applied to the federal government which, after all, has the control of our offshore fisheries, for them to get strongly behind this and to use the voice of Canada as one of the members of ICNAF to support a resolution of this type. Other than that I think that it may fall on deaf ears and not bring the results which we would hope.

Now it is difficult to speak on this resolution connected with the Hamilton Banks without referring to the discussion which we heard last night on the fisheries which, in my opinion, was about the most absurd and ridiculous discussion on the fisheries that has ever been heard in this House. It was promoted, I think, by our member friend from Bell Island and the amount of ignorance shown on the Newfoundland fisheries in his discussion was abysmal. Likely every statement that was made last night indicated a complete lack of knowledge of what was required in the Newfoundland fisheries.

Unfortunately, what has happened over the years was this: that the fisheries in Newfoundland have always been the plaything of politicians. Right from the first days of Confederation it started off with a battle royal between the merchant class and the government of the day. The then Premier used every opportunity he had to blast the people who were trying to keep the industry alive. There were all the usual things dragged in about the poor, suffering fishermen, the fellow that was being persecuted and all this sort of stuff which was absolute rubbish, complete and unadulterated rubbish, and that line was fed for political purposes so as to have set one group of people in the Province against the other for political purposes.

April 2, 1975, Tape 946, Page 3 -- apb

Now what happened there was that the good of the industry,  
the real welfare of the fishing industry became a side issue.  
It was a class warfare issue that was being promoted, not the  
welfare



of the fisheries. I remember that the first election that I stood for this honourable House that I went to the people of Fortune Bay on a complete programme of the revival of the fisheries. If you read the manifesto for that election at the time you would see page after page of what the government were going to do for the fisheries, the government of the day. It is a pity that I have not got that manifesto here to read, because going to that area and honestly believing that it was going to be done. I supported that government very, very strongly. Six or eight years of frustration after that and nothing was done in the fisheries except at election time when the same old stuff was dragged out time and time again to be used as propaganda to try and fool the fishermen.

Now this has all resulted in a tremendous feeling of frustration and desperation on the part of our fishermen in Newfoundland. They feel that are just being the plaything of politicians and have been throughout the years. And if the current troubles in the fishery do nothing else but to bring people together of all creeds, classes and kinds and occupations to realize the importance of the fishing industry in Newfoundland, then all the present problems that we have will not be to no avail. Because if the industry is to survive it is time for us as politicians to cut out criticizing each other and cut out criticizing the trade and cut out criticizing the fishermen and cut out criticizing Ottawa. There is a need of working together on what is an industry which has to survive if Newfoundland is to survive. And we cannot make that industry survive if we continue this internecine warfare among ourselves for political purposes and for no other purposes certainly without the best interest of the fisheries at heart. I would gladly support Ottawa in any real effort it would take in trying to support the Newfoundland interests, and I am sure that my government would. And I would also support the Opposition if they came up with any genuine ideas that would promote the welfare of the fishing industry. But all you hear are not genuine ideas, but all you hear are snarky remarks about one segment of the industry or another which does nothing to build any faith or any confidence in that industry.

Now other countries which are fishing on the Hamilton Banks, and those which we were talking about today, take a far more serious view of the fisheries than Newfoundland has ever taken, or Canada will ever take I am afraid. Because in these European countries fish is an essential part of their diet. They need it. They need the fish to make up the protein which they lack, and fishing is a serious occupation as far as they are concerned. Fish is a serious source of protein which they must have. And their governments in these countries do not spend their time knocking the people who go out to sea to catch fish or knocking the trade or knocking anybody else, They put a concentrated national effort behind their fisheries which is what has been lacking in Canada ever since we became part of Confederation.

Just as a side light, last night, for instance, the honourable Member for Bell Island was talking about a canning industry in this country. There has been a discussion lately that if some of this stuff has to be moved, some of the surplus fish that is not being sold in the markets, we should get into a canning industry, and can up this stuff and perhaps give it to countries for relief purposes or something of this sort. Let me give the honourable member a little bit of a history on the canning industry. I was very closely associated with it at one time. In those days there was no such thing as going to the government for tens or hundreds of thousands of dollars for assistance in the fishing industry. What we did, we did on our own. I was a partner in a firm that at that time, having come through the greatest depression that Newfoundland ever knew, a depression in which the recession that we are talking about today bears no comparison whatsoever, when people were literally starving and the business firms were insolvent, having come through that the company with which I was associated had the nerve and the guts to get out and try experimentation in canning. They spent over a period of years approximately \$50,000, which was a lot of money in those days, \$50,000 for such things that you would find unheard of today. The first thing that had to be done was to build a dam and a waterline. Now today if anybody wants a dam or a waterline built who do they go to? They do not take the money out of their own pockets, They

dash off to the government and ask them to build a water supply for them, or DREE or somebody else. There is no such thing as private industry doing it. They built the dam and the waterline. They put in the best kind of a plant they could with their limited knowledge at that time, and they started to produce canned fish.

By the time the thing got going we were in the middle of the Second World War. And I remember very clearly that we did not know if we could sell the stuff or not, but there was need of trying to get some sort of an industry to help out the difficult salt fish industry at that time. We produced an experimental pack of only twenty-five cases of this product and sent it to England. I got an immediate reaction of a request for 250,000 cases, on a twenty-five case sample we had orders for 250,000 cases of that product. We started, we were in the middle of a war, I must repeat that, we tried to get underway and tried to build up an industry that could supply this then to the food board of the day. But as soon as we tried to get into our stride the war automatically cut off any supplies of tin-plate or anything of that sort, so that you could not get the necessary supplies to do any canning, all we could get up to at a maximum after two or three years effort was 20,000 cases of canned product and we sold that without any difficulty.

And then came the end of the war. Having risked almost everything we had in that particular industry, the end of the war came and what had happened? Some of the Mainland concerns, the big fish companies got on the bandwagon. They thought that during the war there was a good opportunity to produce this stuff and they stuck every kind of muck and trash fish into cans and sold it as a product to the point that when the war ended nobody would buy this stuff. It was absolute trash. And the canned product, including the canned products of Newfoundland, was shoved off the shelves because people in all of the markets were sick to death of a Mainland product which had been produced which really you would not feed to any fit, self-respecting animal. And that is why that industry died.

Now all of the investment and trouble that had been put into it just went out of the window, but it did teach one very big

lesson. And this is the lesson which the honourable Member for Bell is obviously unaware of in discussing a canning industry. If we are going into a canning industry to produce fish or anything else you cannot go in and produce a few thousand cases of canned fish. You have got to so organize the collection and production of that that you are turning out something the equivalent of perhaps Campbell's Soups or one of these large canning companies throughout the world for this reason, that the cost of cans itself, if you are going on it in a small scale, the cost of cans will be more than you can sell the product for regardless of freight or anything else. You have got to mass produce this stuff in millions of cases. You have got to be able to have a production which is so large that you can set up your own can manufacturing plant within your premises and produce cans at the cheapest possible rate so that you are not paying freight on empty cans coming from the Mainland, and you are not paying freight on the stuff going out, you have it all in your own control in this one area, and you get it produced and exported at the lowest possible price. Then if you can produce it cheaply enough there is a tremendous market throughout the world for a cheap fish product. But even at that, it is likely that some government, either the Government of Canada or somebody else would have to subsidize that so it could be sold to these relief countries at a price at which they could buy.

There is no great fortune or no great future in any canning industry just on the basis of its own validity to stand on its feet. Now the times may change, I would think that that would be a worthwhile experiment for the Federal Government of Canada because

there is a great need of food throughout the world and if they were to encourage a canning industry on a very, very large scale in this country, assuming that that the raw material could be obtained, I think that it would be worthwhile for Canada to dump a lot of that into some of these markets for many years, because it would create a world taste for it. You would put it out into the markets and create a knowledge throughout the world of this product which would have to be from the first instance a good product, and then you would have perhaps created in the world a sale for it such as you have for canned soup or canned pork and bean or any of these other huge items which are sold in large quantities.

That is the answer, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, to a canning industry. But it cannot be played around with with a few thousand dollars. If it is it will go down the drain just as all in the past. It has got to be a multimillion dollar industry done on a large scale with a promotion and everything else that is necessary to promote this on the merits and then you might get somewhere with it.

Now this comes back to what we are talking about, the Hamilton Banks. There is no canning industry or anything else that can survive, and really no fishing industry in Newfoundland that will survive unless our stocks of fish are preserved. Unless Canada and Newfoundland can come to grips with the problem of having a supply of fish, controlling the Hamilton Banks and controlling all other banks, it is useless to build up fleets of trawlers, it is useless to build up shore plants, it is useless to talk about canning or anything else unless we have an adequate supply of raw material of which we can guarantee a production that can supply the countries of the world. Unless we can do that, the potential buyers are going to say, what is the use of talking to you, you have not got the stock anyhow.

These are some of the problems which the industry faces and these are huge, tremendous problems which only a government such

as a government the size of Canada can tackle and really put the money behind to do it. This provincial government may be as well-meaning and well-intentioned as it possibly can but unless the fishing industry of Canada is treated as a matter of national concern, I think we may as well wrap it up and forget it. Now that is a pessimistic thing to say, but it really has to be treated seriously in Canada and the first step, the first indication which the Government of Canada should take in showing its sincere backing of the Newfoundland fishing industry is to fight all-out, to fight with complete determination that we are to get control of our own natural resource. When that is accomplished we can go from there on, Without that we are finished.

This is all I want to say, Mr. Speaker, but there has been so much said on the fishing industry that any Newfoundlander that gets on his feet could probably talk about it for an hour or two or three hours but there are a few fundamental things which have to be cured in this industry: First, the securing of our supply of raw material; secondly, the production of vast quantities on a large modern production scale; thirdly, an item which the honourable Member for Bell Island mentioned was marketing.

I should like just to refer to marketing for a period. The marketing effort which is being carried out by the Canadian Saltfish Corporation now is getting lots of pats on the back, and it is a good effort. Incidentally that was not brought about by the past leader of the Liberal Government. That was brought about by the trade going time after time after time to Ottawa.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I know it is kind of foggy out, Sir, but we seem to be in a little bit of a fog in this honourable House, Sir, for the last twenty minutes and I have sat here patiently, most tolerant, listening to the honourable member, interested in what he has to say, but Sir, does Your Honour realize



that the motion before the House, and I will read the last part of it again, Sir, because sometimes we have a tendency to forget, here is the "be it therefore resolved, that this Legislature urge the federal government to make a strong case at the upcoming ICNAF meeting that a ban be placed on fishing on the Hamilton Banks during the spawning season." Now, Sir, how you can relate that to canning, and what the minister is about, the topic he is about to bring up, marketing and so forth and so on, Sir, is beyond me and I would submit to Your Honour -

AN HON. MEMBER: Patience now.

