



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND**

Volume 4

4th. Session

Number 37

VERBATIM REPORT

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 23, 1975

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE M. JAMES RUSSELL

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! It is a pleasure for me to welcome to the Speaker's gallery today a Mr. Gerald Toute, MBE, visiting the Province as the British consul for the Atlantic Provinces. On behalf of all honourable members I welcome you to the gallery and trust that your visit here is most informative and interesting.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Justice.

HON. A. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I should like to very briefly report to this honourable House concerning the Law of the Sea Conference which is meeting and has been meeting in Geneva, Switzerland for the past five weeks and which is scheduled to conclude around May 10, 1975. Canada, I am very proud to say, has a very strong delegation attending the Conference and the leader of the Canadian delegation, Ambassador J. Allan Beasley commands the respect of the delegates who represent the 146 nations participating in the conference. I think we can, as Newfoundlanders, take some pride in the fact that the concensus of those attending the Conference is that the Canadian delegates are probably the best prepared of any delegation in Geneva and that they have brought with them a very wide and diversified group of experts in the various fields relating to the Law of the Sea.

The procedure that is followed in Geneva is that every morning, which was kind of hard to take for me for the first couple of days when I was there, all those attached to the Canadian delegation meet at eight fifteen under the Chairmanship of Ambassador Beasley when the events of the previous day are reviewed - the various committees are meeting continuously in the conference - and then the strategy for the Canadian delegation is worked out for that day and at the same time all of us there were assigned meetings that we had to attend and report back on the following morning. This system gives the Provinces and gave the Province of Newfoundland an opportunity almost on, well on a daily basis to try and exert some influence on the Canadian position. I think it is worthy of

note and of interest to this House that the contribution by those from Newfoundland, in my opinion, has to have a great deal to do with some of the stands, particularly on the economic zone, that have been taken by the Canadian delegation.

For the first three weeks of the Conference Mr. Morris Quinlan of Bay de Verde, who represented the Fish Trades Association, and Mr. Kevin Condon of Calvert representing the inshore fishermen attended as part of the Canadian delegation at Geneva. They made a very meaningful contribution to the work of the delegation. Mr. Cabot Martin, a solicitor with the Government of Newfoundland, has been there since the Conference started and will be there until the end. He has established a reputation as being a Canadian lawyer with a very great knowledge of the Law of the Sea and his advice is being sought almost continuously by the Canadian delegation and others. This, too, has given us, I think, as Newfoundlanders and as a government the opportunity to have our point of view kept before the delegation.

Mr. Walter Carter, the member of Parliament for St. John's West arrived in Geneva on Monday and he will sit with and work with the Canadian delegation, I believe, for about ten days. It is my opinion, Mr. Speaker,

MR. HICKMAN: having spent nine days at the Conference, that the Law of the Sea Conference will not, at this time, settle the issue as to who is going to control the Continental Shelf or the right of the coastal state to control the Continental Shelf to the edge of the Continental Margin.

There seems to be a general acceptance of the 200 mile economic zone. This position has been put very strongly by the underdeveloped coastal states and by Canada, particularly during the Geneva Conference. There has been no agreement as to the extension of jurisdiction to the edge of the Continental Shelf where it goes beyond 200 miles and this is somewhat significant to Newfoundlanders because it means that the tail of the Grand Banks, the southern part of the Grand Banks, where the caplin stock in particular are known to exist and Flemish Cap would be outside the 200 mile economic zone.

MR. MOORES: But there is agreement on the 200 miles.

MR. HICKMAN: There is pretty much agreement on the principle of the 200 mile zone. But, Mr. Speaker, the discouraging thing is that many of the nations, particularly the major powers, have indicated that they are not prepared to settle one issue in isolation. They are not prepared to say we will write an article or a convention now on the economic zone principle, work out the controls that the coastal state will be able to exercise over that 200 mile economic zone, unless we can also settle some other vexacious issues that are presently before the Conference and some of them have military overtones, there is no question about it.

One is the -

MR. NEARY: Do you still believe we should get the Navy out?

MR. HICKMAN: One is the question of the right of innocent passage through the various Straits. There the major powers are insisting that they have the right to go through the Straits of Gibraltar whenever they see fit, or the Dardanelles or many other Straits. Whilst it was never mentioned that it may have some military overtones, it is always in the name of the common heritage of the sea or the freedom of the sea, yet it obviously does have some military overtone.

Canada supports the major powers on that issue. Some of the underdeveloped nations do not. Canada has been asked how she reconciled her support of the right of innocent passage through the Straits whilst at the same time unilaterally declaring that the Northwest Passage, which is the longest and largest Strait of them all, is totally Canadian.

There is an answer to it and the answer that has been given is that this is very necessary to protect the very sensitive ecology of the Arctic, an area that people know so little about, and that Canada could not afford and as a good international citizen was quite within her rights. But it is an argument that has to be answered.

There has been agreement that there must be strong anti-pollution measures, reduced to conventions, but again the type of control, who is going to enforce them, is something that has not yet been agreed.

Last week was a very critical week in the Convention. The Convention works under - it has two committees, one dealing with Fisheries and the economic zones, the control of the seabed, and the other deals with pollution and the Straits and that sort of thing, freedom of the seas.

Then there is a third committee, which is probably more influential than the two committees that are set up at the Conference, and that is called the Evensen Committee and that is under the Chairmanship of a Norwegian gentleman, who is a minister without portfolio in the Norwegian Government named Evensen. And last year at Caracas he became frustrated with the lack of progress at the Law of the Sea Conference and he together with about thirty other representatives from thirty other nations formed their own committee and they sit behind closed doors and they are in effect writing the kind of articles that they would like to see included in the new treaties.

It is a most unusual situation. The President of the Conference does not recognize the evidence in Committee but everybody is waiting for their report. He has, that Committee has completed the articles on several things, such as the economic zone, and he wants to release them for debate at the Conference. But the Russians have stated categorically they are not prepared to have these articles released and debate start until all articles have been dealt with. I mention that because it gives an indication as to why there is some pessimism as to this Conference producing the kind of agreement that one would like to see.

During the next three weeks I think there will be a very determined effort to, on the part of a large number of representatives, to produce a series of principles in the hope that these principles will be accepted and if this can be accomplished, and there is a great deal of doubt whether this will happen, then within a matter of months the law officers of the various nations can get together and draft the necessary articles to implement the principles that have been agreed to. If this is not possible, Mr. Speaker, then I foresee a long series of conferences which may in time lead to new laws governing the use of the sea. If Geneva does not produce concrete results my prediction is that you will see unilateral action taken by some of the larger nations. There is a very strong feeling that the United States and Mexico will do that. Should this occur I believe the Government of Canada will be hard put to find any justification for not following suit. At the same time, I think that we as a government and as a legislature would have a very serious obligation to continue to exert pressure on the Government of Canada and in this we would be joined, I am sure, by the Province of Nova Scotia and, Nova Scotia in particular, maybe B.C., but the unilateral action will not help their salmon fishing because it will not be extended far enough to -

PREMIER MOORES: You are talking about unilateral action. Unilateral action and the Conference, what is the planning on the two of it?

MR. HICKMAN: Well, if it is obvious at the end of the Conference, Mr. Speaker, that there is not likely to be an agreement in the foreseeable future, then my guess is that some of the governments will start preparing

legislation and the feeling is that the Congress of the United States will move very quickly to extend, to take unilateral action to extend their control to their margin and Canada will have to follow suit. Everybody hopes this will not happen. A member of the Canadian delegation who has had many, many years of experience, I think he told me that this was his forty-fifth international conference, he has been very effective - as the honourable the Premier knows I should not name any individual in the House - but he has been very active in ICNAF. He predicts, well put it this way, Canada is going to ask the members of ICNAF to reduce their catching capacity by forty per cent for the next twelve months, and if this happens, and there is some indication that this may happen, this could relieve some of the pressure.

But be that as it may, Mr. Speaker, in reporting to the House we should not lose sight of the fact that there has been some progress made in the field of international law as it relates to the sea. It is the largest Conference that has ever been held in the world's history, considerably larger than the San Francisco Conference or any of the meetings of the United Nations, and there are 146 nations participating. What they are trying to do, this Conference, is to develop a new constitution of the oceans which would then be accepted by all states as binding treaty obligations so that it goes a great deal further, Mr. Speaker, than merely codifying existing concepts and there is going to be -

We are asking for some very radical alterations of the traditional and classical legal concepts on which the Law of the Sea has been founded and operated for the past 300 years. But if this conference does not produce the kind of results that one had hoped, and I have a feeling that it will not, then we, as Newfoundlanders, must insist that the resolution that was passed by this House, unanimously, and which had an impact on the Canadian Delegation, Mr. Speaker, that we persist in trying to persuade the Government of Canada that unilateral action will have to be taken and taken now. Otherwise the fisheries of Newfoundland will continue to be jeopardized to an even greater degree.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Fogo.

CAPT. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the members on this side of the House, I can say we all listened very attentively with what the minister has just reported on his visit to the Law of the Sea Conference. I note one note of interest in his remarks and that is the fact that he felt that our Canadian Delegation are making a worthwhile contribution and contributing to the Law of the Sea Conference. Now that is quite contrary to the opinion of some of our local members, or local politicians when they come out publicly and say that our Canadian Delegation is not making the contribution which it should be making. We all realize -

MR. NEARY: Like the member for Bonavista South for instance.

EAPT. WINSOR: We all realize, Mr. Speaker, that this is quite an involved conference, and there are many, many problems which are not easy to solve, and they must go through the formality and the debates and arguments and every nation has a right to his or their own opinion. So the whole atmosphere I would say of the Law of the Sea Conference is one which entails very patient and all of the knowledge that we, as Newfoundlanders, can supply our delegation with to submit on our behalf and the arguments which they present will be to Newfoundlanders best interest.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is a worthwhile gesture if the Premier initiated this to have the Minister of Justice and perhaps now that the Minister of Justice has returned, he should replace him with another minister to bring back another report. So, you know, if we are going to -

MR. NEARY: They are all going to Japan.

CAPT. WINSOR: - if we are going to be identified as one of Canada's most, I would say, dependent provinces as far as the fishery is concerned, then I do not think we should lose any opportunity to bring that fact before this conference at all times. And I am sure the Hon. Minister of Justice, by his presence being there, has made a contribution. So I do not think we should let it rest there. Now that the minister is back I would suggest, and I would approve the expenditure of another cabinet minister going over there to keep the pressure on, keep Newfoundland's position before the Law of the Sea Conference. It is very important. So that is about all-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Send over the Norma and Gladys.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

CAPT. WINSOR: That is about all I have to say, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure all members listened very attentively, although at some points there the minister, I would not say, appeared not to be too optimistic.

MR. NEARY: He was only an observer over there.

CAPT. WINSOR: - and he had discouraging remarks in there -

MR. NEARY: Too pessimistic.

CAPT. WINSOR: Well, maybe too pessimistic. Sometimes you have to be over-optimistic, and it is better to be over-optimistic than to be too pessimistic. However, now that the minister has seen what is going on there, how our Canadian Delegation are presenting its case, I am sure that will enable some of our own members, our own local politicians, at least to give credit where credit is due and to acknowledge the fact that our Canadian Delegation are doing a very good job.

April 23, 1975

Tape no. 1679

Page 3 - mw

MR. NEARY: The best delegation over there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any other ministerial statements?

The honourable Minister of Transportation and Communications.

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

Speaker, I have a release here I would like bring to the attention of the House. I have been informed that the railways have filed increases of fifteen per cent non-carload rates between this region and other parts of Canada effective May 5 and within the Atlantic Provinces June 1. I have telexed the president of both railways protesting this action. The reason for both railways is because both of them are involved into Atlantic Canada first and then, of course, CN into Newfoundland.