MR. NEARY: that the minister is completely out of order and that to save his general remarks for the estimates of the Department of Fisheries, Sir, which we will have on the floor of this House hopefully tomorrow.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, speaking to that point of order if I may, the whole thing is so closely related that there is no possible way of avoiding it. The Hamilton Banks is one of our basis of supply of fish, I am talking about the supply of fish from the Hamilton Banks and what will be done with that supply. Now I have already said that unless that supply is secured, there is no possible way that we can build up the rest of the industry.

Having listened to the debate on this Hamilton Banks question, I think that everything from soup to nuts is thrown into it and certainly something which relates to the future welfare of the fishery has a very big bearing and very strong connection to this motion on the Hamilton Banks.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Well, the rule of relevancy is the most difficult rule to enforce and in this case the minister was ranging far afield to draw his comparison. And I do not know if the member recognized it or not, I was strapping on my microphone in preparation to bring this to the honourable minister's attention, although in his explanation of the member for Bell Island's point of order would certainly

appear that he was making the remarks relevant. However, they did appear to the Chair to be somewhat irrelevant, but then again the rule of relevancy is the most difficult to enforce.

MR. EARLE: I will try to just finish off with what I consider to be relevant in this particular debate, the supply of fish and the sale of that supply of fish from the Hamilton Banks as and when the source is protected will have a tremendous bearing on the possible potential and future, of course, of the whole Newfoundland fishing industry, and the fact that over the years marketing organizations of various kinds have gradually been built up only lends to our experience and the fact that it comes back to the very thing which I started off my address by saying that there has to be complete co-operation in the industry among all forms of government and between the fishermen themselves if, as and when that resource is protected, this Province is going to be able to take full advantage of it. Otherwise to scream for protection of the Hamilton Banks and the fishing on it, without having a far reaching and well-developed plan on how we are going to use the product, would be asking the Government of Canada to support something on which we did not have the necessary follow-up to make it sensible for them to protect.

In other words, we have to be able to use the product when it is protected and we must tie one thing very closely with the other that we have a well-acknowledged and well-thought out scheme for the development of the industry and for that purpose we need the full and willing co-operation of the federal government.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): The Member for Labrador West.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I am waiting, I see three smiles, Mr. Speaker, but when I am finished people will see the point I intend to make by stepping up to speak on this. Of course as a native of the Province I think that we are all interested in the question of the fishery, especially at this point in time on the inshore fishery, but I am sure that the problems we have had along, especially the Coast of Labrador, and



unfortunately my friend from Labrador South is not here and I am sure that he could be more technical on the problems experienced on the Coast of Labrador, and also the honourable Member for Labrador North is not here, that we would like to say that certainly the people of Labrador welcome this resolution, although by voice or by unanimous consent our vote will be added to it, we would like to make that point as a matter of public record.

In Labrador we are very fortunate. We do have the finest recreational fishing I guess in North America, perhaps in the world, beautiful trout, beautiful salmon, plentiful, quiet, peaceful waters. But -

MR. NEARY: Point of order, Mr. Speaker, What does sport fishing, Sir, trout fishing in Labrador, what connection does it have with ICNAF? Mr. Speaker, I ask Your Honour to please, I plead with Your Honour, to try to get the minister, Sir, to observe the rules of the House, the rules of relevancy and debate the motion on

the Order Paper, Motion number one, Sir, be relevant in their remarks to this motion whether they are going to support it or not support it.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order. The honourable gentleman from Labrador West did not really have time to indicate whether he was in order or not. He is talking about salmon fishing in the Labrador area.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I am making a point of order. Could I be heard in silence, please?

MR. NEARY: You are making a fool of yourself, not making a point of order.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable gentleman is talking about fishing in any aspect at all on the Labrador Coast, whether it be salmon fishing in the rivers which is a good sports fishing area in Labrador, surely the salmon is not going to be in the river at all times. That is some connection with the offshore waters. It has some connection with the quotas involved along the coast. So, why does the honourable gentleman from Bell Island not give the honourable member from Labrador West, give him adequate time to make his points before he starts jumping up in his seat on points of order?

MR. NEARY: Sit down, boy, and do not be making a fool of yourself.

MR. MORGAN: You are always doing that.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

While the remarks, the introductory remarks by the member for Labrador West certainly appeared to be somewhat irrelevant, however, every member has the right to make his point or attempt to make his point by drawing comparisons. I do believe the honourable minister was attempting to do that because he was graduating from the very inshore fishery of trout fishing into the offshore fishery of the salmon and I am sure he would have gotten to the cod fish had he been given time to do so. So, I will entertain some more thoughts and some more -

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry. I hope, you know, that you

never fish in Labrador.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROUSSEAU: You do not know what you are missing.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, there are lots of other lakes though. But, quite apart from that, I just happened to mention some rationale there. Anyway, quite apart from the smiles on the face as to why the member from Labrador West should get up and support this, I think I have as legitimate a case as anybody because in the great mining district of Labrador West I have, Mr. Speaker, many fishermen. So, now you know the point I am trying to make.

So, the many fishermen who have left the fishery in the Province because they could not earn a living from it, many who go up during the non-fishing season to work at the mining sites at the Iron Ore Company of Canada in Labrador City or at Wabush Mines - I would be remiss if I did not stand up on their behalf as surprising as it may seem that there would be fishermen amongst my constituents in this probably the least fishing district in the Province with respect to the commercial fishery, if not the least.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: I know you have a Navy Cadet Corp down there.

MR. ROUSSEAU: We have a Navy Cadet Corp with a fine band. That is irrelevant too. They are placed very high. They have a fine little thing that goes bong, bong. I do not know the name of it but it is beautiful.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: A glockenspiel.

MR. ROUSSEAU: A glockenspiel. That is it, the glockenspiel.

Well, anyway, quite apart from that, I do stand up and echo my sentiments on record as well as to vote in the House on behalf of the many fishermen who reside in the towns of Labrador City, Wabush and Churchill Falls. The honourable member from Bell Island is laughing. I am eminently serious. The honourable member from Bell Island knows well that there are many fishermen in the mining towns of Labrador City, and Wabush and on the hydro site at Churchill Falls. So, one would hope that I would stand up on

their behalf and echo their support for this resolution and the hope that I am sure that many of them would like to come "home". They are not back on the island part of the Province in some instances, those who are involved with the fishing industry because, of course, the living is not there for them anymore.

So, resolutions of this nature would certainly enhance their ability to earn a living wage -

MR. NEARY: Give us the weather forecast.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Does the honourable member think - you know, I might be serious. I really am.

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Next Wednesday.

But, anyway, Mr. Speaker, I will sit down with those very few words, but I would like to go on record as saying that I am sure that all the fishermen in the district of Labrador West would like to support his motion through me in the House and, of course, my vote for it will be their vote. I did want to stand on my two feet and record it, as nonsensical as the member for Bell Island thinks it is. It is not. The member for Bell Island knows well the number of fishermen there, as I say, who are up there because they cannot make a living in the fishery. I do stand up on their behalf and certainly pledge my support on their behalf for this motion.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): The member for St. John's Center.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, just a few words in support of this. I might say that the district I represent, St. John's Center, is not entirely dependent upon the fishery, but we produce some excellent fishermen in that area and St. John's itself, notwithstanding the apparent ignorance of the facts of some of the members from the so-called outports, Sir, St. John's is a very heavy producing fish area.

Mr. Speaker, I have very much pleasure indeed in supporting this motion. I believe it is time, Sir, that someone, after so many years, has come to grips with the grave problems that are facing our fishery and particularly this where, apparently if we are to believe those who know about the fishery and if we look at this resolution, where during

the early winter months of the late January, February and March where the actual young, the spawn that would produce in later weeks and months the fish that our fishermen would depend on to earn a living is being destroyed. In my own Department, Sir, of Social Services if I may relate it, only the other day I came across an amazing statistic that due to the ice blockade that we had late last spring on the Northeast Coast - I think that covers some sixty per cent of our 15,000 or 16,000 fishermen - due to that, some fishermen who had never before had to accept some form of government assistance, had to come to my department, some 1,280, say 1,300 people to receive assistance. Some twenty-four of our forty-five welfare districts, Sir, are completely dependent on fishery. As we heard here in this House last night, and I am trying to be relevant because we are talking about the fishery, we are talking about fishermen and when we talk about the fishery, Sir, whether it is on the Hamilton Banks or any other part of this Province, we have to deal exclusively with what is happening in this Province and how we all live, whether we fish or not, in some measure Sir, we do derive our incomes either directly or indirectly from the fishery.

So, Sir, I can only say how happy I am to support this and to see that at long last, at very long last, some government, and it happens to be our government, are taking the bit in their teeth, if you like, Sir, to go and demand that some protection be given those 15,000 to 16,000 fishermen who do earn their living from the fishery, to try to protect their livelihood for them.

I have sat, Sir, in this honourable House since 1962. I have heard in the fourteen years I have sat, I have heard members from different districts get up and express the great concern at the rape of the fisheries, of the tremendous numbers of foreign fleets that were coming in depleting our fish stocks. Sir, when we think of this and think of the complete inaction with regard to taking any preventive measures, Sir, I must say that we should feel ashamed of ourselves that we have allowed the fishery, our stocks, to deteriorate

to the extent that they have deteriorated, Sir.

I listened with considerable interest to the honourable Minister of Finance, Sir, who was born a fisherman, who has spent his almost entire life in the fisheries, and to see that he had to stand in this House and be mocked, if you like, by a very, I do not know how to describe him, Sir - to describe him properly I would have to use nonparliamentary language - but a gentleman who dared last night in this House, Sir, offer insults to an outstanding gentleman of this Province, the Minister of Fisheries, whose name, the Crosbie name, has been associated with the fisheries for so many years. To have to listen to the type of tripe and derision, Sir, that emanates from the seat opposite -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I hate to have to speak, Your Honour, but a point of order, Sir.

MR. MURPHY: To get back to what I was saying.

MR. NEARY: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. A point of order. Would the honourable minister please sit down while I am raising a point of order.

MR. MURPHY: When the point of order is acknowledged by the honourable Speaker, Sir, I will sit down at his command and not at the honourable member for Bell Island's.

MR. NEARY: Sit down, Dick Tracey.

Mr. Speaker, I submit to Your Honour again, and I have to draw this to Your Honour's attention that the minister, Sir, who obviously does not know the rules of the House, is completely irrelevant to the motion that is before the House. Mr. Speaker, do I have to repeat the THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED again.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Yes, boy.

MR. NEARY: Well, this motion

has to do with urging the Federal Government to make a strong representation at the up-coming ICNAF meeting to place a ban on fishing on the Hamilton Banks. Now, what Messrs. Crosbie or Earle or any other honourable member of this House, whether they were insulted or they felt they were insulted or they were insulted, what that has to do with this particular motion, Sir, is beyond me. I would submit that Your Honour draw the member's attention, the minister's attention to the rule of relevancy in this House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, again the rule of relevancy is rather difficult to adjudicate upon. The member was speaking about the fisheries generally. This is a motion that does allow a wide-ranging debate on the fisheries generally. Now, his remarks, directed to the, I presume, Member for Bell Island concerning his remarks on other matters would have to be irrelevant to this motion. However, I do not think that any of his other remarks were. They were related to the fishery generally and how the fishery relates to the economy of the Province. However, I would have to suggest that he was irrelevant and perhaps would desist from remarks of the type which lead to the interruption by the Member for Bell Island.

MR. MURPHY: I thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I thought I was being relevant, Sir, when I referred to people who had had some experience in the fisheries, Sir. I do not know how long we are to be goaded, Sir, into such stupid things as has been happening about relevancy because the only irrelevancy, Sir, is when we have to refer to the one that is interrupting continuously.

MR. NEARY: Are you challenging Your Honour's ruling?

MR. MURPHY: But as far as this motion is concerned, Mr. Speaker, if I may continue with the usual courtesy that is supposed to be shown, that it is so important, Sir, to every segment, to every segment of this Province of ours, whether it be the City of St. John's or Labrador West or any other part, Sir, it is all very



much dependent on our prime resource which is the fishery and as this resolution says, Sir, that we urge the Federal Government, we urge them, we try to force them, Sir, to take the action that is necessary to protect the fisheries of this Province, Sir, because, Sir, when we talk of the fisheries, we talk of something that has been the life blood, the life blood, Sir, of this Province. Anything, any effort we can take to preserve stocks, Sir, whether it is this particular motion now or any motions that we deal with that has to do with destroying our stocks, Sir, is of importance to every member. It is no joke, Sir. It may be a joke to some people, but not to me, Sir, because I know and I can go back nearly fifty years, Sir, when I began work in the City of St. John's where your very wages that you drew on Water Street, Sir, were subject to the fishery that year. Everything revolved around the fishery at that time, Sir. We had no great handouts in these days. You were just as independent as the honourable Minister of Finance has said.

People went out and did it on their own. No longer, Sir, can you get brilliant ideas and say the government will pay the bill. You could not do it in these days, Sir. They are doing it in these days, now but not in the past.

So, Mr. Speaker, if I may compliment the honourable Member for Bonavista South, Sir, and also, Sir, and a word of praise to our Minister of Fisheries who is doing everything in his power, Sir, to adopt corrective measures to preserve our stocks and perhaps one of the most important moves yet made, Sir, and I witnessed on T.V. last night that tremendous meeting in Carbonear on the inshore fishery and also I heard, I understand, although the T.V. did not cover it or radio, I do not know, the meeting in Placentia. I say, Sir, we can talk all we like in this honourable House, Sir, this eighteen or twenty of us with a few people listening here and in the galleries, we can talk all we like. Talk is cheap, Sir, but what we want is action and this is the action that we want, to get



the man whose living depends on it, Sir, get him involved in it, get him involved in it. Ask any fisherman on this thing here. Ask any fisherman what is the life blood and let us preserve the stocks. We go to great measures, Sir, to have closed seasons on our wildlife here. We close the season - why? To give these animals a chance to breed and to get out.

If we could do the same thing, Sir, as this resolution suggests - you cannot have fish, Sir, unless they are spawned. And when we speak of fish, Sir, we are not speaking any longer of something that you throw away anymore. From my own experience, Sir, last year in Sarasota, Florida, salt fish, \$3.75 a pound, Sir, Canadian salt fish. But try to get it, you try to get it in many of the mainland cities of Canada and in the Eastern United States, you try to buy a bit of salt fish. As far as this is concerned, Sir, this is what is needed.

We can talk about building 5,000 trawlers, Sir. You can talk about all the nets in the world. You can talk about the price of nets. You can talk what you like. You can go fishing with a \$1 million outfit, Sir, fishing rod, a silver reel, anything else. If the fish are not there, it is just as well to stay home. This is it, Sir. If our fishermen are to survive, to live in a manner to which we all have become accustomed, Sir, in this day and age, let us do our part as parliamentarians, Sir, and I use the term very loosely, to urge those who can help, Sir, to bring in this measure. I think everybody in this honourable House, Sir, without exception should support this whether they come from an urban, rural area, city, town, outport, whatever you would like to call it, but if Newfoundland is to survive, Sir, it is to survive if the fishery survives and otherwise it is going to be too bad for us all.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): If the member speaks now, he closes the debate.

The Member for Bonavista South.

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, when I introduced this resolution, I think it was four Private Members' Days ago, I did not realize then

that this resolution would get so much debate. I was hoping it would get some considerable debate in this legislature, but I did not think it would get so much debate as what we have seen during the past four Private Members' Days.

I am proud that it has brought in such debate in the Assembly, a stimulation of debate mostly non-partisan. It is unusual, Mr. Speaker, that we can stand as members of this legislature and not get involved in partisan debate. Usually debate is twisted some how or other in a partisan fashion, but this debate has not been a partisan debate and I think it is because the resolution has been recognized by all members of this legislature as a very important resolution because it is dealing with closing the Hamilton Banks during the spawning season which is having such an effect on the inshore fishery, in particular, the Northeast Coast of our Province where sixty per cent of all our fishermen in this Province reside and try to make a living from the sea.

The fact that, I think there were fifteen maybe sixteen members on this side of the Assembly spoke in this debate, spoke in favour of the resolution and I think the majority of the Opposition members spoke in favour of this resolution in a non-partisan fashion and as the mover, the initial mover in the person who introduced this private members' resolution, I am indeed proud. But I think maybe today I am going to sit down not being a very proud man after all. I am proud of this legislature, yes, and I am proud of this government with regards to its stand on the fisheries. After hearing all of this debate and hearing the points brought forward by Cabinet ministers, and by backbenchers and by Opposition spokesmen showing their deep concern for the fishermen and the fisheries problems in this Province, I can be proud, yes. But, Mr. Speaker, last weekend I learned of something that took place in this Province two weeks ago

which really made my stomach turn and my blood boil as a Bonavista Bay man, as a son of a fisherman and as a true-bred Newfoundlander. Here we are as a group of politicians, a group of leaders debating in this legislature a resolution which is so important to the inshore fishery along the Coast, yet the Federal Government decided two weeks ago to send down to Newfoundland the official delegation that they are going to send to ICNAF, in Edinburgh, Scotland in June. They came down to Newfoundland while we here were debating this very important resolution which is going to be taken to the Federal Government asking them to go to the ICNAF meeting in Edinburgh in June and to put all the pressure you can on the international countries to try to get some kind of an agreement by negotiation to ban the fishing on the Hamilton Banks during the spawning season.

We all want that. We all spoke in support of that. We want to see it happen. But when I learned on the weekend from a person who was attending a private little gathering, Mr. Speaker, and it was a private little gathering where the Federal Government sent down their official delegation that is going to ICNAF in June and called together a little meeting in the Holiday Inn here in St. John's. What for, Mr. Speaker? Guess what? They called together a little meeting, a select few by invitation. I think there was representation there from the Fishermen's Union, a number of fish trades or fish companies in the Province. I think there were four fishermen, Mr. Speaker, four fishermen, selected by invitation. There was no mention and no indication given to this legislature whether we as legislators, we as politicians, we as leaders, whether it be Liberal, New Labrador or NDP or Conservative as legislators, there was no indication given to us or no consultation whatsoever asking us if we would want to come along and to express our views because of the fact there is a Private Member's resolution before the House of Assembly which is being debated, being supported by government, supported by Opposition. No. They completely ignored

the government, number one. Number two: to make things really bad they ignored this legislature which is both parties, all parties concerned.

Now, if that is the kind of concern that I expressed also in my remarks when I opened the debate on this resolution, the kind of concern - we know the concern of the Federal Government towards the fisheries. We have known it for years. We have seen it in the lack of action, in their neglect of the fisheries. We have seen that, but now to have the gall to send down their official delegation, to call a little gathering, a little meeting and to ignore this legislature, to ignore this very important resolution, to me it is really unquestionable, that kind of action. It is questionable. Why would they do that kind of thing? What are we in Newfoundland? What are we, lackeys for the Federal Government? What are we as politicians, as members of this honourable House of Assembly? Are we going to be ignored, both the Liberal Party, and the Progressive Conservative Party, New Labrador Party? Are we going to be ignored? Are we going to be looked upon as lackeys of the Federal Government? Are we going to be casually pushed aside by the mandarins, the autocrats in Ottawa who make the decisions which are so important and so vital to the economy of this Province?

It makes my blood boil, Mr. Speaker, because it is a very down to earth, basic situation where we see a few autocrats, a few technocrats, mandarins in Ottawa sitting down and making decisions that we are going to decide what Newfoundland wants, we are going to tell the Newfoundland fishermen. That is what happened two weeks ago and I am sure every man that got any connection at all in this House of Assembly with the fishery, who has any concern for the fishery will agree with what I am saying today. We cannot afford to allow Ottawa to continue to push us around, to ignore us, to show that arrogance.

If Canada is going to go forward in ICNAF in June and they are going over there, this delegation, out of the mere courtesy alone, Mr. Speaker, they could have, at least, met with the Select Committee of the House of Assembly which was also then appointed and I am a member of that Committee and there are nine honourable gentlemen here serving on that Committee, both Opposition members, New Labrador Party, Mr. Martin is on the same Committee. I think there are seven gentlemen from our side, six, seven, that delegation going to ICNAF out of courtesy alone could have invited the Select Committee of this legislature to sit down with them to get some indication as to what they felt Newfoundland's position or what they felt Newfoundland would want to see pushed forward at the next ICNAF meeting in June. But, no, no, Mr. Speaker, no, no, that kind of courtesy was overridden by the arrogance, by the arrogance and I have no hesitation in repeating my earlier remarks, the mandarins in Ottawa who always chose to ignore Newfoundland.

I think Newfoundland really is one big Newfie joke to those technocrats and those mandarins in Ottawa and it is making me sick. Last week also, we have a task force with the Federal Government now, a task force appointed by the Federal Government, that is here in Newfoundland. I do not know where they are, Mr. Speaker. I talked to members of the media. They do not know where they are either. I talked to the people connected with the fishery. They do not know where they are either, but they are a Federal Government task force here in Newfoundland - doing what? They are here, Mr. Speaker, to make decisions, to make recommendations. The Federal Government task force on the inshore fishery is right now in Newfoundland, they were two days ago, here in Newfoundland, not consulting the fishermen, not consulting the fish merchants, not consulting the Newfoundland Government, at least not this honourable House.

I think there was a meeting held with the Minister of Fisheries, but no consultation in regards to the fishermen. But that task force, guess what they are doing, Mr. Speaker? Guess what they are doing?