The text of my telegram was this; that the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador protest most strongly the proposed fifteen per cent increase in non-carload rates filed with the C.T.C. Newfoundland's industry is being suppressed with the rapidity and magnitude of freight rate increases. Newfoundland being at the end of the distribution suffers more severely than other regions when any uniform percentage increase is applied. We urge you to reconsider your action and at the very least postpone the increases for a sufficiently lengthy period in order that industry can explore alternative courses of action.

Remember within the context, Mr. Speaker, this is following on the heels of a lifting of the rail freight freeze, the discontinuance of less than carload lots, the twenty-five per cent increase that has just been involved a couple of months back. The railways increased their rates on January 1, 1975, an average of twelve and a half per cent, and on March 1, 1975 the rates were increased an additional average of twelve and a half per cent. Furthermore on March 16, 1975, the lessened carload rates for the movement of goods within Newfoundland were cancelled which had the effect of further increasing freight rates.

It is recognized that the railways are experiencing cost increases along with other sectors of the economy. Nevertheless, the rapidity by which increases are imposed and the magnitude of the increases are unacceptable. In this period of rapid inflation there must be some restraint shown by responsible parties. I am of the opinion that the

railways are not acting in a responsible fashion. The railway in Newfoundland is virtually a monopoly on the movement of certain types of goods and the shipper in many circumstances is confronted with a take it or leave it situation.

The railways are in the habit of not providing sufficient notice to shippers of proposed increases thus preventing a shipper from thoroughly investigating alternate ways of getting his goods to the market. I will be meeting with Mr. Marchand on Monday in Charlottetown and certainly I am sure that my colleagues in the other three Maritime Provinces and myself for sure will make this a topic of top priority.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, while I appreciate the gesture of the honourable minister in shooting off a wire to the honourable Mr. Marchand, the Minister of Transport, Sir, to try to stave off this increase in CN freight rates in the Atlantic region, I would submit Sir, that it will take more than just a telegram to the minister to try to get CN to reverse their decision to make an application.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, a point of order. You know, I have made a legitimate ministerial statement here, and the honourable member is twisting it politically for political points. I think it is a matter of great concern. We have done it before in respect to the removal of the less than carload rates. We have done it before on the twenty-five per cent increase that was suppose to be implemented on January 1. Now, the suggestions being made are to score merely cheap political points. I think the member is - I have more respect for the member than that.

I did mention at the end of my release, Mr. Speaker, that I would be meeting with Marchand, Mr. Marchand on Monday, and we certainly intend to bring it to his attention. So, let him speak to the release, Mr. Speaker, and stop trying to score cheap political points.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order, Sir. I would submit to Your Honour that this is just merely a matter of opinion between two members. It is not a valid point of order, Sir, and I think that Your Honour was just probably about ready to rule it as such.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The Chair was about ready to rule that the honourable Member for Bell Island was entering into a debate on this particular ministerial statement. The honourable member is aware that he can raise points of clarification on the ministerial statement and speak specifically to the statements made by the minister but should not enter into a debate on any ministerial statement.

MR. NEARY: I am perfectly aware of that, Your Honour. Thank you very much for your ruling, Sir. I was about to make the statement, Sir, and then follow up by asking the minister a few questions. In my opinion, Sir, it will take more than just a telegram. So, the minister did not make it clear whether or not the Premier, for instance, would be approaching the Prime Minister of Canada on this matter. Will the minister be bringing a resolution into the House of Assembly that we could pass the same as we did for the Law of the Sea -

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is now using the time allocated for ministerial statements as question period. He is asking the minister questions. If he has a question for

the honourable minister he should ask him during question period.

MR. NEARY: Mr. -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The purpose of - an honourable minister is permitted to make a statement. And as for the rules, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition or some other person is permitted to speak to that statement. And in speaking to the statement he is permitted to seek points of clarification. And the Chair submits that if he is to seek points of clarification he can only in the form of a question. And in this particular point the Chair feels that the honourable Member for Bell Island was in order.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was just merely asking the minister, Sir, if he would clarify a couple of points. What follow-up action will the minister be taking apart from the meeting with Mr. Marchand in P.E.I.? Will the Premier be following through with a strong objection to the Prime Minister of Canada? And will the minister be bringing a resolution into the House that we can pass unanimous, both sides of the House could pass unanimous to have forwarded to the Prime Minister of Canada and to the Government of Canada. Because as the minister rightly pointed out this is going to have a drastic affect on the cost of living here in Newfoundland. So I hope that the minister will make it clear at a later date what follow-up action, apart from just a routine meeting with Mr. Marchand in P.E.I., what further action will be taken on this matter?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Another ministerial statement -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! The Hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications has made a ministerial statement pertaining to the subject. If he has another ministerial statement with a completely different subject he is certainly permitted to make that.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, I have another ministerial statement. The Hon. Dr. T. C. Farrell when Minister of the Department of Transportation and Communications announced the government's intention to set up a Highway Safety Advisory Board. Now this may seem to some a long time ago. Much work was required in drawing up the terms of reference, of

selecting the various representatives who would serve on the Board.

I am happy to announce that all this necessary work has been accomplished and that the following people have been informed of their appointments to the Highway Safety Advisory Board; Superintendent A. Hawyrs, representing the R.C.M.P.; Lieutenant Richard Roche representing the Newfoundland Constabulary; Messrs. Edward W. Bennett and Stephen Jackman, President and Vice-President respectively representing the Newfoundland Safety Council; Mr. Maxwell Hussey, Director of Motor Vehicle and Driver Safety, and Mr. Don O'Driscoll, Highway Traffic Engineer, both representing the Department of Transportation and Communications; and Mr. William Morey and Llyod Stephens representing the general public.

The Board will have access to motor vehicle registration statistics, accident statistics, studies and reports on matters relating to highway vehicle and driver safety, and may request compilation of other statistics and reports by officials of this department for the purpose of making recommendations to me in my capacity as Minister of Transportation and Communications. The Board may recommend action on any matter concerning highway safety. It may find it necessary to consult with any individuals, groups, organizations or any other body in any item in an effort to obtain desired information, may call meetings to receive briefs and-or recommendations from any individual, group or organization or any other body, and will be supplied with copies of all proposed legislation and regulations pertaining to highway safety. The members of the Board will elect their own chairman and will meet at least once a month. While all members of the Board including the chairman serve without remuneration any expenses involved in travelling, board and lodging or out-of-pocket expenses incurred while carrying out their responsibilities will be paid by the department.

The term of office of the members of the Board is at the pleasure of the Minister of Transportation and Communications. Arrangements are now being made for the Board to hold its inaugural meeting, and I am sure that I speak for all members of government as well as the general public in wishing the Board every success.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, this particular matter that the minister just made a ministerial statement on, Sir, is something that we have been concerned with for some considerable time on this side of the House. And if the minister will remember a week or so ago, I think, I put a number of questions to the minister about this Safety Advisory Council.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: In view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that we are having a record number of accidents on our highways, a record number of people being killed and injured, I think, Sir, that this will turn out to be one of the better announcements probably that the minister will have the privilege and the honour of making in this honourable House.

The minister did not make it clear, Sir, in his statement whether the Advisory Committee had a limited period of time in which to submit a preliminary report to the minister. I realize, Sir, it is an on-going thing and the Advisory Committee have been appointed at the pleasure of the minister. But I would suggest, Sir, that if it is all possible, and perhaps the minister could clarify this for me later, for the minister to ask the new Safety Advisory Committee for a preliminary report at an early a date as possible to see if we can cut back on the number of accidents and killings that we are having on our highways in this current year.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any other ministerial statements?

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I have some forty-one petitions containing some, as far as I can estimate, between 4,000 and 5,000 names, of persons within the Avalon Peninsula area, residents within the Avalon Peninsula area. And the prayer of the petition, what the petitioners are asking for is reconsideration and cancellation of plans to install roads, to place roads for the Moose Management Area 33, Fox Marsh-Colinet areas for reasons that I will go into in just a moment.

Mr. Speaker, this is rather a mammoth petition, as it were. I suppose it is one of the largest petitions perhaps that has been presented to this honourable House for some time if not forever. And it is a matter that is of great concern to the persons concerned. I might say that originally it was hoped that the, originally it was intended that the Hon. Minister of Education was going to present this petition himself. He wished to present it because it involved areas within his district itself down the Colinet and St. Mary's Bay area. But unfortunately today, he is out in his district meeting a joint council in Gaskiers so consequently somebody else is. I am quite happy to present it, really, on his behalf. It is also of great interest, Mr. Speaker,

in that there are many people from the St. John's area as well who have signed this petition and perhaps I could just touch on some of the areas which are included.

The first petition containing some 300 to 350 names comes from a section of St. John's, the Bond Street area, St. John's East area, with which I am familiar. Another one is from the St. John's area as well. Another large number of names from Colinet, from Harricott in the district of St. Mary's Bay, from North Harbour, from Mount Carmel, and it looks like that pretty well all the residents of Mount Carmel are very concerned about this as well as many other people as well, from St. John's again, from Markland, that is in the present district of Trinity South. There are other areas as well. Here is one from Whitbourne, from St. John's again, from the Mount Pearl area and pretty well all around the circle. There is a very high preponderance in the numbers of people associated with this district from St. John's.

Now I would like to read the nature of the petition itself, because a petition that has caused so many people to sign it, I think, should be gone into fairly thoroughly.

The Department of Forestry and Agriculture have recently called tenders for the construction of two forest access roads in the St. Mary's Bay area. One tender calls for a one mile extension of the Fox Marsh-Ocean Pond this year, the Fox Marsh Road-Ocean Pond this year. Eventually it is planned to join this road up with the existing roads in the Deer Park. The other tender calls for a two mile extension of the Colinet Pond Road. This road is to cross Colinet River and proceed in a northerly direction to join up the Ocean Pond Road.

As you are well aware, this is the only wooded wilderness remaining on the Avalon Peninsula. It is a place where wildlife abounds, moose, rabbit, fox, grouse, partridge, trout and Atlantic Salmon. They have everything here except members of the House of Assembly, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Or Liberals.

MR. MARSHALL: Or Liberals.

The reason for the large wildlife population and the areas unspoiled beauty is that this area is not now accessible except by foot or canoe. Once roads are constructed they can never be erased. With it one of the finest recreation areas on the Avalon Peninsula will be lost, an area that you and your parents have enjoyed for years. Let us hope that your attention will preserve it for future generations. So

all the members who are concerned about this region being spoiled by roads and by pulp cutting have signed these petitions and have forwarded them in. It should be noted, and the petitioners take great pains to point this out, that they have no intention of preventing conventional log cutting in the area. Now, there has been a lot of log cutting in around this area, as anyone associated or knows anything about the area, the wilderness area knows and for many, many years there has been log cutting and there has been some concern expressed with respect to the overgrowth of woods in the area, the insufficient harvesting and the possibility of problems that that would cause throughout the whole area itself, in that there would be a fire hazard and danger of various other things that are contrary to nature itself.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is quite evident that the area was quite well cut out for years and years and has existed for years and years and also in recent times with the advent of the snowmobile, and most logging is done in the wintertime, there are a high preponderance of snowmobiles that go in and around this area for the purpose of cutting out wood, legitimately, on permit from the Department of Forestry and Agriculture. So, you are really not impeding in any way the harvesting of wood because the harvesting of wood that is done down there has been done traditionally. I can remember seeing trucks on ponds that used to drive up over the ponds. Now with the new type of machinery that they have, snowmobiles are used very, very frequently by people and very, very successfully. So the woods can be cleaned out for that purpose for the use of snowmobiles.