They are getting information and they are going to go back to Ottawa and make recommendations to the Federal Government and these recommendations, Mr. Speaker, ninety-five chances out of a hundred, will become law or regulation or policy after the end of this month when we see the present interim help to the fishery in Newfoundland cancelled out.

Whatever the Federal Government brings in then, whether it be another band-aid situation to help the fishery in the Province, whether it be a long-term policy, whether it be a short-term policy, no matter what kind of a policy it is going to be, it is going to be based on, ninety-five chances out of a hundred, based on the recommendations made by these technocrats from Ottawa who come down here, look around the Province, look at the map - Where is Burgeo? Where is Bonavista? Where is Wesleyville? Where is Fogo? Oh! They are all along the Coast. There they are on the map. Sit down at the Holiday Inn or some other hotel in St. John's and make the very important decisions affecting the lives of thousands of fishermen around our Coast.

It is getting ridiculous. It is beyond shame.

CAPTAIN WINSOR: - Federal Newfoundlanders -

MR. MORGAN: Federal Newfoundlanders. Oh! Sure. Oh! Yes! We got sure we have. The honourable gentleman from Fogo, a very knowledgeable man in the fisheries, I must admit, and also a man concerned for the fisheries, ask if there are not some Federal Newfoundlanders or federal employees, I assume he is asking, on the task force. Oh! Sure, we have. Yes, we have. We have the same people who sit in the Sir Humphrey Gilbert Building or sit down in Pleasantville day after day, week after week, who do not see a fisherman, do not see a fishing boat, do not see Bonavista, do not see Wesleyville, do not see Fogo.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: One would think they know their geography though.

MR. MORGAN: They know the geography. They know where to find Fogo. They might fly there, but they know where to find Fogo. They would

April 2, 1975.

Tape 951

RH - 5

find their way, maybe. But we have these people on the committee. They are there on the task force, on the Federal Government task force. They are giving advice. They are giving the advice and recommendations, the task force as to what should be done with the fisheries.

2857



Sure they are, Mr. Speaker, the same way as you sit down in their plush offices and draw up regulations that are governing the fishermen of this Province. But it is all done, Mr. Speaker, and the unfortunate part it is all done without consultation with the fishermen

And yesterday morning and yesterday afternoon when I sat in the hall in Carbonear, and in the hall over in Placentia, and the honourable gentleman for Fogo was there, and the honourable gentleman for Port de Grave was there, and we saw the fishermen come in and sit down before our Committee, and we saw how they poured out their frustrations to us. We saw all of their problems. Problem after problem, problem after problem, genuine frustration, their sincerity shining through, bona fide fishermen who are trying to do their best to earn a living for their families. The honourable gentleman for Fogo saw it. We all saw it. We all listened. It is the purpose of our Committee to listen to them. We know what their frustrations are. And being the son of a fisherman I also know it from my own experience, the frustrations of a fisherman.

But my big question, Mr. Speaker, do those mandarins, do those technocrats, do those aristocrats in Ottawa realize the frustrations of fishermen when they come down and sit down with their closed little meeting in the Holiday Inn and make decisions on the fishery? No, Mr. Speaker. No, Mr. Speaker, they do not know the frustrations, and further more they do not care about the frustrations.

Here we are today, Mr. Speaker, putting forward a resolution to be voted on today before this House of Assembly closes. A Private Member's Resolution which I feel, and I am confident, will be voted on unanimously by all members of the Legislature, passed by this House of Assembly unanimously, asking for the closing of the Hamilton Banks during the spawning season. And yet, and yet the official delegation going from Canada, going to sit down at the ICNAF meetings in Edinburgh, going to sit down and negotiate with the foreign countries to try and get some kind of an agreement with regards to the control of our fish resources along the Continental Shelf, and in our situation along the



coastline of other nations.

We see an official delegation going over to Ottawa and, believe it or not, the closing of the Hamilton Banks, and what I am saying today, I think, is confidential information. If you talk to the delegation right now in Ottawa, any delegation, or delegate, and they say oh, no we cannot tell you what the official position of Canada will be at the ICNAF meetings. But, Mr. Speaker, I happen to know. I have my means and ways - some gentlemen call me the investigator - means and ways of digging in and finding out, and I know what the official position is going to be unless we as a member of one of the segments of Confederation, as a province demand, that these recommendations be changed. They are going to ICNAF in June as it presently stands and they are not going to ask for the closing of the Hamilton Banks.

Now what I am saying is factual. What I am saying is true. And you talk to any member today of a delegation that is going over, the federal government delegation, and they will say oh, no we cannot tell you what we are going to put forward at ICNAF. It is confidential. The meeting they had in Holiday Inn two weeks ago was also confidential. It was confidential. The information discussed was confidential.

Mr. Speaker, that is the reason why today in closing the debate my optimism which was built up in listening to the members speak, and the minister speak, the Opposition spokesman speak, my optimism was really built up, because I am quite concerned over this resolution because I know what it means to the fishermen in Bonavista, and my own district Bonavista South, but now, Mr. Speaker, in putting the resolution forward and today getting it voted on and passed unanimously my hopes have been let down. But, Mr. Speaker, my hopes are let down but not my determination because I feel and I certainly hope that all members when they vote on this resolution today and pass it will agree with what I am going to say. Because of what I said today about the position that is going to be put forward by the Canadian delegation going to ICNAF, because what I am saying is true, and it can be verified by all members of this Legislature if

they want to dig in and find out the way I did, because we know they are going over there and going to ignore this resolution, presently that is how it is. They knew it was on the Order Paper. They knew what we were discussing in the House of Assembly on Private Members' Day. They knew we were debating a resolution that was going to be sent forward to their delegation, but they ignored us. They ignored us completely. They ignored the Newfoundland Legislature which really is ignoring the Newfoundland people, ignoring the Newfoundland Province.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable Member for Port au Port when he was speaking in debate, he said that the neglect of the fisheries in this Province by the federal government was really tearing at the fabric of Confederation. You know he was right. He was right on the nose. The federal government's neglect of our fisheries is tearing at the very fabric of Confederation. Now here we are being shown by the federal government that they are going to ignore the Newfoundland Legislature which, in a sense, is saying they are going to ignore the Newfoundland people.

We must not, and I am sure, Mr. Speaker, all honourable members will agree, that we are not going to, we are not going to, any further, to be ignored, to be pushed aside. We are not no longer going to be lackies for the federal government. We are not no longer going to be listed as the technocrats, the stupid Newfies, no longer, Mr. Speaker. And I would like to see a delegation from this Legislature take this resolution and with all the minutes taken from Hansard which shows all the different points of view and argument brought forward by all honourable gentlemen, there was not one gentleman who spoke in this debate, made the debate partisan, not one member. It was a very genuine, sincere debate with many points and many arguments brought forward.

Mr. Speaker, I think that this resolution should not be just mailed to Ottawa, I think this resolution and it is my strong recommendation, too bad I would like to make this as a part of an amendment to the resolution, but rather than do that, because it would

mean a debate over and over again, maybe I should, but I will make it as a very strong recommendation that this resolution will resolve the ministers and the members, backbenchers and opposition spokesmen speaking in support of this resolution and putting forward their ideas that this resolution be taken by a delegation from this Legislature, not mailed, not sent, delivered by a messenger, but taken by a delegation to Ottawa, by delegation from this Legislature to the federal government and also so this delegation from our Assembly will sit down with the official Canadian delegation going to ICNAF and to point out to them that we are not going to accept anything else but having this resolution put forward at ICNAF in June.

If we are concerned for the fisheries, as all the members who spoke indicated they were, even the Member for Labrador West, the honourable gentleman from St. John's Centre and places like that where there is no fishing boats, no fishing activity, expressed their concern for the fisheries and the fishermen of this Province, all the honourable gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, all these gentlemen have expressed their concern, and if we are going to allow a few individuals to come down from Ottawa and to overrule the decisions made by this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, I would say we have got no part to play in Confederation. That is not spoken in a radical point of view either, It is spoken after much thought. It is spoken as a man who represents a fishing area in this Province, If a number of technocrats or mandarins can come down from Ottawa and sit down and overrule the decision made by this Legislature, we have got no part to play in Confederation. It might sound like a very strong statement, but it is facts.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: That is the point, Mr. Speaker, why are we here? Why are we a part of Confederation? Why do we have a resolution today on the floor of this House of Assembly asking for the closing of the Hamilton Banks? Why? That kind of resolution should not be necessary. Why should we have that resolution, urging the federal government, urging

April 2, 1975

Tape No. 953

NM - 3

the federal government to go over to ICNAF in June and to say we want the Hamilton Banks closed. Why are we doing it? Because we have no choice, We have to do it. We have to do it.

It all revolves around the attitude of the federal government. They recognize Quebec. Oh, yes, Mr. Speaker, the federal government recognizes Quebec. Sure, that is where the majority of the seats are. It all revolves around political reasons, where the political strength is. They also recognize Ontario. They are also now in the last three or four years strongly recognizing the Western Provinces, the Prairie Provinces. But are they recognizing Newfoundland? Are they recognizing Newfoundland's needs? Yes, Mr. Speaker, they are recognizing Newfoundland the way they did two weeks ago which was typical. Typical.

This resolution started out to be a motherhood resolution, something that I thought, and was thankful to see after all members agreeing with because they had concerns for the fishermen and the fisheries of this Province. But now at the closing of this debate it is down to something else more fundamental. It is down to something which is really of a big issue in this Province, because if we pass this resolution, and I am confident that we will pass the resolution, and if we have not allowed Ottawa to overrule the decisions of a Newfoundland Legislature, to ignore the decisions of the Legislature, that, Mr. Speaker, is incredible.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: If the honourable gentleman has been in the House of Assembly during the beginning of the debate - what I am pointing out is that two weeks ago - I will outline -

MR. NEARY: I was kicked out by the government, that is why I was not here.

MR. MORGAN: No, no that was today, today's debate, today's debate.

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: Yes.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: So what I am getting at, if the federal Delegation going to ICNAF is not going to ask even, or request any way or form the closing of the Hamilton Banks, and the fact they were here two weeks ago, the official delegation met in Holiday Inn, a private gathering - I should not say private, because it was not really a private gathering but it was a small personal type gathering -

MR. NEARY: Was the Minister of Fisheries there?

MR. MORGAN: No.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: I think, I am not sure but I think Mr. Cashin was there. But at least I talked to one person who was there, He knew about my Private Member's Resolution before the House, and he said, well the delegation are going to ICNAF in June and they are not even going to put forward a recommendation to ban the Hamilton Banks. But you fellows in the House of Assembly are debating every Wednesday for the past four Wednesdays, you are talking about closing the Hamilton Banks, you want it closed, the government wants it closed. But do you know what, he said, the federal government are not going to ask for the closing of the Hamilton Banks.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Cashin was ....

MR. MORGAN: I am not sure if Mr. Cashin was there or not, but I think there was representation there from the Fishermen's Union, I think there was.