The various movers of this petition have in a very short period of time obtained a tremendous amount of support to their petition and they look upon, many of them as I say from the St. John's area although it is not exclusively from the St. John's area, the Topsail area and the Harbour Main district and all over, they are all very, very extremely concerned about it because they feel that within the Avalon Peninsula certainly that this is the real last stand, as it were, for persons to enjoy recreation, recreational activities as is afforded by terrain such

as we have here in Newfoundland and they are afraid that the over-exploitation of it is going to, in effect, mean that it is going to be ruined and I think their fears are well founded because if you start with one road, no matter how small, eventually these roads are going to be extended and before you know it, this very beneficial area, this wilderness area which is one of the most forward steps that has been taken by any government in this area will be, if not destroyed, will certainly, its utility will be certainly very much disseminated.

Now, the movers of this, the various - there is a Mr. McCarthy I believe and other gentlemen who have worked very hard and as I say they got a great deal of enthusiastic support. We would hope to see, or I would hope to see and I think it is intended from what I have heard, from my conversations with people involved with this movement as it has now become, that they form an association called a conservation type of association to protect this particular area and for the purpose of fostering the enjoyment of recreational activities such as is afforded in areas such as this. I want to say that -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! I would remind the honourable member of our Standing Order (92) which strongly says that the member presenting a petition must not be longer than five minutes except by leave of the House. The honourable member has now concluded his five minutes and the Chair is certainly willing to let him continue by leave of the House. Does the honourable member have leave to continue?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed.

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I shall not be too much longer. Actually there are forty-one petitions. So I brought them all at once.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MARSHALL: No, I will not consume two hundred minutes. But, Mr. Speaker, I do want to point out that this is a very important petition, and when it was brought to the attention of the House and to the attention of the present Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, under whose jurisdiction it comes, about one month ago he very speedily moved to see that all actions with respect to the installation of these roads were suspended

April 23, 1975.

Tape 1683

RNI - 3

because he fully appreciates the problem involved as well, until he looked into the matter. As I say, these people have continued on in their endeavours. Now, there is no doubt about it as far as I am concerned that the desire of the developer as it were, the harvester of wood, the development of industrial development, development of jobs, opportunities in this Province such as is afforded by our forestry resources can exist quite well in this case in harmony with the people who wish to preserve the recreational benefits of the area. Because, as I say, and I emphasize and re-emphasize that maybe even ten or fifteen years it might have been necessary in order to realize the maximum harvesting from this area to install

access roads. But now, particularly with the advent of the snowmobile and the use that has been made with the snowmobile, particularly because of the fact that the people who harvest from this area are seasonal in nature, they are usually employed in the woods in the Winter-time and not all year long, all year long and in the Summer, what have you, they are usually employed at other jobs or they are employed in the fishery or what have you. These two particular concerns, one of recreation and preservation of our great asset that we have, the wilderness area, the recreation as afforded by this Province, and the desire on the other hand for development, for industrial development, for job development, can exist hand in hand. I think though that it can only exist if these petitions, this mammoth petition, forty-one of them containing, as I say, between 4000 and 5000 names are heeded as I know they will be and that the money that is available for the present access roads in the area can probably beneficially be put elsewhere so that we can enjoy the bountiful returns of the wilderness area.

So, I would ask, Mr. Speaker, as I say on behalf of the Minister of Education as well as myself and I think all members of the House will endorse this, and I want to also emphasize that it has already received sympathetic attention of the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, I would ask that these petitions be laid on the table of the House and referred to the department to which they relate, that is, Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bonavista North.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleagues on this side of the House I rise in support of the petition so ably presented by the Member for St. John's East, on behalf of almost 5,000 residents of the Avalon Peninsula area. Along the Avalon Peninsula area, Mr. Speaker, we have, I suppose, the greatest concentration of population in our Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. Therefore, I believe it is very important that we preserve a fair amount of our wilderness area for the recreational purposes of this population. I also note that in the area we have a unique situation as far as caribou are concerned. There is a fairly large herd of caribou at certain times of the year within twenty-five miles of the City of St. John's. This is unique across North America. St. John's

is the only city which has a large concentration of caribou almost within sight of the city. I believe the wilderness for these animals should indeed be protected because as you know caribou are not like moose. If the wilderness is at all disturbed, they will just simply disappear. They do not at all mix with the human being whatsoever.

The moose in the area, while there are quite a number, the population in recent years has dropped substantially. Of course, because of this there had to be controlled seasons and a certain number of licenses issues. The people in the area are indeed concerned about any large programme of road construction. Any programme that would be carried out would have to be carried out on a very limited basis. I believe none should be carried out until an ecology survey has been done. Any effects from any road construction should be carefully studied so that no damage could be implemented to the ecology of the area.

It is indeed, Mr. Speaker, with pleasure that we on this side of the House support this petition. We trust that the Minister of Forestry will, before any road contracts at all are awarded, take careful consideration, before any construction starts, and proceed with the utmost of caution.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

HON. H. COLLINS (MINISTER OF FORESTRY AND AGRICULTURE): Mr. Speaker, I could not let the opportunity pass without having a few words to say in response to the petition which has been signed by so many people in that particular area of Fox March and Colinet.

There is already an access road in existence between Colinet coming from the sea back towards the Trans-Canada Highway. There is also a road from the Trans-Canada Highway down over the Fox Marsh area, about five or six miles, as I recall it, in each direction. It was proposed to extend those roads as a result of a request from various people who are engaged in sawmilling operations, etc.

However, in view of the concerns of many of the people, not only the people of the area, but people all around the Avalon, particularly St. John's, people who see this area, maybe the last of the wilderness type country, I instructed the officials of the department about a month ago to cease any further work on it until I had had the opportunity to investigate the circumstances myself. I am happy to say today that we have decided to discontinue any further work in the area, certainly for this year and hopefully forever, but certainly for this year and I am looking forward to sitting down with the interested groups to look into the situation in the event that from an economic point of view and for the sawmillers point of view, if we do need the wood in the area and the wood indeed should be harvested, maybe there are other ways to do it and to drive the wood down the Colinet River as has been done in the past.

At any rate, Mr. Speaker, I would like to give all honourable members the assurance that no further work will be done.

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

HON. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, just very briefly in light of the honourable minister's statement, I would like to say that I have a personal knowledge of this area from having gone across by canoe the Fox Marsh area. It is a fantastic recreational area, an area of fantastic potential and any forest access roads that go in there should only be constructed after a very careful consideration of the effect on the ecology of the area.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Speaker, may I speak to this petition and I speak not for it, I speak against it. The reason why, Mr. Speaker, I happen to live around this part of the area and for years and years and years, about fifty-two years I can remember, I have been in there logging.

There is an ocean of sawmills. There is only ten in this area. There is timber in that area that is lying down and it is old and wants to be cut. And there is nothing there to destroy, it is fine timberland to harvest for sawmills. Right at the present time we have a lot of sawmills around this area and never were there so many men to go logging in that area at this present time as what there were years ago because there was anywhere from 1,000 to 1,200 men that derived a living in this area. That is the reason why I speak against it, Mr. Speaker, it is the livelihood for a lot of people in the outlining districts, not only pertaining to mine, and I cannot see why such a petition should come on the floors of this House of Assembly. I presume that petition was read over. There are names on that petition that were signed that people never knew what they were signing. I know some sawmill operators with their names on that petition, do not know what they were signing. For a few millionaires we have got a few cabins there and I speak out and speak justly. Who are we going to protect? Are we here in this House of Assembly to try to arrange to make a livelihood for the people who are in the Province or for a few millionaires? If I am chosen amongst one of them I still maintain that there are a few men in this Province that want to earn a decent living and if this is what is going to go ahead here in this House of Assembly and others, I say, well, make it a welfare state.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, -

MR. SPEAKER: Before I recognize the honourable Member for Bell Island, I think that following the remarks made by the honourable Member for Bell Island we should proceed with other business. It appears to the Chair as if a number of persons would perhaps like to speak to this petition. In essence they are really debating the petition which is not permitted.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the prayer of the petition that was presented by my learned friend, the Member for St. John's East.

The people in the Colinet area, Sir, have argued

now for the last few weeks strong and hard and they have made very valid protests against the disturbance of this prime wilderness area in the Markland - Colinet neighbourhood and I am very pleased to learn today, Sir, that their protests have not fallen on deaf ears and that the minister has taken action to have this forest access road deferred for an indefinite period of time. I am amazed, Sir, at the reaction of the honourable Member for Port de Grave. Apparently there is dissension in the ranks.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! The honourable Member for Bell Island may speak to the petition but with regard to remarks made by other members for or against the prayer of the petition, whether the honourable Member for Bell Island agrees or disagrees with them is out of order.

MR. NEARY: Well, Sir, I am amazed that anyone, Mr. Speaker, in this Province who would speak against this petition. It is a motherhood issue, Sir, and it does not make any difference what millionaires have cabins in the area, Sir. The protests have not only come from those people down there who own cabins in the area but in the main the protests have come from the residents of the area and this is why it is so important, Sir, that the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture pay attention to the prayer of the petition, which he has and I hope, Sir, that in future when forest access roads are being developed that the minister and his officials will be a little more careful in developing their policy of forest access roads and not go out and destroy the whole countryside of this Province, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any other petitions? The honourable Member for Bay de Verde.

MR. HOWARD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a petition on behalf of 148 voters of Old Perlican, and the prayer of the petition reads as follows: "On behalf of the official board and the congregation of the Old Perlican United Church charge, we the undersigned do hereby petition the Provincial Government of Newfoundland to have pavement laid on the section of road that leads from the present pavement to the United

Church Cemetary via the old Bay de Verde Road.

"This section of road is possibly two-tenths of a mile long and was upgraded and ditched by the Department of Highways during the Fall of 1974 and since there are several Old Perlican residents living in that immediate area and others in the process of building and since McNamara Construction is presently paving in the area, and since it is a much travelled road by the general public, we believe that our request is reasonable and solicit your approval."

I support this petition, Mr. Speaker, because not only is this road used as the road to the cemetary but also is a short cut to Bay de Verde and the people living in the North of Old Perlican. I ask that this petition be laid upon the table of this House and that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, just to show you how far the ecumenical movement has gone, Sir, it gives me great pleasure to support this petition on behalf of the United Church congregation in Old Perlican who would like to have the road in front of their church paved. I think it is a very reasonable request, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon.

AN HON. MEMBER: In the cemetary.

MR. NEARY: In the cemetary, in front of the cemetary -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible.) so the hearse can get up there.

MR. NEARY: Well, Sir, I do not know if the honourable member is a member of that congregation or not, I do not think he is. So -

AN HON. MEMBER: Any day now.

MR. NEARY: He looks like a candidate for a cemetary but -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: But, Sir, I do want to support the petition. I am sure that with all the bright new shiny yellow bulldozers and road paving equipment going around the Province in the next few weeks leading up to the election that it will be no trouble to get that little stretch of road

in front of the United Church Cemetary in Old Perlican paved.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Harbour Grace.

MR. YOUNG: I would like to support that petition, Sir, because -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. YOUNG: I think, Sir, I do not know if there will be an election campaign or not, but I think it is worthwhile, Sir, that we should have all our cemetary roads paved, upgraded and paved. This is why I support this petition. Now, Sir, I may say that I never had no complaint from my customers but I am sure some of their relatives really know and our vehicles know that some of these cemetary roads should be paved. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any other petitions?