MR. NEARY: What has the member got against the Fishermen's Union?

MR. MORGAN: No, no, I am not - the Fishermen's Union is fine. They should have been there. But what I am saying is that they should not, this group, this delegation should not decide that they are going to make the big decision what they will put forward on behalf of Newfoundland. This House of Assembly is now deciding, and this resolution, if we go on today and pass it unanimously, if it is passed by the Legislature, we are deciding, the people of the Province, we are the people. We are here, all of us, representing the people of this Province. And if we find ourselves in a situation where we cannot get our views put forward and accepted by a small committee or a delegation going to ICNAF, today this issue is one that could really, not only as the honourable Member for Port au Port mentioned earlier, tear at the fabric of Confederation, it could really tear us away from Confederation.

MR. NEARY: The Bully Boy is going to ICNAF. Is he not, Bully Boy Crosbie?

MR. MORGAN: The honourable gentleman if he would speak in respect for some other honourable gentleman I might reply to him. But the Hon. Minister of Fisheries -

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: But I will reply to him anyway. The Hon. Minister of Fisheries and hopefully, and I say it without hesitation, I am going along myself, hopefully. But we are only going -

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: But we are only going along -

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, could I - if the honourable gentleman cannot keep quite will he leave the Chamber again so we can have the debate in sensible order.

AN HON. MEMBER: Name him.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister of Fisheries will be going to ICNAF, and hopefully I will be going along as well, but only as observers.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: And that is important, Mr. Speaker, because the official delegation are the ones who vote, the ones who put forward debate, the ones who put forward recommendations, the ones who put forward the issues at stake.

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: So, Mr. Speaker, you know it is really sickening to listen to the honourable gentleman for Bell Island who - here we are with a very important issue, and he wants to make a mockery of it.

MR. NEARY: No, I want to send the fishermen, not a Townie.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: He wants to make a mockery out of it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: You have made a mockery out of the House of Assembly so would you please - if you cannot stay in the House and be sensible, leave the House again.



MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Here we are with a situation that we are going to decide, and if this legislature, if the honourable member from Hermitage who was just making some very uncomplimentary comments over there, if he believes, Mr. Speaker -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, if he believes in standing up in this Assembly and voting on a law or voting on a resolution that we pass unanimously, if he believes that kind of resolution should be completely ignored by any government department in Ottawa, that should be ignored completely by the federal government in general, he does not share my belief.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: I think you are giving a great speech. Do you not agree?

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I have taken part in meetings in the past dealing with the federal government. I have seen the attitude of many of these people who make the recommendations that go into the Departments of Fisheries and the Environment like the Hon. Romeo Leblanc's department, the federal Minister of Fisheries. Well, Mr. Davis was there, but at least Mr. Davis at the latter part of his term in office - Mr. Davis was sort of surprising to me because in the beginning Jack Davis was looked upon as a man who was the enemy of the fishermen. But you know, Mr. Speaker, during his last year in office I began to believe that Mr. Davis was no longer an enemy of the fishermen. He was a friend of the fishermen. Mr. Davis, I think, was the best minister in Ottawa responsible for fisheries that Ottawa ever had.

He was determined the last year he was in office to get some assistance for the fishermen, to get help for the Newfoundland Fishery and the Atlantic Coast Fishery. He was determined. Of course, he could not persuade his colleagues. He could not persuade the Hon. Mitchell Sharp.

I recall a statement made in the House of Commons. At that



time the honourable member from Gander-Twillingate, Mr. Lundrigan, was the MP. I recall that a question put forward to Mr. - he was then the External Affairs Minister, the Hon. Mitchell Sharp - about the position Canada would take in regards to declaring a 200 mile limit. The question was - the essence of Mr. Sharp's answer was, oh, no, we cannot do that because there could be international repercussions. International repercussions - no no, we would not dare go out and fight for the Newfoundland and Labrador Fishery, fight for the Atlantic Provinces. Oh, we could not do that because we could have raised the ire of the Russians or the Spaniards or the West Germans or the Portuguese. Oh no, we could not do that. We do not want any ripples along the international waves. We do not want that.

That is the kind of backbone the federal Minister of External Affairs showed towards our fisheries and towards our problems with the fisheries in Newfoundland. So, we know that Mr. Davis, I think, was doing his best. Now, we have a new minister, The Hon. Romeo Leblanc, I listened to him making his speeches. I listened to his comments on television. I have looked at some of the statements he has made in the House of Commons. I think he is a very sincere gentleman, but the only thing is he is a new minister, not only a new Minister of Fisheries or responsible for fisheries but a new minister. I think, I am not sure, he is a new member of the Commons, elected for the first time.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: Yes. He is new in the House of Commons. He is new in cabinet and, of course, he is new in regards of responsibility for fisheries.

Now, so Mr. Romeo Leblanc, a very sincere man, is sitting over here and he wants to do something for the fisheries. He says to his officials in his department, now, gentlemen, I want to do something but I do not know what to do. Now, would you go down to Newfoundland or would you go down to Nova Scotia, go down to the Gaspé Coast, would you go down to Atlantic Region Canada and

April 2, 1975

Tape 955

IB-3

come back to me and make some recommendations so I can do something favourable to the fisheries and try to get myself in a good light in the eye of the fisherman. That is exactly what is happening today in Ottawa, exactly

2868

what is happening. Mr. Leblanc is totally depending upon the advice he is receiving from his task force groups, from his officials, and from the official station here in Newfoundland. I say station because they are only here temporarily. They are here for a three or four year period and they are off to Halifax or Moncton or somewhere else. The only station - they are like the Labrador fishermen used to be years ago. You go there and you would be stationed for three or four months and you would come back home in the fall. Well, now we have aristocrats and autocrats and mandarins, some of them, not all of them, some of them are really good men. I have talked to them, met with them and discussed the problems of the fishery with some of them. Mr. Len Crowley, a man I have great respect for, Mr. Graham Frampton, another man in the federal level. But you are not getting involved into all these gentlemen, but these gentlemen are like stationers. They are here for maybe a year, maybe two years, maybe, possibly, three. It depends on how well they are doing a job and then they are transferred. They are transferred, maybe, hopefully they are transferred to Ottawa because that is where they all want to be, up in those big plush office buildings with the cafeteria downstairs, with the bands brought in on the weekend, where they have dances every Friday night.

Mr. Speaker, last summer I went into the Department of the Environment Building in, I think it is Principle Street in Hull, the new building now where all the fisheries and small craft harvest division is in Hull, across the way from Ottawa. This is in a beautiful, Oh! beautiful building, beautiful building. This is where a Newfoundland fisherman has got to go up and look for something if he cannot get his M.P. In most cases in Newfoundland the M.P. cannot even get in touch with him. He cannot even hear from him.

So, if a Newfoundland fisherman, for example, in Bonavista or out in Carbonear or Old Perlican or Bay de Verde or Placentia Bay, any of these places, if he got an M.P. Who is not concerned for him and his problems, if he got a M.P. he never hears about, never hears from,

cannot get in touch with and he has got a very serious problem, like a breakwater needs repair or a wharf needs repair or harbour facilities of some sort, he goes into Ottawa. Of course, there is no point in going into the House of Commons with a delegation because he is going to be shuffled off to the advisors to the ministers, in this case, Mr. Leblanc's advisors. They are sitting over in a big plush building over in Hull, a new building, a building where I mentioned earlier, a building where they have a beautiful cafeteria which is equal to and above practically any night club around this Province.

Mr. Speaker, they have a band down in the cafeteria with a hardwood floor dance area. This is in the Fisheries Building now and the music and the band instruments are all there all the time and Friday evenings all the people in the building get downstairs for a big gathering.

MR. NEARY: I'se the bye.

MR. MORGAN: And they play every tune except I'se the bye that build the boat.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: Of course, they make a few comments about those stupid Newfoundlanders and a few stupid Newfie jokes. One of the boys might say, Oh! boy, those stupid Newfs from Twillingate were in last week about that breakwater. That kind of a comment. And they are making these kind of comments, they are making these kind of comments, Mr. Speaker. I know. As the M.P.s have often said in Ottawa, the word fish is a dirty word, not only in the House of Commons but in these plush office buildings in Ottawa, in these plush office buildings where they bring in those, where they have the instruments, they have a dance floor.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: Pardon?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: Yes, the honourable gentleman's -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: He is looking for a booking. - -

MR. MORGAN: The honourable gentleman's band we had at the leadership convention would be put to shame, be put to shame, unfortunately, be put to shame because -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: Yes, now, Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman just made a good point.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, could I speak, carry on - Okay.

MR. NEARY: If you are going to make a fool of yourself, you might as well go all the way.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman from Bell Island mentioned that, did they serve flippers over there, did they serve flippers. You know, if they really did serve flippers and served cod tongues and that kind of thing, they might have a different attitude towards Newfoundland. They just might. They just might sit down to a beautiful meal and say, my God! This came from Newfoundland, that little Island out there in the Eastern part of Canada, where those stupid Newfoundlanders are.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: Oh! Yes.

Oh, yes they might just sit down for a good meal of cod tongues and change their minds. But, Mr. Speaker, the way it seems right now it might mean more than having a feed of flippers or a meal of cod tongues or a meal of cod fish to have some concern for the fisheries in our Province. And we can joke all we like but the situation is serious because as long as we got those mandarins in Ottawa who have no concerns for the fishermen of this Province, and the problems of the fishermen, we are going to have that problem. We are going to have the problem of not getting action from Ottawa. We are going to have the problem of being neglected continuously, and we cannot afford that to happen. If we do not get action at the ICNAF meeting in this up-coming June meeting, what are we going to have? We are going to have inshore fishermen along the Labrador Coast, along Twillingate, Fogo, Lumsden, Wesleyville, Bonavista, St. Anthony, LaScie all along the coast we are going to have fishermen - and you go in and talk to them about jokes and laughing and playing bands and dancing and there will be no dancing or laughing in these areas. No, Mr. Speaker, it is no joke, It is a very serious situation. And to make it more serious when I even think about it my blood boiled on the weekend when I heard about that Committee coming down here, the delegation, and going to ignore our resolution. Ignore our resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I would just like to remind the honourable member that he has five minutes left.

MR. MORGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Hear! Hear! The best news we heard all day.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, we are going to vote today on a resolution -

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

AN HON. MEMBER: He introduced the resolution. Ninety minutes.

MR. MORGAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, being the introducer of the resolution -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: I still have forty-five minutes.

MR. NEARY: No, five minutes more.

MR. MORGAN: Five -

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has five minutes left by leave.

MR. MORGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I will clue up because the fisheries and the problems of the fishermen - really at times I think I get carried away. I get too emotional. Because, like I said when I brought in the debate, you know I lived with the fisheries. My old man was a hard working fisherman I saw how he toiled and tried to make a living from the ocean. And I am so involved in the fisheries and so involved in the concern of the fishermen I get carried away. And maybe I should not. Maybe I should not. Maybe it is useless. But, Mr. Speaker, no, I do not think it is useless. I think that my determination is the determination of all honourable gentlemen of this Assembly. That if once we today vote, and we will vote in a few minutes on this resolution, and if the vote is unanimous, and I hope it will, and I have confidence that it will be with all members of the House voting in favour, and voting for this resolution that we will not, we will not in any way tolerate Ottawa going to the ICNAF meeting and not putting forward that resolution asking for the close of the Hamilton Banks. Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: All those in favour of the motion as amended "Aye", those against "Nay". I declare the motion carried.

MR. MURPHY: Is that recorded?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! There was one other precedent that I recall when there was a standing vote taken on a Resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Ring the bells, Sir, please.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

All of those in favour of the motion as amended please stand.

The Hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy, the Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, the Hon. the Minister of Health, the Hon. the Minister of Social Services, the Hon. the Minister of Transportation and Communications, the Hon. the Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation, the Hon. the Minister of Industrial Development, the Hon. the Minister of Finance, Mr. Stagg, Mr. Morgan, Mr. Brett, Mr. Senior, Mr. Wilson, Mr. Marshall, Mr. Young, Mr. Howard, the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition, Capt. Winsor, Mr. Neary, Mr. Rowe, Mr. Simmons.

MR. SPEAKER: Those against the resolution please stand; nil.

I declare the motion unanimously carried.

Motion No. 3 as it appears on today's Order Paper to be moved by the honourable member for Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move:

THAT a Select Committee be appointed to enquire into and report upon all circumstances surrounding any decision or decisions by the Government to acquire any office or other accommodation, by rental, purchase or otherwise since January 1, 1973, or any proposals so to acquire office or other accommodation; the Committee to have power to send for papers and documents and to require the attendance of witnesses to testify under oath; the Committee to have power to sit in session or out; and the Committee to carry out their work as expeditiously as possible, to submit an interim report to the House within thirty days of their appointment, and to submit their final report within ninety days of their appointment.

Mr. Speaker, it is not the kind of motion I can honestly say I take pleasure in moving. I take pleasure only in the sense that it is a necessity that this kind of motion be moved because it is a necessity that we have this kind of Committee because it is a necessity that we have this kind of investigation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, after I had given notice that I would introduce



this resolution, the documents relating to the rental proposals from Mr. Craig Dobbin and others, these documents were tabled. When I heard they were going to be tabled, I wondered if there would be still the same kind of need for an investigation until I saw the documents. Mr. Speaker, I have here the documents.

Mr. Speaker, if there was any doubt about the need for an investigation on this matter, anybody who has read this document at all carefully, I believe, must agree there is not doubt about the need. This is an indictment of the first order of the actions of this government, Mr. Speaker, insofar as their conduct with respect to rentals is concerned, an indictment of the first order. I shall come back to that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I wonder if I could just interrupt the honourable member for a moment. It has just been brought to my attention that we have in the galleries some newly elected councillors, perhaps some of the newest councillors in the Province, on January 25, 1975 from the Town of Bay de Verde, the Deputy Mayor, Mr. Joseph Noonan, Mr. Don Barter, I think it is, and Mr. Bren Doyle, councillors.

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

The honourable member for Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I regard the motion I have just moved as a crucially important one. I believe it is especially relevant at this particular time because of the number of questions being raised around the Province, being raised publicly, all throughout this Province, questions about the actions of this government, question about the credibility of this government. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, question about the very integrity of this government.

This,

Mr. Speaker, was the honourable crowd that was going to do away with patronage completely, no more patronage. The word went out after January, 1972.

Well, of course, Mr. Speaker, there are many examples we could quote on this subject. Perhaps the one that comes most readily to mind is the example, that shocking example we saw a few weeks ago in relation to The Daily News. We saw how viciously they were punished for stepping out of line, for taking a stand on the trawlermen's dispute which was not in line with the government's company-support stand. We know what happened there. We know how appearances have been given. We know how the government has tried to give the impression that it has changed its mind on the subject. Of course, we also know by reading The Daily News that the facts speak for themselves and that that paper is still being punished by this administration.

That, of course, Mr. Speaker, in its own way is a form of patronage or at least it is one of the spin-off effects of a patronage policy. A patronage policy, Mr. Speaker, a deliberate policy of dishing it out and this is what this green documents is all about, Mr. Speaker, it is proof positive that the patronage policy is very much in vogue, very much in this vote.

MR. DOODY: What is that document?

MR. SIMMONS: That, Mr. Speaker, is the green paper intended for people who were obviously very green, because anybody who would feel that this document would exonerate the government -

AN HON. MEMBER: Table it in this House.

MR. SIMMONS: It was tabled. The Minister of Mines, Mr. Speaker, is not one of the terrible three in Cabinet. He would not know about it unless he read it since it became public. It is all the documents to do with the Dobbin deal, the scandalous Dobbin deal, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: I thought it was a telephone book.

MR. SIMMONS: I will go through it. It is much more enlightening than

a telephone book, as you will see shortly, Mr. Speaker.

Now, before this was tabled, the Opposition, my colleagues here, made a number of attempts to get to the bottom of the affair, to ask questions that would bring this into perspective. We knew there was something going on. The Premier at one point said that no agreement had been signed. He, Mr. Speaker, as only he can do, was choosing his words extremely well when he said that, but not well enough, not well enough. He said and I quote, "No agreement had been signed with Mr. Dobbín." Mr. Speaker, on that one he was not telling the truth. The documents he made available to the House have proven to be less than truthful on this particular point.

A deal was signed. Now he was playing on the word agreement, as in some kind of a formal agreement. In that sense the Premier was somewhat correct but he was, as I think we will see in a moment when I get to the appropriate document, he was playing with words, Mr. Speaker, at best.

On November 15 the Minister of Public Works and Services wrote to Mr. Craig Dobbín and in part it says the following, "November 15, 1974. 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, it is accepted. It is accepted, subject to formal approval of your building plans and lease agreement."

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing much conditional about that particular acceptance. That acceptance is contingent not on coming up with a good proposal or a right proposal or an acceptable proposal. The proposal is accepted now subject to two formalities, mere formalities in the rental and construction business, the formality of providing proper building plans in adherence with proper health codes and safety codes and what have you and the provision of a lease agreement. Two formalities, but otherwise, Mr. Speaker, the government accepted the Dobbín

proposal on November 15.

The Premier, Mr. Speaker, has been far less than honest with this House and with the public of Newfoundland in his dealings with this matter. He has indicated on a number of occasions, Mr. Speaker, that no agreement had been signed. Well there is the document, Mr. Speaker, and I say -

AN HON. MEMBER: Read it out "Roger" -

MR. SIMMONS: I do not have the Hansard except that I have the quotation from it and it reads, "No agreement was signed in response to a question from a member on this side.

AN HON. MEMBER: What did he actually sign?

MR. SIMMONS: Well, what was signed was a letter -

AN HON. MEMBER: We know it, but the audience.

MR. SIMMONS: A letter from the Minister of Public Works, T. C. Farrell, M.D., signs the letter. e

signs the letter. And in part it says, Your proposal to rent to the government office space etc. is accepted. Now that proposal, Mr. Speaker, was changed three times. Three times. And perhaps we ought to go back to the beginning of this rather startling document because it is an indictment from beginning to end. An indictment of the kind of practice and practices this government are engaging in. On September 30, 1974 the then Minister of Public Works, the present Minister of Transportation, wrote a letter to Mr. Craig Dobbin, Omega Investments, to Seaboard Construction, to Crosbie and Company Managing Group, and to Lundrigan's Limited, wrote to four companies on September 30, a letter such as this one. This one is to Mr. Dobbin.

Government have directed me to invite proposals for an additional space in the St. John's area. The amount of space contemplated will be in the range of 75,000 to 100,000 square feet. We will invite you to submit a proposal as to the following; the cost per square foot etc. (2) the date or approximate date if such space could be made available, (3) which cost in connection with this space will be borne by the landlord, and which by the tenant. A copy of your standard lease, if available, will be beneficial. Your proposal must be submitted to the minister etc. not later than 5:00 o'clock on October 14.

Now, Mr. Speaker, here is the first part of this charade, this mockery, this going through the motions. Mr. Speaker, having read those documents I can only come to one conclusion; that the backroom boys had cooked a deal, and they said, now let us not forget all those things we said about democracy, about calling tenders. We better make sure the record is right, just in case. So somebody says, Craig, I will write you a letter. And so on September 30 they write him a letter. They say, just to cover our tracks really well we will write three or four more letters.

Here we are, the government of a province asking four developers, would-be providers of office space to give a detailed quotation on 100,000 feet of office space - asking them on September 30 to have that proposal ready for the government by October 14, two weeks later. Now,

of course, you can assume, Mr. Speaker, from that alone, you could assume that perhaps the four developers had been contacted beforehand - verbally, nothing wrong with that - had been contacted beforehand and had been told we will put this in writing for you, but in the meantime think about it because when we write you the letter you are only going to have a couple of weeks. We can assume that happened, except the documents say otherwise.

That letter went out on September 30 to the four developers I have mentioned, Omega, Mr. Craig Dobbin, Seaboard, Crosbie, and Lundrigan's on September 30. On about the middle of October, around the time the deadline had run out, one of the companies, Seaboard wrote the minister, who is the present Minister of Public Works, the ministers have changed, the persons in the ministry had changed. On the 15th. Seaboard wrote, in part, "the considerable amount of work which would have been required to prepared such a proposal and a large amount of information which it would have been necessary to obtain from the government to make any such proposal meaningful just could not be fitted in to the two weeks which was allocated."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I can only assume from that that the first time Mr. L.M. Brown, the President of Seaboard Construction, heard about the request for office space proposals was when he got that letter of September 30. So he never had time to do it, Mr. Speaker. And I can understand that. I do not know the ins and outs of his company but I know to ask a company to prepare that kind of a proposal in that short a time is a fairly tall order. Now remember, Mr. Speaker, that the deadline for submitting the proposals was October 14, which was a Monday. So the last office day before the 14th. was Friday October 11. On that day, at the last possible moment, the St. John's Development Group, a letter signed by Mr. Andrew C. Crosbie, President - Mr. Crosbie on behalf of his company wrote to the Minister of Public Works, on the last possible day that he could submit his proposal, and he submitted a proposal in some detail indicating whose responsibility the taxes would, what the other lease arrangements would be, for how long, who would be responsible for the finishes in the building, all the detail that one would expect

in a proposal such as that. He submitted it on the last possible day. I may say that before that, that same gentleman, Mr. Crosbie, wrote an earlier letter. He wrote a letter which said in part - I think he wrote this the day after the letter requesting the proposal was written. He wrote as follows:

This is to inform you that we will be submitting a proposal, but in order to do so there are a couple of additional questions that we would appreciate the answers to so we may provide you with the proper proposal. These are the questions, would you please advise the term of the lease, five or ten years. Two, does the government wish us to quote including all of the interior finishes, etc., etc.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that letter points up a couple of things. First of all, that the initial request from the government was a fairly sloppy one. Sloppy, sloppy, Mr. Speaker - I should be kinder here - sloppy if the letter was meant to convey the request, but not at all sloppy if the people from whom you were expecting the proposal already knew what you wanted anyway. Then it was only necessary to go through the formalities, put something in writing to cover your tracks. Mr. Crosbie, who has been in this kind of business for a long time, could not find enough detail in the minister's letter to even make up a proposal. He had to write back such things as, well, do you want the building finished inside or are you looking for an empty shell. That kind of thing.