The Hon. Minister of Mines and Energy presenting a petition.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, obviously my good constituents of Parkers Cove are not satisfied with the petition recently presented by the Hon. Member for Bell Island. They have forwarded another one. As you have probably heard there is a raging dispute going on in that community with respect to the location of a school to serve both Parkers Cove and Rushoon. I will not read through the entire prayer of the petition, the entire body of the petition, Mr. Speaker. But basically - I will just leave well enough alone - but basically, I think, it is an area that has traditionally been a very emotional one for the smaller communities when they see a school being phased out from their community, there is an emotional response. The people are concerned that this is the beginning of the end of their community and, therefore, they have to express their concerns in the strongest possible way. Unfortunately, in this case, with respect to a few individuals, the manner in which the response is expressed is a little too forceful on occasion. I understand that there have been some difficulties in the community over the last couple of weeks.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that this is an area where government recognizes that the school boards have a certain authority, that they must make these types of decisions to ensure that the decisions are made on the spot by representatives elected from the communities. It is unfortunate that at times you appear to get into this conflict between either not having the improved types of facilities that a combined school to serve a number of communities will supply, either having that or keeping the smaller schools in the smaller communities which cannot supply the educational advantages to the children. So to a certain extent it is a matter of balance. It is a very emotional area. It is an area where government believes, I believe, the school boards believe, I think, and I believe

most residents believe that the first principle that must be applied is, what is in the best educational interests of the children concerned? And for this reason, Mr. Speaker, I would like to have this tabled and referred to the Department of Education and the department could then, I would hope, pass it on to the attention of the school board and hopefully the board, in reaching its final decision, will consult adequately with the residents of the communities who are going to be affected.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, this is truly, Sir, democracy at work. About a week ago I presented a petition on behalf of the residents of Parkers Cove and today my learned friend, the member for Placentia West presented an identical petition on behalf of the residents of Parkers Cove. It is probably, Sir, signed by the same people. You might have noticed, Mr. Speaker, that the minister in presenting the petition was very, very, careful to avoid stating whether or not he supported the petition on behalf of his constituents in Parkers Cove.

MR. SIMMONS: Did he sign it?

MR. NEARY: No, I do not think the minister signed it.

MR. SIMMONS: He had to or he cannot present it.

MR. NEARY: The member, Sir, for Placentia West is quite right. That feelings are running very high in Parkers Cove at the moment. And I had an S.O.S. this morning as a matter of fact, and I believe the minister himself had an urgent call last night from residents of Parkers Cove who were scheduled to appear in Magistrates Court in Marystown this morning for forcing their way into a bingo hall where they made their feelings known in no uncertain terms to the Reverend gentleman who happens to be the Parish Priest in that area.

AN HON. MEMBER: It happened in the bus.

MR. EVANS: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: In the bus? No, Sir, it happened in the hall according to my informant this morning. They

busted in, they did not break the door, they just forced their way into the hall to make their feelings known.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: But, Sir, this is rather tragic, rather unfortunate indeed that feelings should run so high because some of the people who were charged, I think, in magistrates court this morning - I am not sure whether they appeared or not - were women.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: One woman.

MR. NEARY: One woman. I understood there were two. But, I take the minister would -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: What I said. There was one.

MR. NEARY: One. Yes, Sir. So, obviously they have very strong feelings in Parkers Cove about this matter, Sir, and not only in Parkers Cove but we have a similar situation today in Tilt Cove and in Robert's Arm. I do not know what we are going to do about this kind of situation, Mr. Speaker. The government, the Minister of Education, passes the buck to the school board. The school board passes the buck back to the government by saying they do not have the money, and the government says they cannot control the school boards. They cannot tell them where to build the schools. So, the people are just getting the runaround and they are getting frustrated.

But, I do hope, Sir, in the interest of cooling off this situation in Parkers Cove and in the other communities where similar things are happening in Newfoundland that the government and the school boards will be able to resolve this matter to the satisfaction of all concerned.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any other petitions?

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations.

HON. E. MAYNARD (MINISTER OF MANPOWER AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS): Mr. Speaker, I have the answers to questions no. (34), (37), (38) and (39) on the Order Paper of April 1.

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

MR. ROUSSEAU: I have the answer, Mr. Speaker, to question no.(1) and no.

(23) asked to the Minister of Transportation and Communications by, guess who, the honourable Member for Bell Island, and also the answer to question no. (7), the Minister of Public Works and Services asked by, guess who, the Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: I am getting a few answers out of you.

MR. ROUSSEAU: What?

MR. NEARY: I am getting a few answers out of you.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. COLLINS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have an answer to the honourable Member for Bell Island. I have not got the number or the date, but the question is to ask the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture to lay upon the table of the House the following information any contracts or agreements or any payments made by the Department of Forestry and Agriculture during the fiscal year ending March 31, 1974, to date, to Cabot Group 4 Limited.

I do not know what Cabot Group 4 are but my officials tell me that the answer is no, and it follows then that the other three parts of the question do not apply.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a point of order. Your Honour, this is most unusual, Sir, that I should get the answer to a question before it appears on the Order Paper. The minister has just received I presume this document from the Speaker's office. These questions have not yet, Sir, appeared on the Order Paper, and I would like for the minister to go down to his office and do a little more research and then bring the information into the House. The question has been put in the Speaker's office. It is in the process of being sent to the Queen's Printers -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: No. The question has not appeared on the - it is most irregular and unusual to get an answer to a question when it has not even appeared on the Order Paper.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: I am not complaining about it but it is an usual procedure.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The procedure may be a little bit unusual, but the situation is this, that the questions went to the printers to appear on the Order Paper. Once they leave the office to go to the printers then a copy of the questions is distributed to the department concerned. The questions were to have appeared on today's Order Paper. For some reason which I do not know of, they did not get there.

MR. COLLINS: To speak to that, this answer was given to me by the officials in the department which means that the question must have gone down there. I think it indicates that we are interested in answering questions, giving all the answers and doing it before they appear on the Order Paper.

ORAL QUESTIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder, Sir, if the Premier could tell us if he has any additional information now that he has had twenty-four hours to get in touch with the companies, Atlantic Processing and so forth, if the Premier has any more additional information on the fish plant in Marystown being put up for sale. Is Spencer Lake going to take it over? Does Spencer Lake have an appointment with the Premier next week to discuss this matter? What is the situation concerning the fish plant in Marystown?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES:

Mr. Speaker, as far as the government are concerned the position with the fish plant in Marystown is very simple. I answered it here to the honourable Member for Bell Island yesterday, He mentions the name Spencer Lake, is he interested? Is he? We heard that Atlantic Fish are getting rid of the plant, all these various things that are only geared for publicity and for taking advantage, if you like, of emotions of the moment. The fact is, Sir, that as far as Atlantic Fish is concerned, as far as we are concerned, we know no more other than Mr. Graham Kirkland the President of Jannock Corporation, who is the controlling company for Atlantic Fish, they have made the statement that because of the present circumstance in the fish business they would like to sell, or if they find a buyer, Atlantic Fish Processing, the plant in Marystown. We have not been approached for an appointment next week, nor the week after by Mr. Spencer Lake or anybody else. But what we have done, Mr. Speaker, is this that we have assured the people of Marystown and we have advised Atlantic Fish that before anything is done regarding the sale of that plant we want to be fully informed, and also irrespective of whether the plant will be sold or whether the plant will not be sold, the one thing that this government will make absolutely sure of is that the people of Marystown and the people on the Burin Peninsula who work in that particular organization will have the full protection in one of the most modern and efficient plants in Eastern Canada, will have the full protection of this government to ensure that it is continued in operation so that the economic benefits it is providing to the Burin Peninsula will not be cancelled out, if you like, will not be stopped, will not even be hesitated not even for a short time, but rather that the government, and I think Atlantic Fish, in all fairness, is interested in seeing the continuation of the plant. If a sale can be transacted between Atlantic Fish and some other company I would say this, that the government's position in loans and leases shall be protected and will be, and also whoever the person who goes in to operate the plant is concerned, if they sell, will be of such a type that we feel very confident as a government that it will be in the best interest of the people of Marystown.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Hon. the Premier. Would the Hon. the Premier care to react or tell the House whether public statements made by Mayor Fred Tessier of Grand Bank are true that other fish companies on the Burin Peninsula are either planning to pull out or closing up or selling out. Is there any truth or foundation to these statements or to these rumours or to these reports that are circulating on the Burin Peninsula?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. the Premier.

MR. MOORES: To our knowledge, Mr. Speaker, I would first of all say that it would be most unlikely for Mayor Fred Tessier to - I would say he was worried about this, but to say it was a fact would be most unusual and I think it would be probably very inaccurate. Secondly, to the government's knowledge, and I would think that we would be the first to know, there is absolutely no report of this at all.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could the Hon. the Premier then while we are on the subject of Marystown care to indicate to the House what steps his government has to provide a new town plan for the community of Marystown? And this matter is considered to be of an urgent nature.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. the Premier.

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the member for the district - the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing is not here today, but the member for the district the Hon. Minister of Mines and Energy can answer that in more detail than I can.

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, this is an area where we have had discussions with the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing for some time, and I have had representation from the Marystown Town Council, I have met with them, we have met with the Department of Municipal Affairs. Our last meeting was only - it was within the last three weeks to a month. The planners at the Department of Municipal Affairs are now engaged in the process of coming up with a revised town plan. It is not something that can be done overnight, Mr. Speaker. Marystown is growing at a very fast rate, I suppose it is one of the fastest

growing communities in the Province. And this is causing certain growing pains. The town plan which up to a couple of years ago appeared adequate is now, because the town is beginning to burst at the seams, causing difficulties with respect to applications by people for residential permits and so on.

So we have requested the Department of Municipal Affairs to revise the town plan. The planners are now engaged in this activity. Officials from the Department of Municipal Affairs were suppose to meet with the Town Council in Marystown within the last two days. I assume that that has been done, I have not heard, but I assume that is being done. And, Mr. Speaker, just as soon as the staff and the resources of the Department of Municipal Affairs permit this revision to the town plan will be carried out to permit the proper development of the Town of Marystown.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable the Premier, Sir, would tell the House if his government is going to follow the example set by the Federal Government and carry on a provincial enquiry or probe into the octopus-like corporations and companies operating within provincial boundaries that seem to have a strangle hold on just about everything that goes on in this Province? The corporate life of Canada is being investigated now by a Commission that is being set up by the Prime Minister of Canada. Will the Provincial Government - I beg your pardon?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: It is first.

MR. NEARY: It is first what?

PREMIER MOORES: It is the first royal commission.

MR. NEARY: Will the Provincial Government be following through taking this good example and investigating companies within provincial boundaries who seem to have a strangled hold on just about everything that goes on within the boundaries of -

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I do not know who the companies are the honourable member is referring to.

MR. NEARY: Do you want me to tell you?

PREMIER MOORES: I can assure the honourable Member for Bell Island now that any national or multinational or any other company we can attract to this Province we will gladly do so. Anything that will get more employment and more development for this Province we will encourage. This business of investigating people all the time, the Opposition when they were in government and since have a hang-up about investigating that which is successful. In other words, they have been so used, Mr. Speaker, to being failures, they cannot stand success whether it be in companies or whether it be in politics, and the answer is no, Sir. We have no intention of setting up any commission to investigate the few entrepreneurs and the few businesses we have in this Province.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the honourable the Premier aware that in two provincial general elections in this Province that

that is what the honourable Premier, platform the honourable Premier campaigned on, investigations, witch hunts, enquiries?

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, we did set up one investigation. It was on the liquor store leases and as the honourable member well knows from Bell Island, that was justified. But we are not on witch hunts, Sir. We are not out to persecute people. Really what we are talking about in this Province is trying to build it up, trying to build it up on a sound basis. The honourable member well knows that. If there are corrupt practices, if there are practices which are against the well being of the citizens in this Province, of course it will be investigated. But, Sir, if we talk about investigating multinational or octopus-type companies as the member says from Bell Island, I wish we had a few octopus type companies so we could identify them in this Province. If you look at the major companies who are investing in this Province, you have got Price Newfoundland Limited in Grand Falls, you have got Bowaters in Corner Brook, you have got the Iron Ore Company in Labrador, you have got Wabush Mines in Labrador.