Well, the Crosbie people put the proposal in on the last possible day. That leaves one or two other groups, Mr. Speaker. Lundrigans on the last possible day, on October 11, the last office day before Monday, the deadline, they put in their proposal. Again it is quite detailed. It is several pages long. It outlines what they will do in terms of wall finishes and floor finishes and telephone outlets and air conditioning and washrooms and elevators and the whole bit, everything, such as you would like to have in a proposal like that.

Something else which appears in the Lundrigan letter and in the Crosbie letter, something which the minister asked for, the minister



in his letter of September 30, asked if the companies would indicate the approximate date on which the space would be available. Mr. Speaker, that is a reasonable request. Mr. Lundrigan's group and Mr. Crosbie's group came through with the answer. We can give you the space by a certain date. All right.

I have mentioned the Lundrigan group. They came up with a proper proposal on the last possible office day before the deadline. The Crosbie group did exactly the same thing, came up with a full proposal on the last office day before the deadline because obviously they needed all the time available to them to prepare such an extensive proposal.

The Seaboard group said, we do not have time to do it. That leaves us with one group, one other development, Mr. Craig Dobbin. Now, when did he write his letter, do you think? He writes his letter on October 7 because, Mr. Speaker, he had his proposal all ready, I submit, before the minister ever wrote his letter of September 30. He knew exactly what was going to be in that letter. That is why, Mr. Speaker, I say without fear of contradiction, it was a cooked deal from the beginning. It was cooked, Mr. Speaker.

On October 7 Mr. Dobbin comes through with all kinds of detail. Well, not all kinds as we will see in a minute. Lots of detail - a couple of facts, a couple of important issues missing, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Dobbin never even bothered to tell the minister when the space would be available. He did not even bother to tell him when the space would be available, whether it would be 1975 or 1976 or 1977.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: And he was asked.

MR. SIMMONS: He was asked specifically as one of the three points in the letter requesting proposals.

Now, in fairness to the other people, Mr. Speaker, the Lundrigan and the Crosbie groups who submitted these proposals, both did state when this space would be available. In the case of the Lundrigan people, they figured it could be done within twelve months after acceptance of the proposal by the government. In other words,

this was the Fall of 1974. By the late Fall of 1975 they could have this space available.

In the case of the Crosbie group, the St. John's Development Group, they figured they could have the space available, the finished space by September of 1975. Mr. Dobbin did not bother to indicate when the space would be available. He did subsequently indicate the date, Mr. Speaker, and we will come to that shortly.

But first of all, Mr. Speaker, I think the facts speak reasonably well for themselves, that this from the very beginning was a cooked deal of the first order.

Now if that was not enough, Mr. Speaker, just to add insult to injury and these documents have to be incomplete, Mr. Speaker, we were obviously given selected documents, from the Premier's point of view he did not select them very carefully from some of the things I have mentioned, but we have not, Mr. Speaker, I maintain been given all the documents yet on this matter. For example, there is nothing here which tells the Lundrigans or the Crosbies what happened to their proposals, did they get an answer? Was it verbal? Were they told their proposals were rejected or was the government sitting on their proposals, sleeping on it, what? Nothing at all in those documents.

But there are a couple of curious things in this document, Mr. Speaker, Let us go back over the dates again. The original proposal was requested by the government on September 30. Mr. Dobbin, and I will just deal with it now as it relates to Mr. Dobbin because I want to make a couple of points in relation to his proposal, Mr. Dobbin was written on September 30, Seven days later his has got his proposal all ready. On October the 7th. he is ready to to.

Now, Mr. Speaker, just a little aside here, Perhaps this comment is the product of my suspicious mind, but the only proposal that got the once-over was the Dobbin proposal. There are all kinds of x's and question marks and comments in the margins about the Dobbin proposal, but not a single item about the others. I do not know if they were rejected outright or - I do not know what the reason is for that, but I will leave that to your fertile minds, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Dobbin submitted his proposal on October 7, just seven short days after the proposal was requested. We skip now for some curious reason from October 7 to November 13 and we find another letter from Mr. Dobbin which is suspiciously like the first one - a couple of important differences which are not explained in the documents.

The first important difference is that Mr. Dobbin's original quote was for \$6.90 a square foot and, by the way, in that particular quote he did not particularly say who was responsible for finishes or - he tried to some degree but it was a sloppy proposal I am told, and I should say, Mr. Speaker, I am no authority on this, I submitted this document to a couple of developers, who shall remain nameless, and the word 'sloppy' that I have used a couple of times this afternoon is a repeat, an exact repeat of what one of the persons said to me having looked at the document for a couple of days, I said what do you think of the proposals, and he said if they are developers, Mr. Speaker, indeed both them are -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: They are competitors, Mr. Speaker, and both them said they would like to have been invited originally to bid on this but were not given the opportunity for some reason.

One of the developers whom I talked to having looked at this for a couple of days said - I said what do you think of it? And I prodded him a bit and I said, well which is the worst and which is the best? Well, he said, I will put it to you this way, Dobbin's is by far the sloppiest. I said, what do you mean? He said, well Dobbin's had the most loopholes in it. Of course he was not telling us very much. You only have to read through this to see how many loopholes there were.

I go back now, Mr. Speaker, to Mr. Dobbin's second letter, the one of November 13, and in that letter, which as I said was curiously like the one he wrote on October 7, there are however, a couple of major differences. One of the differences is that the rental per square foot, Mr. Speaker, which was \$6.90 in the letter of October 7, is now up to \$8.46 in a letter of November 13.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is a high rate of inflation.

MR. SIMMONS: Gone from \$6.90 a square foot to \$8.46. Now, Mr. Speaker, this second letter raises a few questions. Were the Lundrigans, were the Crosbys given an opportunity to submit a new bid? Were they allowed? Were they given the option of being able to up their ante as well or was

April 2, 1975

Tape No. 962

NM - 3

that a particular privilege reserved to Mr. Dobbin alone? Which brings us, Mr. Speaker, of course to the question of who is Mr. Dobbin? Who is

this Mr. Dobbin? Is he some stranger to the Premier, a person the Premier had heard about and said perhaps we should send him a request for a proposal? Hardly! This is the same Mr. Dobbin that the Premier bared his soul for just a few months previous on the cable television deal.

MR. MURPHY: So what?

MR. SIMMONS: So what?

MR. MURPHY: So what? Do you not want a Newfoundland to get it?

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, -

MR. MURPHY: So what? So what?

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, if a Newfoundlander gets it, it therefore will not -

MR. MURPHY: I am going down now, I am going down now -

MR. SIMMONS: Go down and display your intelligence by keeping quiet.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Lundrigan, Crosbie, Brown -

MR. MURPHY: I would not go near you, I am near enough now.

MR. SIMMONS: Good! Good! The feeling is mutual "Ank".

MR. DOODY: The honourable member is losing his train of thought.

MR. SIMMONS: Losing my train of thought?

MR. DOODY: Yes. Carry on.

MR. SIMMONS: Disconcerting. Mr. Speaker, this is the same Mr. Dobbin who a few short months ago had the protection of the Premier on the cable T.V. deal. Now, my friend from St. John's Centre says, do you not want a Newfoundlander to get it. Yes, I would like a Newfoundlander to get it and I would also like, Mr. Speaker, for whomever gets it to get it fair and square. I wonder did the Premier write some letters on other people's behalf at that time as well? I sincerely doubt that.

This Mr. Dobbin, Mr. Speaker, is a pretty good friend of the Premier. Did that have anything to do with the sloppy way this was done? Did that have anything to do with the fact, Mr. Speaker, that it only took Mr. Dobbin to send back his proposal?

AN HON. MEMBER: How do you know he sent it back?

MR. SIMMONS: I leave it to the members of government, Mr. Speaker,

to contradict that. If they want to get up and argue that he is a bad friend, let them do it. He may well be a bad friend now having being given this kind of run-around, or perhaps, of course, the deal is still cooked. That is the other thing we want to know with a Select Committee. We want to know now if the developers, the would-be providers of office space are being given the once-over, the run-around, going through the motions?

This same government, by the way, that only gave two weeks last Fall has suddenly smartened up, Mr. Speaker, and now, I believe, they are giving over two months to get the proposals prepared. But again I ask, are they still just going through the motions? And is Mr. Dobbin a pretty good friend, so good a friend, in fact, Mr. Speaker, that he knows that he had not a thing to worry about in terms of this proposal? And if he wants to submit another proposal, which went from \$6.90 to \$8.46 already, if he wants to submit another one that will put it up - \$9.00, \$10.00, \$10.50 - but that it all right with the boys. Perhaps he has that kind of understanding. That, Mr. Speaker, is the kind of thing we want to know and that is why we raised this particular issue.

Just to go back to the beginning of this document for another moment, you will recall that the original request, at least formally in writing from government, if we are to believe that this is the total documentation, which I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, I say it is a selective documentation, I say the Premier and the government did not table all the documents, if this is a complete documentation, if we are to believe it - then the first formal request from government was on September 30. Yet, Mr. Speaker, we know that as early as the previous April Mr. Dobbin was out dealing with the Wedgewood Park Council, dealing with them on matters of permits, building permits and that kind of thing to erect a substantially large office building. Did he know then, Mr. Speaker? Did he know at that time? Was



the deal already cooked that early?

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Order, please!

This is the second time I have heard the honourable member use the words, "the deal cooked." I take exception to these remarks. The honourable member may make his point using phrases that do not impute dishonesty or any other unparliamentary phrases. I do recall having heard him say them before, however, I was not in the Chair at the time. The honourable member is asked to use other phrases.

MR. SIMMONS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I submit the word is parliamentary but that is for Mr. Speaker to decide. If it offends his sensitivity I shall withdraw. I think the point is made, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Rephrase.