MR. NEARY: How about construction companies?

PREMIER MOORES: You have got a great many companies, Sir, of that nature who are playing a very major corporate role in this Province and I really do not know what this Province would do without this sort of investment. The one thing this Province does not want to do is turn off any other company from making that same sort of investment because the day that happens, Mr. Speaker, we as a Province will be much worse off. The fact is that this government wants to support private enterprise and we want to support the development of this Province in a rational and meaningful way.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, another question for the honourable the Premier. Does the honourable Premier then have any reaction to a statement made yesterday by the British Trade Consul in the Atlantic area that British businessmen are steering clear of Newfoundland?

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, with people like the Member for Bell Island making statements in this House, it is no wonder.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is a good thing we only got a few more weeks or months to run so we can get into the polls and get this crowd out.

PREMIER MOORES: Where are you going to run? Sure, you do not even know where you are going.

MR. NEARY: Would the honourable the Premier care to tell the House if -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Nobody wants him.

MR. SIMMONS: We know where the Premier is going.

PREMIER MOORES: Yes, some place.

MR. SIMMONS: (Inaudible). Where is that?

PREMIER MOORES: Against you.

MR. SIMMONS: Okay.

PREMIER MOORES: Yes, sure.

MR. NEARY: You are awfully jumpy today. What is wrong with all the ministers? They are so edgy and jumpy and jittery.

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

MR. NEARY: We are not going to have an election tomorrow, are we?

PREMIER MOORES: Possibly.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! If the honourable Member for Bell Island wishes to ask a question, I suggest he get on with it.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to direct a question to the honourable the Premier. Would the honourable the Premier tell the House if he himself or any of his ministers or if the government have taken any steps to determine from the Government of Canada, from Canadian National Railways the effects in this Province of a proposed cutback in CN employees that is to take effect right across Canada? What effects will it have in Newfoundland?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES:

The situation on that, Mr. Speaker, is that we are concerned about it. It was announced yesterday, I believe, and the Minister of Transportation and Communications and the Intergovernmental Affairs Minister are both following up to see just exactly what affect it will have on Newfoundland if any and hopefully it will not. And certainly our representation will be to that effect.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications. Is the Minister of Transportation and Communications aware that the road to St. Bride's on the Cape Shore is impassable at the moment and the children are unable to reach the school by bus? Is the minister aware of that?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Am I aware of that? Mr. Speaker, my telephone has been jingling with irate calls for two days, irate children, irate adults, some understanding people, and I can appreciate the problems that exist on that particular stretch of road. And I would probably do it an injustice by calling it a road. Actually the part that is not being done, last year we called a contract on six miles, south from mile zero to mile six. This year we have called a contract on three further miles, from mile six to mile nine, but there is a problem now on that part of the road which has not been reconstructed or upgraded. I think the road that we have upgraded thus far is in good shape. I have just talked with, before I came up as a matter of fact, one of the officials who was down there yesterday, and they are aware of the situation. And from down in the area you hear, you know, that nobody is doing anything, and I talked to my officials up here and they tell me that they are doing something but, you know, it is rather difficult. So tomorrow I have dispatched the chief engineer for the department down. This morning there is a bulldozer down there. The problem has been that we have not been able to get the proper sort of shale material to harden the soft spots on the road. We had hoped to get

a bigger piece of equipment and stockpile the material. There is a smaller piece gone down. Some people are concerned about that, and I can assure the people they need not be concerned about that. The piece of machinery that is down there is enough to do the job we have to do now. What we had hoped to do was to be able to get a larger piece of machinery to dig out the shale and the rock. We have to dig it out. We will put as many trucks down there as we have and as are necessary to attempt to get the road in as good a condition as we possibly and humanly can within the next two days. And that is about all we can say. The people will be down there in the area tomorrow, the officials of the department, and we certainly intend to do everything we can. We appreciate the feelings of people down there. And, like I say, hopefully within two days, the situation, I hope, will be rectified.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the same minister. What about the Harbour Arterial Road Agreement? Has that been signed yet? Is it going to be signed soon? It was supposed to be signed several months ago. What is the hang-up? When can we expect the Harbour Arterial Road Agreement to be signed?

MR. ROUSSEAU: I have the answer. There is no agreement, Mr. Speaker, supposed to be signed a couple of months ago. This is the first time I have heard about that. That is a new announcement the Hon. Member for Bell Island made. The Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs -

MR. NEARY: Crosbie told us.

MR. ROUSSEAU: - and myself have said on numerous occasions in this House that the signing is imminent. Now, you know, imminent might mean a week, two weeks or three weeks. We have had excellent co-operation from the federal government. We have had excellent co-operation in coming to an agreement in principle, and it is now in the process in Ottawa. When it is signed, it will be announced. All we can understand is the term imminent, and we assume that that may be tomorrow

or it may be in another week or two, but agreement in principle has been reached, and the signing should take place imminently, and I do not know when that will be when we get it back from Ottawa.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the same minister. Would the Minister of Transportation and Communications tell us what action he has taken to make protests against the application by Eastern Provincial Airways to increase fares in this Province, especially, as it applies to the minister's own district of Western Labrador? What action has been taken?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Well, Mr. Speaker, first of all, you know, I have to put that in context. With the Air Canada increases and the EPA increases they are filed with the C.T.C. Under the National Transportation Act unfortunately there is no process by which representations can be heard from anybody. The increases that are filed are normally granted automatically and that is unfortunate. And our only recourse is to attempt to convince the Federal Ministry of Transport to change the National Transportation Act to make it possible for people, government bodies, interested groups or individuals to make representations on any fare increases that are requested and filed with the C.T.C.

For example, I do not know, in my own personal opinion, and I guess nobody else knows whether the Air Canada increase is warranted or not. There is no way of finding out. They have filed and, like I say, in most instances they are granted automatically.

In respect to the EPA increase: I have been talking to officials of EPA, and we had a meeting planned on other items and undoubtedly this will come up. I was talking yesterday with the vice-president of Eastern Provincial Airways for government and community affairs, and we are meeting here in St. John's next Wednesday. I am certainly concerned coincidentally as Minister of Transportation, of course, in respect to the Labrador City-Wabush area as I said publicly because the fares are already \$100 from Labrador City-Wabush to St. John's plus a \$5.00 tax makes it \$105 one way or \$210 return. We think, you know, in Labrador - I speak then by the way not as a Minister of Transportation and Communications but as a member, in my opinion as a member for the district and the people up there that any increase in that particular route is unwarranted. We certainly intend to bring that to the attention of Eastern Provincial Airways.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Is the minister aware that the honourable the Premier, the head of Her Majesty's government has come out publicly condemning an increase in fares for Air Canada and that Newfoundlanders should have special consideration? So the Premier says. Is the minister aware of that? If so, will the minister tell us if we can expect the same kind of public statement from the honourable the Premier concerning an application for increased fares for Eastern Provincial Airways?

MR. ROUSSEAU: As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, on Saturday afternoon, I suppose, the Premier and I travelled together and we talked about this and the Premier made a statement. When the Premier makes a statement by the way, he makes it, you know, on behalf of the government. So, you can -

MR. NEARY: His only concern here is about Air Canada. What about -

MR. ROUSSEAU: I think the honourable Member for Bell Island can assume that when the Premier makes a statement he does on behalf of the government. At least he did the last time I had heard.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: I am coming back to you. I am coming back to you.

MR. ROUSSEAU: So, the honourable Premier has consulted the department. We do not act in conflict. We act in unison. If the action is taken -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: We are all leaders.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROUSSEAU: - either by the Premier or by the ministers, it is done on behalf of the government and the Premier has expressed his displeasure with the rate increases and that is government policy. You know, I feel the same way. I do not disattach my particular feelings with regard to the Wabush-Labrador City-St. John's one. Any fare increases, as I said, now are unwarranted in this day and age. My God, we have the rail increases, the air freight increases, plus the cost of living increases and we are quite concerned I can assure the honourable member.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. I do not think the minister completely understood my question, Sir. The question I put to the minister was can we expect a similar statement protesting an application on behalf of EPA for increase in fares? Can the minister tell us if we can expect the Newfoundland Government to let out a howl of protest that can be heard right across Canada against any increase in rates for Eastern Provincial Airways?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Is EPA applying for one?

MR. NEARY: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Premier.

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, regarding increase in freight rates of any type -

MR. NEARY: Fares, air fares -

MR. MOORES: All fares or freight rates or whatever it happens to be, whether it is freight coming into this Province or whether it is people coming in or out, it all boils down to the same thing, Mr. Speaker, in that we are saying that being at the end of the great Confederation of Canada, being at one end we pay more than anybody, obviously, from any other location.

Our position has been and it has been stated yesterday to the Minister of Transportation, the Ministry of Transportation, is that

we feel that we should have very special consideration, particularly as an Island, and most of our people living on the Island part of the Province, regarding freight rates or regarding passenger travel. We have protested regarding Air Canada rate increases and we will any EPA increases because we feel that, not that - I am not saying these companies do not need that money. I do not know if they do or not. But what I am saying is that the people in Newfoundland and Labrador are in a position where we are paying more for that sort of service than anybody in Canada. And irrespective of what freight agency is involved, we will of course protest and protest very loudly to the central government because this is exactly the sort of thing that is in my opinion discriminatory between other provinces in Canada, and the furthestmost provinces in Canada.

I think it is one of the policies that could probably do more Mr. Speaker, to improve our Province's lot if that were recognized in Ottawa than just about any other one single factor in our society, is the matter of transportation whether it be for people going in or out or whether it be for the many products we bring into this Province.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Hon. the Premier.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Just as a point of information.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROUSSEAU: May I just as a point of information.

MR. NEARY: Sure, go ahead.

MR. ROUSSEAU: By the way we are not aware - we know the Air Canada increases, We do not know what the EPA increases are yet. This is the reason we have not done anything. They have announced a filing but -

MR. NEARY: Right.

MR. ROUSSEAU: - we are not aware of their increases. We are of Air Canada's. That is the difference.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Hon. the Premier, Sir, who just went on public record as stating that the Hon. the Premier and the government would protest any increases, any applications for increases. Now what sort of protest other than just glib statements in the House and outside of the House, what kind of formal protests can we expect from the government of this Province to the Government of Canada, Canadian Transport Commission, and to Air Canada? What will be the form of these protests?

MR. MOORES: It will not be Air Canada, Mr. Speaker. And the form of the protest as the honourable member well knows is representation to the minister at the federal level. Now whether the minister at the federal level listens or not probably the honourable Member for Bell Island knows as well as anybody because he has been in contact with them and he has certainly heard from them and he has heard about them recently, probably more than most people in this House. But the fact is, Sir, that we will be making representation directly to the minister based on reason and logic and not just as the Member for Bell Island says, by squealing loudly, We will be doing it hopefully on a rational and reasonable basis so that it will be accepted rather than being looked upon as just another screech out of a stuck pig, so as to speak.

MR. NEARY: Well Mr. Speaker a supplementary question. Would the Hon. the Premier be getting together with the four Premiers in the Atlantic Provinces? And will the four Premiers be approaching the

Prime Minister of Canada? Just how will it be done? You know, could the Premier be a little more specific, and just tell us what, step by step, what action is going to be taken to protest these increase in fares?

MR. MOORES: The answer, when the presentation is made - certainly we are not opposed, Sir, as a matter of fact we will be very willing and we will make it public. Of course, we will, because the people of Newfoundland are at stake. As far as getting the Premiers of the Atlantic Provinces together and performing the mode of attack that the honourable Member for Bell Island is trying to orchestrate over there physically, directorially or whatever way he is trying to do it. The answer is that we will be obviously having the same stand, I would think, that Quebec would as well, and I would think that the Western Provinces would. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I would think that every province in Canada is concerned about this with the possible exception of Ontario, and I only say the possible exception, because I think they are also going to be concerned if everybody else is concerned. The matter of transportation will certainly be the subject of the Premiers' Conference this year. It will certainly be the subject of an on-going, many conferences, because I do not suppose there is any one thing with a country so sparsely populated as Canada which stretches over 5,000 miles that is more meaningful than the subject of transportation and how it can be best co-ordinated within this nation.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary for the Premier, in view of the fact that the Premier is now so concerned about Air Canada's rates and fares, can we expect the Premier in the future when he is travelling in behalf of the people of this Province to get an Air Canada credit card and stop using the Churchill Falls jet and the government aircraft?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! This question is out of order.

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, it is too bad.

MR. NEARY: You can answer it.

MR. MOORES: If I could, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: If you wish to answer it.

MR. MOORES: The fact is Air Canada do not give travel cards even to members of government. I think they do to federal ministers probably

but certainly the lowly provincial types do not get credit cards. As far as travelling on government jets is concerned, as the honourable Member for Bell Island knows the Leader of the Opposition used what he refers to as the government jet to go to St. Anthony yesterday and I hope he did not want him bumped because we were only too glad to take him up. And the same goes with any service we have of this aircraft, and this has to be very clearly made that in Newfoundland -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MOORES: were distances mean a lot, in Newfoundland where it is difficult to get around the use of aircraft is terribly important with people whose time is valuable. Now that Mr. Speaker does not apply -

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. MOORES: - to the Member for Bell Island, but it does apply to most people on the government side of the House.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Would the Hon. the Premier care to inform the House whether or not Churchill Falls have been reimbursed for a trip they made to Halifax recently to carry the Premier and party over to Halifax enroute Bermuda?

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, Churchill Falls is a government organization. It did not need to be reimbursed. BRINCO, when we bought the company, was well reimbursed for what we received, but once again so were the people of Newfoundland because it means that through the hydro electric development of Labrador, through the great potential it is going to mean to this Province in industrial development, what it is going to mean to the people of this Province in the way of stable rates for hydro electricity in the future, what that particular purchase meant, Mr. Speaker, will be a way of life that will mean probably more singularly than any other thing that this Province has ever done as far as the benefit of the people are concerned, and I am sure the Member for Bell Island will not try to warp a plane going to Halifax, to Montreal where it was going anyway, out of context when one considers the ramifications of really what we are talking about here.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I almost forgot what the question was. Sir, would the Minister of Transportation tell the House whether or not Newfoundland is still a member of the Atlantic Transportation Commission? And if so, will the minister be drawing on the resources and the expertise of the Atlantic Transportation Commission to fight these increases by CN and by Air Canada and by Eastern Provincial Airways?

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

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, I am certainly not going to make the same mistake. I am going to do it very slowly so that the honourable member can understand this time. Yes, we are still a member of the Atlantic Provinces Transportation Commission. We are an equal member with the other three Atlantic Provinces. Atlantic Provinces Transportation Commission are also acting on behalf of the four provinces in Eastern Canada. But this government has never been afraid to add its singular voice to the already collective voice of the Atlantic Provinces Transportation Commission and that is why we are bringing this to the attention of CN on our own as well as through the Atlantic Provinces Transportation Commission. We have been informed that they are also working on it. They are, of course, a servant, in a sense, of the people of this Province and of this House of Assembly, the same as they are of the people in the other three Atlantic Provinces and the Houses of Assembly in those three provinces.

So when we meet with Mr. Marchand in Charlottetown on Monday, the Atlantic Provinces ministers, I am speaking on behalf of our governments in each of the four provinces, we will certainly bring these things to life and much of the research and back-up work will have been done by the Atlantic Provinces Transportation Commission. They will follow through as they did when there was the discontinuation of the L.C.L., the less than carload rate lots. They worked on that, and they are presently working, of course, with us on this issue as well in respect to the filing of increases by CN.

So, yes, we are still a member. We use them, and we are quite proud of the work they have done especially in the area when the L.C.L. rates were discontinued. They did a fine job, and they are staying on top of this on our behalf, and we are paying equally with the other three Atlantic Provinces to continue their operation.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Provincial Affairs, Sir. Could the minister tell the House why the government failed to appear at beef hearings that were held in the city yesterday? I think Mr. McKenzie was the chairman of a committee that held hearings here in the city of St. John's yesterday on the price of beef in Newfoundland and the government failed to appear at that hearing. Could the minister tell us why the government failed to appear?

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

HON. G. DAWE (Minister of Provincial Affairs and Environment): Mr. Speaker, the government failed to appear at the hearing merely because the people who were here to hear the people of Newfoundland, to accept proposals left within a half hour of the start of the meeting. They received two proposals, two submissions from people, one was Mr. Pat Murray. We sent two officials from the Division of Consumer Affairs of the Department of Provincial Affairs and Environment, and when they got there the people from Ottawa had already taken off to Hotel Newfoundland to make reservations and preparations to go back to Ottawa, which is very typical of the type of people they send here from Ottawa to listen to the complaints of Newfoundlanders.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Would the minister tell the House if he had any advance notice of these hearings?

MR. DAWE: Of course we did. Why do you think we sent two people?

MR. NEARY: Well, how much notice did the minister's department have that these hearings were going to be held?

MR. DAWE: About as much as you did.

MR. NEARY: How much, Mr. Speaker? How much notice? A day?

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, it has been in the papers for two weeks now on and off from various news media who were carrying it in the newspaper and on the air and so on. We have had as much notice as anybody else.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Why was the minister's department so slow on the uptake? Why were they not -

MR. DAWE: A half hour is slow.

MR. NEARY: - why were not the minister and his officials there when the hearings started?

MR. DAWE: Because they arrived thirty minutes late.

MR. NEARY: Who arrived thirty minutes late? Your officials?

MR. DAWE: Two officials whom I sent.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am dissatisfied with the answer given by the minister, and I wish to debate it at the late show tomorrow afternoon, Sir, at 5:30.

MR. DAWE: Surprise! Surprise!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: It being Private Members' Day, we will proceed with Motion No. 3 as it appears on today's Order Paper. The amendment was made by the Hon. the Member for St. John's East, and he has fifteen minutes left to speak.

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Perhaps in the last few moments before I end my remarks, I might recapitulate what was said last week, last Wednesday.

MR. MARSHALL: First of all with relation to this particular, the main motion itself, brought in by the honourable Member for Hermitage, for reasons given last week which were quite self explanatory, I feel that there is no need of an enquiry as such. Why? Because nothing happened. And you do not have an enquiry, Mr. Speaker, into nothing. Although the honourable members of the Opposition it might scintillate them and that is the way they might like to employ their time, you do not have an enquiry into nothing.

I would also like to point out, Mr. Speaker, what I pointed out last week, what I thought was very significant was the time spent by the honourable Member for St. Barbe North and the time spent by the honourable the Leader of the Opposition in eulogizing, as a matter of fact almost immortalizing Mr. Dobbin. It was a marked contrast, Mr. Speaker, from the type and tenor of remarks that were made by the honourable the Member for Hermitage the week before. I think it is very significant that this was so, and very significant to draw this to the attention of this honourable House. As a matter of fact, I think in the duration between the weeks that the honourable Member for St. Barbe North had really gone, as far as I am concerned, to great excesses. Because it is not a case of necessarily immortalizing or building any person up one way or the other. As I say, he is, as I said the other day, he is a normal human being like everybody else. But he is not a saint, neither are any of us, I suppose.

Very significant I think of the Leader of the Opposition who again today is not here. But when he was speaking, you know, everybody had, who was dealing with the government, had some crooked innuendo attached to him, if they happen to be lawyers who were legitimately involved in certain areas with the government or they happen to be people who are employed that the Opposition Leader did not like, he referred in a certain way and he referred to the great contractors of this Province in an entirely different way and as far as I am concerned therein lies the story itself.

I also mentioned in my remarks the other day, Mr. Speaker, to recapitulate, the great importance of public tendering in this Province and the necessity for there to be not one iota of bending or compromise, that we had to be rigid in our view with it and we had to demand that public tenders occurred at all times and in all places in transactions relating to the government for reasons which I will not go into now but certainly should appear to be, and should be most evident to members of this House.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I mentioned the fact that this government is to be recognized for its public tendering policy since it has gotten into government, recognizing that it has called tenders in, certainly in most instances. And I think that we can now, there is no need of, as I say, any type of enquiry, when you take that the statement of the government on the first regular day of this sitting that was stated by the honourable the Premier speaking on behalf of the government, endorsing the fact that tenders are going to be called to provide services whether leases or otherwise and the record speaks for itself in that instance. So there is no really need for any kind of an amendment. It is the type of negative thing that the Opposition is wont to bring before this House from time to time. And instead, in the hopes of getting this matter to be considered in a positive vein, I brought an amendment before the House, and it is probably just as well because it is only a short amendment to refresh persons minds as it does not it does not appear on the Order Paper what this amendment is.

Be it resolved that after the word "that" all words be deleted and replaced by the following words, and this is the amendment, "That this House endorses the government in its expressed policy." This is the policy expressed by the Premier on the first regular day of sittings. "To call open public tenders for all public works, whether such public works are affected pursuant to long term leases, purchases, agreements or otherwise. Secondly," and this is also another important arm of the amendment, Mr. Speaker, that I would hope this House would enthusiastically endorse as well, "that this House further urges the government to cause buildings needed for additional accommodation of the public service to be

April 23, 1975

Tape No. 1695

NM - 3

constructed on Confederation Building grounds."

Now this amendment, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest fits

5006

very well within the tender call that was made on March 12 by the acting Minister of Public Works as indicated and fits also within the framework of the statements which he made when he informed the House of his calling of these tenders. But I have to say that there appears to me, my poor uneducated eye on this statement to be somewhat, I am little bit confused with the statement that accompanied the public tenders because of the fact that the honourable minister appeared to be saying that we are calling public tenders with respect to the leasing. Perhaps I can read the last two paragraphs of his statement which I think are very pertinent.

It says that "In view of this requirement of public tenders," that is he is referring to the statement by the honourable the Premier, the government's policy of calling tenders and the necessity of additional space, "in view of this requirement public tenders are being invited for rental proposals to provide up to 400,000 square feet of office accommodation in the immediate St. John's area, the first 100,000 square feet being required by December 31, 1976 and the remainder by 1980. The Department of Public Works and Services has been requested to prepare an up to date estimate for the construction of a government owned building to provide similar accommodations and when tenders are received a comparison will be made to determine which is the more economical procedure to implement."

So this is why I am a wee bit confused with the statement, Mr. Speaker, because we are calling tenders, and when you call tenders it is normal to say the lowest or any tender not necessarily accepted, but in this case we are really in effect saying we may proceed by another basis. We may go by way of lease, we may construct, or then it says we will look into it and maybe we will build our own building.

So, I would take it then by that statement by the honourable minister, despite the fact that they were calling tenders, that the government at that particular stage, and we are at that stage now, had not really fully made up its mind because, indeed, the minister indicated to a statement

subsequently, an elaboration to the news media, to one of the news media that this call for tenders was broad enough in effect to permit a building on the Confederation Building grounds. This, Mr. Speaker, is what the second arm of this amendment to the resolution which I have introduced urges. It urges the government to build the accommodation to provide the accommodation necessary for the public service on the grounds of the Confederation Building. Now, it does not say how it is to be done. It can be done by leasing, it can be done by a contractor building it, but it must be by tender call, or it can be done by the government itself building the building, which I would feel would probably be the most economical measure of doing it.