MR. SIMMONS: I am quite prepared to rephrase. I know what I mean and I intend to convey it. I will find the right words. I know what my suspicions are on this deal. I know what my suspicions are. I know what the people of Newfoundland are saying about it, Mr. Speaker, and they are saying it in much more pointed language that I used a moment ago. But if I am not permitted to use that word -

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

The people of Newfoundland are not in this Chamber and they do not have to speak in a parliamentary manner. The honourable member is constrained by parliamentary rules and will have to abide by them.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, which I shall do gladly. The people of Newfoundland, which I trust is not unparliamentary, the people of Newfoundland,

Mr. Speaker, know what their suspicions are on this matter. This adds fuel to the fire. I only wish that the government would have gone all the way in tabling this and made it available to every Newfoundlander. I would not from the expense standpoint, but in terms of letting them know what a shady thing is going on here, I wish the people of Newfoundland had it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The honourable gentleman is really attempting to mislead the House by saying the people of Newfoundland are looking at this information and interpreting it to be shady. That, Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman cannot say correctly in the House, that the Newfoundland people are saying that. I think he is completely out of order. He should refrain from making statements like that in this House of Assembly.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order, Your Honour. I would submit, Sir, that my colleague is completely in order, Your Honour, and my colleague is merely pointing out that this whole deal has the appearance of being -

MR. MURPHY: What deal? There is no deal.

MR. NEARY: There is a deal. The whole deal, Sir, my colleague is saying that it has the appearance, Sir, of being rather, to put it mildly, shady. And I would submit that my colleague is completely in order, Sir, and is being completely harassed and interrupted by members on the government benches, Sir. I would ask Your Honour to rule that the members allow my colleague to proceed with his remarks in silence.

MR. BARRY: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. We see the member for Hermitage engaging in the typical smear tactics -

MR. F. ROWE: Is this the point of order, Sir.

MR. MURPHY: Just a minute. Wait. Let the Speaker decide that.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): If the honourable minister will permit, the Chair will be the arbiter of points of order and will not be pointed to or directed by any honourable members as the two honourable members to my right were at that time.

The honourable members may rise, but they are not to direct

or to scold the Chair in any way.

MR. BARRY: You are ruling are you, Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker, the honourable member's comments, the member's comments, the member from Hermitage's comments are impugning the reputation of members of this House. He is not doing it directly, Mr. Speaker. He is doing it in a typical, sly, sneaky, insinuating way, Mr. Speaker, by the use of innuendo and insinuation.

MR. SIMMONS: I will say it more directly if you want.

MR. BARRY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we submit that if the honourable member has something to say, we submit that the way to do it is for him to say it directly, is for him to lay his seat on the line, for him to submit a resolution to this House saying directly, Mr. Speaker, what he is attempting to say now in a very cowardly fashion.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

Maybe all honourable members might do well to research just what type of debate is permissible on a motion of this type. Now, the honourable member may state his case - and this is my interpretation of how the debate will proceed - the honourable member may state his case, he may state facts. However, when any honourable member then begins to state opinions as this honourable member has done, it is a cooked deal or a shady deal or it is this or it is that, it then becomes the honourable member's opinion on the facts. If that opinion happens to be unparliamentary, then of course the Chair has to interrupt.

Nevertheless, the honourable member may state his facts. But, if he wants to editorialize on them, he then may have to put up with the interruptions from the Chair.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I understand that perfectly. I understood it before and shall continue to practice it.

It is my opinion it is a very shady deal. It is my opinion that the people of Newfoundland feel it is a shady deal. If the members on government side or other members of this House want to contradict me on that point and do not subscribe to my opinion, let them put their

money where their mouth is, vote for this resolution and let us get a select committee and settle this thing once and for all.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the reason for the interruptions is quite different altogether. I am touching certain nerves, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I refuse to sit here as a member of this Assembly and be labeled as part of a shady deal. The honourable gentleman, referring to this contract as a shady deal -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Sure it is.

MR. MORGAN: - is impugning all members of this House of Assembly.

MR. SIMMONS: It is my opinion.

MR. MORGAN: Because we are partisan to it by sitting on the government side. The honourable gentleman must refrain from using any kind of a word as deal, there was no deal, number one, and number two, there is nothing shady about it.

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

MR. NEARY: My colleague, Sir, if the members on the government benches would only permit him to carry on with his remarks, my colleague makes a statement in his opinion or it has all the appearance of, Sir, that, in my opinion, is parliamentary, and the government members will not give my colleague a chance to finish his remarks, Sir. He is making a prima facie case, and he has every right to do so.

I would submit that Your Honour -

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: These points of order are just raised, Mr. Speaker, just to interrupt my colleague, to get him off his trend of thought. I would suggest, Sir, that my colleague is completely in order and should be allowed to continue with his remarks.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the member for Bonavista South may think there is no deal. I refer him to this document where the Minister of Public Works says in a letter to Mr. Dobbin, your proposal to rent space etc., etc. is accepted. Now, in my language, Mr. Speaker, that is a deal and I shall continue to call it a deal until someone rules it unparliamentary. It is a deal. The deal is right there. I say, Mr. Speaker, having looked at these documents, where it is my opinion and the opinion of two developers who have looked at it for me, that Mr. Dobbin has by far the sloppiest proposal there, the sloppiest of the three proposals.

I can only come to the conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that if government writes a letter of acceptance to the developer which has offered the sloppiest deal, that there is something suspicious about it. I intend to ask questions about it. That is my right as a member of this House. If the member for Bonavista South is tender all of a sudden, well let him vote for this resolution and let us have a select committee, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

I suppose the Chair must rule on the point of order raised by the honourable member for Bonavista South. It is an exceedingly difficult

matter to rule upon. The precedents are unclear. The honourable member stating that it is his opinion that a certain set of facts constitute a certain situation. It may or may not be parliamentary. I believe that he was within the realm of parliamentary procedure in his last remarks. However, once the opinion becomes an assertion, which it quite often does, then the Chair will have to interrupt him.

But, it is an extremely difficult set of circumstances to rule upon. I would suggest to honourable members if they wish to rise on points of order, that they might cite precedents for the points of order.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you! Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When I want to know, Mr. Speaker, what innuendo is, I shall not look to the Member for Bonavista South as the authority. Even his own crowd think he is looking for publicity most.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Member for Harbour Grace said that he was publicity hungry.

MR. SIMMONS: The Member for Harbour Grace said that he was - publicity hungry, was the word.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: So, I see him as no authority, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: A publicity hound, yes.

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

AN HON. MEMBER: - come over there and punch you in the mouth.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Now, the member for Hermitage -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hey! Hey!

MR. NEARY: Restrain yourself.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: He is the most dirty politician we have in the House.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Name him, Mr. Speaker, name him.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

Both honourable members have been exceedingly unco-operative insofar as willingness to participate in the debate in the normal way. The Member for Bonavista South has been out of order on a number of occasions in his interjections, and the Member for Hermitage has gone into a matter that is totally irrelevant, waving around a press clipping that has absolutely no relevance to this debate and, of course, is provocative and can only lead to behaviour such as that which was suggested by the Member for Bonavista South.

Maybe if I could stay on my feet for another two or three minutes we would carry this all over until next week so all honourable members can research the points of order which I am sure are going to be raised in this debate from now on.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we are not forgetting, of course, that it was the Member for St. John's East whom I am delighted to -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if my colleague will permit me. It is getting kind of late. Your Honour, I want to stand on a point of order, Sir. The Member for Bonavista South, Sir, threatened to come across the House and punch the Member for Hermitage in the mouth, and called him a dirty politician. I want Your Honour to rule on that because that is the sort of thing, Sir, that lowers the dignity and the decorum of this House.

I want Your Honour to instruct the Member for Bonavista South to withdraw that kind of a statement, Sir.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order. If any honourable gentleman on the other side of the House of Assembly refers to me as a hound, he better not do it outside of the House of Assembly because he will get it punched outside, not in the House but outside. That was the Hon. Gentleman from Hermitage. He referred to me as a hound.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

Both honourable gentlemen, as I stated before, were engaged in rather provocative and personal remarks that could sometimes - it has

been known to end up in violence. I do not think that it was imminent in this case however, but the Member for Bell Island is quite correct. Remarks of this type can only lead to complete disorder and a shambles of the parliamentary process -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Almost six o'clock.

MR. SIMMONS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I, for my own part, of course, I use the term hound in context. I said publicity hound.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Colloquialism.

MR. SIMMONS: That is what I meant, but that is beside the point.

Mr. Speaker, it being near six I would like to - oh, Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, is the member going to be invited to withdraw the unparliamentary remarks?

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable -

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

Unfortunately I am not able to entertain any more points of order or debate at this time. It is now six o'clock. I note that the honourable Member for Hermitage has the floor as the House adjourns. I leave the Chair until three o'clock tomorrow.



CONTENTS

April 2, 1975 Page

Presenting Petitions

By Mr. Earle from residents of St. Bernard's, Jacques Fontaine, Bay L'Argent, Little Bay East, Little Harbour East, and Harbour Mille asking that the roads from these communities to the Burin Peninsula be upgraded and paved. Supported by Mr. Simmons and Mr. Rousseau. 2804

By Mr. Doody from residents of Brigus Junction asking that the road which connects the community with the Trans-Canada Highway be paved. Supported by Mr. Neary. 2807

By Mr. Barry from residents of Petit Forte asking for improved service by Canadian National boats. Supported by Mr. Simmons. 2808

Answers to Questions for which Notice Has been Given

Mr. Rousseau tabled the answer to Question No. 17 placed on the Order Paper of March 11 by Mr. Neary. 2811

Oral Questions

Delivery of free McCain Foods Limited products to Bell Island. Mr. Neary, Mr. Murphy. 2813

Delivery of free McCain Foods Limited products to Southern Labrador. Mr. Neary, Mr. Murphy. 2814

Possibility of an airline volunteering the use of an airplane to transport free McCain Foods Limited products to Southern Labrador. Mr. Neary, Mr. Murphy. 2814

Progress report sought on a new fresh fish processing plant at Burgeo. Mr. Neary, Mr. Doody. 2816

Tabling of correspondence and documents on negotiations for a new fish plant for Burgeo. Mr. Neary, Mr. Doody. 2819

Government acceptance of principle of compulsory arbitration in negotiations with a group of indirect employees, e.g., interns and residents. Mr. Roberts, Dr. Rowe. 2820

Report sought on negotiations to store oil in the Bell Island mines. Mr. Neary, Mr. Barry, Mr. Doody. 2821

Disbursement of the surplus realized by the sale of DOSCO assets. Mr. Neary, Mr. Barry. 2826

Termination of employment notices issued to Highways watchmen. Mr. Winsor, Mr. Rousseau. 2827

Orders of the Day

Private Member's Day - Debate

Debate continued on a motion by Mr. Morgan that Be It Resolved: That this Legislature urge the Federal Government to make a strong case at the upcoming ICNAF Meeting that a ban be placed on fishing on the Hamilton Banks during the spawning season.

CONTENTS - 2

Order of the Day (Continued)	Page
Mr. Young	2828
Mr. Earle	2832
Mr. Rousseau	2842
Mr. Murphy	2846
Mr. Morgan	2851
Motion unanimously adopted	2874
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.	2874
Adjournment	2896