With respect to leasing, and I here, I am only expressing my views, it is my opinion that leasing in this particular instance is not really appropriate because there is such a large amount of space involved and needed that you have to build a building. You do not build a building. If a person builds a building and leases it back to the government or to any concern he is not a philanthropist. He is going to build a building and lease it back and get in ten years or fifteen or twenty years he is going to get paid for the building he puts up, he is not Santa Claus. Certainly he is not Santa Claus. Maybe the honourable members on the opposite side are eulogizing of the contractors might think there are Santa Clauses in the fraternity of contractors, Mr. Speaker, but you know obviously there are not. They are going to have to be paid for their construction costs.

So what we are going to be doing by leasing payments, whoever we lease from if we lease, it would seem to me, subject to seeing a proposal that really dumbfounds me, what we really will be doing is we will be paying for the building of a contractor and at the end of the term he will substantially or actually own the building itself. I do not think that any of us in our own business life would operate in that particular manner but would prefer to build it, at least build it ourselves so that at the end of the time we would own it. Leasing might be appropriate for governments if it is going to lease a floor or two of a building for a short period of time but I would contend not long term leases for a long period of time. Because, as I say, the contractor, whoever builds it,

April 23, 1975.

Tape 1696

PH - 3

is going to capitalize that cost and that cost is going to be paid out of the rentals.

There has been an argument made, Mr. Speaker, the argument has been advanced, and I heard it somewhere, I know not where, but I know it has been advanced, that we can finance a lease building better because we can finance it on current account. We will not have to borrow in the capital account markets. That reasoning, Mr. Speaker, is also completely fallacious because, you see,

governments are really no different than private individuals. If somebody goes in for a loan for any reason, be it what it may, whether it be for a lease, to incur a long term commitment, or building or what have you, the same way as you go into any financial institution. They look at all of your commitments. They look at the mortgage payments of the individual that he has to make on his house and his car, the number he has in his family and what have you. What I am saying really is that the argument is not valid because anybody lending a large amount of money to the government, or giving to a person - financing them for the purpose of leasing back to the government, will look at the government's financial situation. In any event, it is entirely inappropriate to finance a building, as far as I am concerned, through current account when there are such demands on our current account. It should be financed really on capital account anyway, because the benefit of this building will be over a long period of time. That is the nature of the differential between capital and current account.

The reason why it is appealing in this way is because the accountants, these blessed accountants and computers and what have you that order our daily lives say that lease payments come out of current account. That is because it is very hard to draw an arbitrary figure with respect to lease payments as to whether or not, you know, it should be five years, over five years, should be a capital expenditure or under five years or what is the arbitrary figure. But, I do not want to get into that now - I can - it is an accounting concept, and it is one that is entirely erroneous to say that we should lease because we can get it on current account, we can pay for it in current account rather than capital. I would challenge anyone who made that statement. If I had more time I would enter into more debate along those lines. But, there are other remarks I want to make.

So, as I see it, Mr. Speaker, subject to my correction, subject to correction, the government has not really on the statement of the honourable acting Minister of Public Works, made up its mind as to whether it is going to lease, as to whether it is going to get a building built, as to whether it is going to build its own building. This is in accordance with the statement. They are going to make

inquiries. Now, with the greatest of respect, Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is really any great need of any searching enquiries in that area. I do not think that we need to make any great enquiries. I do not think we need civil servants to tell us what to me is quite obvious, that the building should be on the Confederation Building grounds. It should be an extension to the Confederation Building preferably, and if it cannot be, it should be another building.

The cost savings over the years, the administrative cost savings, as I said the other day, will go a long ways to paying for some of the pressing needs in this Province. To have a building over on one end of the town and another building here - I mean the express purpose of building the building as the Minister of Public Works has indicated, which is reasonable, is to consolidate space. Well, you are going to consolidate the space around, if that is worthy, you should try to consolidate, as far as I am concerned, all in one place.

No, Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is necessary for us to have a corps of civil servants, a corps of consultants, a corps of experts to tell us what to my mind is completely obvious, that we ought to have the building on the Confederation Building grounds. Perhaps we need experts to enquire into whether this tender is better than the other tender, to give us analysis or what have you. But, surely there are certain things that we can make as legislators, that the government can make and that it ought to make on its own without the necessity of - I mean, ordinary common sense dictates it. The actual note is calling for the tenders itself calls for the construction of a building within the immediate St. John's area. It does not say we are going to get experts to determine whether we should have part of the Confederation Building in St. John's, for instance, and part of it in Grand Falls or out in Topsail or down in Bay Bulls or what have you. So, that is already a value judgement made. It has to be within the St. John's area. I would say that it is entirely appropriate and very wise for the building to be built on the Confederation Building grounds.

Now, my time is drawing to a close, Mr. Speaker, on this particular

debate. But, I would very strongly urge, as I say, this government to - we have tenders called and it will be very interesting from their point of view of making comparisons. I would suggest however that there may be contractors, because of the nature of the statements accompanying the tender calls, who would not go to the expense of preparing bids because it was made to be almost indefinite, and I think indefinite it was. What I am asking the government to do really by this is to make up its mind.

I say now I do not accuse it of not making up its mind, because it can make up its mind. But, what I am asking the government really to do is to say, all right, it first of all makes sense to build on the Confederation Building grounds as an extension to the Confederation Building or as another building. I am asking the government also I feel in ordinary prudence to dictate that it not be done by way of straight lease. Maybe it should be built by a contractor on public tenders. I would favor myself the government building it through project management.

But, in any event, what I am asking the government to do is this, quite frankly, that we make up our mind as legislators here that the building should be here, that we should take steps to provide and make a definitive decision to build on the Confederation Building Grounds here in St. John's right where we now stand, and that we call such tenders, take such steps as may be necessary for the purpose of realizing this, as far as I am concerned, extremely beneficial result.

So, Mr. Speaker, my time has now expired. So, before I am cut off I would strongly urge this House - I hope that it receives the full endorsement - as I say, the first part of this resolution is the House endorses the government in its expressed policy to call open public tenders for all public works whether such

public works are affected pursuant to long-term leases, purchase agreements or otherwise. Now these are the words as enunciated by the Hon. Premier as being the policy of this government on the first regular working day of sitting of this session, and I think it is something that we can all endorse, and we can all recognize the government has done it. And the second part, which is part and parcel of it, Mr. Speaker, is that the House further urges the government to cause buildings needed for additional accommodation of the public service to be constructed upon Confederation Building grounds. I think it is an eminently sensible motion and one that I would certainly hope would obtain the unanimous endorsement of this honourable House, and I would hope the honourable members of the Opposition can feel themselves inclined, without eulogizing their contractor friends, that they can feel themselves disposed and bestir their bones to get up and support this motion or this amendment to the motion in a very enthusiastic manner.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Dunphy): The Hon. Member for St. Barbe North.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I was not going to speak, at least, this time on this particular amendment to the motion moved by my colleague from Hermitage, Sir, the amendment to the motion.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. F. ROWE: I realize that, I am not that dim.

The original motion was moved by the member for Hermitage, Sir, and has been amended by the member for St. John's East. Now, Sir, to my mind the sole purpose of this amendment, which is a motherhood amendment -

MR. NEARY: It is a red herring.

MR. F. ROWE: It is a motherhood amendment. Sir, who could disagree with the two sections of that amendment? Who could disagree? But, Sir, it is a very skilful, a very skilful parliamentary manoeuvre to get the government off the hook.

MR. NEARY: Hear! Hear!

MR. F. ROWE: That is the sole purpose, I submit, Sir,
of that motherhood amendment -

AN HON. MEMBER: Get the heat off.

MR. F. ROWE: - one which everybody in this House, I would submit, will, in all conscience, have to support but it gets the government off the hook. It gets the government completely off the hook with respect to the original motion put by my colleague from Hermitage. Sir, my colleague from Hermitage put forward a very good case upon a thorough analysis of the various pieces of correspondence that went on between the government and four firms. And he proved without any doubt at all that the government was not in fact sticking to its policy or so-called expressed policy to call open public tenders for all public works. He proved beyond any doubt that this was the case and that there were certain so-called deals or, if honourable gentlemen prefer, agreements. There were agreements made and between contractors and government without the openness that this government had promised they would provide with respect to such works.-

MR. NEARY: Hear! Hear!

MR. F. ROWE: such construction work? And, Sir, I do not know how many lawyers and how many legal brains had to get together overnight and for weeks to come up with this skilful motherhood amendment that we have to support and thereby get this honourable crowd, Sir, off the very sticky hook that they were hung on there when my colleague presented the original motion.

MR. ROWE: Now, Sir, I would submit, I give the honourable Member for St. John's East, if this is his sole creation, if he was the only creator of this amendment I, Sir, suggest that he is a very skillful lawyer and parliamentarian and getting the government off the hook at the same time.

AN HON. MEMBER: Off what hook?

MR. ROWE: Off what hook? The hook, Sir, was so great that you could hang the whole Cabinet on it at the one time, Sir, because we were asking for a select committee to enquire into these circumstances and reveal them for what they were and if the government have nothing to hide, instead of us getting an edited version of what was going on, what would have been contained in an unedited version? So I give the Member for St. John's East all credit for his parliamentary skill and probably he is trying to crawl back into the good graces, Sir, of the present administration. So much for that, Sir, I submit that that is the sole purpose of of his amendment.

Now the honourable Member for St. John's East also made reference to the fact that myself and my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition have been eulalizing -

MR. CARTER: Eulogizing.

MR. ROWE: Eulogizing, I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I thank the Member for St. John's North for straightening up my grammar.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: Immortalizing and making saints out of our contractor friends. Now, Sir, I almost jumped up on a point of order or personal privilege.

MR. EVANS: You are the one who defended Dobbin.

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): Order, please!

MR. ROWE: I was not the one, Sir, who defended Dobbin. I was defending Dobbin's name and reputation because the actions of this government put the reputation of that gentleman into question publicly, and any other person -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: Now, Sir, if I can be heard in silence I would appreciate it very much. We accorded honourable gentlemen on the other side the courtesy

very much. We accorded honourable gentlemen on the other side the courtesy of listening to them without interruption and I would expect the same thing from honourable gentlemen at the present time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: No, of course not.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: What have we got?

MR. ROWE: Sir, can I have a ruling on whether I am going to be heard in silence or not please?

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): I would like to remind honourable gentlemen both to my left and to my right when a speaker has risen to speak that he is to be heard in silence and to observe that.

MR. ROWE: Having been used to speaking to high school students and university students, Sir, I would expect the same courtesy from the gentlemen on the other side of the House but it is apparently not so.

Now, Sir, I almost jumped up on a point of order or a point of privilege at this particular stage of the game because the way the honourable Member for St. John's East, worded it very skillfully once again, one would almost think, Sir, that I had a contact with Craig Dobbin or I was a great friend of Craig Dobbin or I had shares or was a partner or there was some hanky panky going on, you get up and protect me buddy and I will take care of you, well that put that on the -

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: Well let us get one thing straight right off the bat, Sir, the sole - I had two motives, there were two reasons why I stood in my place and gave a biography of Mr. Craig Dobbin

and tried to do in my own small way something to protect the integrity and reputation of that gentleman. Sir, because of the bungling of this government, because this government had not stuck with their so-called expressed policy to call open public tenders but instead to make agreements with one of four companies which was less than open, obviously the man who was successful was associated with what I consider to be the wrongdoings of this government in terms of what the promises of this government were during election campaign and what their policies were contained in Throne Speeches. He was guilty, Sir, by association, guilt by association and I am not a lawyer but there is such a thing as being guilty because of association. I want to make one thing abundantly clear, Sir, and that is to focus the House of Assembly's attention and the people of Newfoundland's attention on the fact that the government had broken an expressed promise during campaigns and it had nothing to do whatsoever with Dobbin, Crosbie, Lundrigan, Seaboard Construction or any other contractor who would in his own best interest try to get the best kind of a deal he can with government or any other council or any other institution or any other business that he could get. That is their own business, a company's business. It is not the companies that came out - Seaboard did not come out, and Lundrigan's did not come out, and the Dobbin group did not come out, and the Crosbie group of companies did not come out and say every single deal that they were going to make was open for public scrutiny. The companies in Newfoundland did not come out and make the promise or make it a statement of policy. It was not contained in their annual reports, if they have them. It was this government, Sir, that said that they were going to have public tendering and they got caught. By whom? One of their own members, one of their own members caught them in the act and resigned over it.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Who caught them?

MR. ROWE: And resigned over it. Sir, for that again we have to congratulate the honourable member for St. John's East but I am thoroughly disappointed, Sir, -

MR. NEARY: He lost his nerve.

MR. ROWE: - thoroughly disappointed, Sir, that he has elected to take the government off that hook of being investigated by a select committee.

I am thoroughly disappointed in the member, and how did he do it? By bringing in an amendment that anybody in their right mind has to agree with, a beautiful, skillful piece of parliamentary trickery, Sir, absolutely beautiful, skillful indeed, Sir, skillful indeed.

Now, Sir, I mentioned one reason why I got up and so-called immortalized and tried to make a saint out of Mr. Craig Dobbin which, of course, is a gross exaggeration of the fact on the part of the Member for St. John's East. Sir, there was another reason and I do not mind baring my soul on this one. This is a political arena, this House of Assembly. This is a political arena and do not let me hear honourable members opposite try to suggest otherwise. None is so naive as to suggest that amongst other things this happens to be a political arena. Now, Sir, if you were backed into a corner like the government was, backed into a corner, caught by one of your own members, my colleague for Hermitage documents the case, something very funny going on here that requires the investigation or enquiry of a select committee and the documentation, Sir, was so perfect the case was closed practically by my colleague from Hermitage. The government was up against the wall. It was in the corner. What do you think the government's stand, defense might be when they got no defense? They would -

MR. NEARY: Red herring.

MR. ROWE: Red herring is one. But the other one, Sir, and I have heard this take place in this House before where a government member would leap to his feet and accuse the Opposition of crucifying and destroying the reputation, integrity and good name of an innocent young Newfoundland businessman who is making a great contribution to the economy of this Province. So, Sir, what did we do over here? Being a little bit on the skillful side ourselves once in a while, instead of giving some honourable member on the other side the opportunity to jump up and make such an accusation, I myself jumped up immediately following the Member for Hermitage and made it quite clear

that there was no intention on the part of the Opposition to question the motives, honesty, reputation, integrity or anything else of the four groups of companies, and in this particular case, as it turned out, Mr. Craig Dobbin. We wanted to put the spotlight on the place where it should be placed. And the place in this case was the actions of this government during these whole proceedings and the writing up of these agreements and the correspondence that took place between them.

So, there are the two reasons, Sir. So, do not let the honourable Member for St. John's East leave the impression that I was gotten to or we are defending our contractor friends.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: It is just as well to say it.

MR. F. ROWE: Contractor friends -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: Sir, I do not have a contractor friend in the world.

As a matter of fact the only contractor that I happen to know is one for whom the honourable member is a lawyer, and I think I gave him such a hard time in the building of my own home that that contractor will never build another home for me again. That has been my only contact, Sir, with a contractor and that is in the building of my own home. So, let us get that one perfectly straight.

Now, Sir -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Did you ever walk on the same side of the street with one?

MR. F. ROWE: With respect, Sir, to - I do not believe I have actually. I do not believe I have.

MR. NEARY: Because if you do, they will accuse you of -

MR. F. ROWE: I suppose if I meet him in the elevator or the liquor store or in Canadian Tire, I am really in deep trouble, Sir. Anyway, this is just thinking out loud.

Now, Sir, with respect to the amendment. This House endorses the government in its expressed policy to call open tenders for all public works whether such public works are affected pursuant to long term leases, purchase agreements or otherwise. I will go back and get to the "and" after.

Sir, who can argue against that? Can you argue against that? The only thing I can argue against there is that is their expressed policy going to be consistent with their expressed actions or their actual, their actions? This is where the problem lies, Sir.

MR. NEARY: He is talking his way back in again.

MR. F. ROWE: Well, that is a conceivable possibility, trying to weasle, worm, come in by the back door, Sir, got a few flicks. He does not want any more flicks. He is getting bruised and scarred. So, let us try to get the government off the hook and bring in a very skillful amendment.

But, Sir, the one thing that bothers me about this - I do not know if hypocritical is unparliamentary in this particular case. It is probably is, so, I will not use it. But, Sir, you know, when you endorse the government in its expressed policy to call open tenders for public works whether such works are effective pursuant to long term leases, purchase agreements or otherwise, Sir, one has to ask the question, where does expressed policy lie with respect to action? Is the government's action going to be consistent with their expressed policy? Because we have already seen one example. It has been proven in this House by the documentation of my friend from Hermitage and it has been proven because of the resignation from the cabinet of the Member for St. John's East. It has been proven once already that the action of this government is not necessarily consistent with their expressed policy. We are now relying completely upon the word of the Premier of this Province.

We have already discovered once, Sir, that the word of the Premier of this Province is like an empty bucket, at least in this particular instance

because the word of the Premier of this Province, Sir, was completely the opposite of the actions of the Department of Public Works with respect to getting government space for this Province. So, the Member for St. John's East is saying, give the government one more chance. We got caught with our pants down. Let us see now if we can keep them up, the tender pants down. It is as simple as that, Sir. This amendment is simply saying we got caught, we are sorry, okay people of Newfoundland, give us one more chance to see this time if we will do what we say we will do. That is all this amendment does, Sir.

We are just caught in a most peculiar situation here of having to support something because it is motherhood and having to hope, having to hope that this government will be consistent with their expressed policy or promise.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: Yes.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Do not choke on it.

MR. ROWE: Yes, I almost did choke on it because it is so skillfully worded for one purpose -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: Off the hook boys. I will not accuse the member of being put up to it. He is probably just trying to get into the good graces of government again. Sir, we have already seen one example where this government has said one thing and done the exact opposite. This is why I almost choke when I have to support this amendment. I almost choke when I say yes, I will support it. We were promised by the Premier, Sir, that the, and I will not debate it but I have got to use it as an example because we are now being asked to believe the word of government again, but we were told, Sir, that the government would implement the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Redistribution. The government did not do that, Sir. We were told also that there would be a permanent commission to review the situation. The government did not do that, Sir. And now we are asked to say, the government says once again, has expressed policies to call open tenders. It is a logical question for us to ask, will the government do this or will they do what they have done with some other of their expressed policies and promises? One hundred and sixty-nine, Sir,

look. 169 promises and policies that this government has not honoured. Here we are being asked to give them a second chance when they were caught dead in their tracks by one of their own kind. It is pathetic, Sir, that parliamentary trickery has to be used, a motherhood amendment, it is pathetic, has to be brought in this House by the very person who opened the case to get the government off the hook. I have heard of caucus. Sir, I have heard of party and I have heard of caucus and I have heard of **cabinet** solidarity, Sir, but this takes the cake in solidarity.

I expect the Member for St. John's East, that every night he goes home, Sir, he sings "Solidarity Forever." This is what he must sing every night before he goes to bed because, Sir, if I ever saw an example of caucus, party or Cabinet solidarity - which I think is a good thing, by the way - this takes the cake, because, Sir, it is sort of a hybrid in this case because the minister, do not forget, did resign over the issue, did resign.

MR. NEARY: The Premier said he got flicked out.

MR. ROWE: Then the Premier, of course, went ahead and humiliated him and insulted the honourable gentleman by saying he was juiced up and he got flicked out.

MR. NEARY: For months, he said, he had been -

MR. ROWE: On T.V., said he was juiced up.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. F. ROWE: and he got flicked out, and he will settle down after awhile. Well, Sir, I never realized the importance of what the Premier said that night when he said he settled down. He sure has settled down, Sir. He is dragging him off that great big hook with a motherhood amendment. Sir, the only thing I can say in supporting this half of the amendment is I sincerely hope that the government will keep their promise in this particular case.

MR. NEARY: You got high hopes.

MR. F. ROWE: I hope I am not too naive in that one.

MR. NEARY: They never kept one yet.

MR. F. ROWE: Now, Sir, the second part of the amendment is grandmotherhood. If you are going to build government offices, Sir, the obvious place to build them is somewhere where people can find them. There is nothing more frustrating than some poor gentleman coming in, say, from my District of St. Barbe North. He comes up here to see me, then he has to go down to Public Utilities because he wants to get a carriers' licence. So we ship him down to the Philip Building -

MR. NEARY: Do not forget the Crosbie Building on Viking Road

MR. F. ROWE: - and then he wants to see something about the Fisheries Loan Board so we got to ship him up to the Viking Building .

MR. NEARY: The Viking Building on Crosbie Road

MR. F. ROWE: And then we got to bring him over to the - he wants to find out something about the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation so we got to bring him over to where it is at:

MR. NEARY: The Crosbie Building, I believe.

MR. F. ROWE: The Crosbie Building, is it? Is that where -

MR. NEARY: It is over on Crosbie Road.

MR. F. ROWE: It is in another building.

MR. NEARY: In Crosbie town.

MR. F. ROWE: There is nothing more frustrating, Sir. Mines and Energy is down in the Phillip Building, I believe. So, you know,

this House further urges the government to cause buildings needed for additional accommodation of the public service to be constructed upon Confederation Building grounds.

Sir, I think I will move that I will make sure that I will feed my family for the next month. It is the same thing. I think I will make a policy statement that I will not beat my wife. This is the same thing. How can you argue against that? It is sensible.

MR. NEARY: The sun is going to shine.

MR. F. ROWE: What has that got to do with the original amendment? Once again, Sir, a very skilful, legalistic - the honourable member must have been up, or probably he is a genius lawyer, Sir, and it just, you know, insight. This amendment flicked right into his mind -

MR. NEARY: He spent five minutes at it.

MR. F. ROWE: - as soon as he saw our motion, Sir. But, I would like to be able to stand in my place, Sir, and congratulate the Hon. Member for St. John's East. I would love to be able to stand here and congratulate him for bringing in this amendment because I, for one, will support it with a choking voice because, Sir, it is laughable. The Minister of Justice has just confirmed everything that I suspected here. It is laughable, Sir. It is laughable because, and I cannot say this too many times, an amendment that everybody has to agree with, which takes the government off the hook, and I would submit, Sir, that this was the sole motive for this particular amendment, and I, with a quivering, choking voice reluctantly support this amendment, but I in no way congratulate the honourable member for bringing it into this House.

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

MR. NEARY:: Mr. Speaker, a point of order, Sir.

I do not want to draw Your Honour's attention to the fact that there is no quorum in the House because that may seem childish but there is no quorum Your Honour and unless the

government members come back to their seats, Sir - the Select Committee on the Inshore Fishery is not travelling today, the members should be in their seats - unless they are prepared to come back, Sir, I will have to call a quorum.

MR. SPEAKER: I understand that the Hon. Member for Bell Island is not making a quorum call at the present moment. I recognize the member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I have a few words to say, I will not be too long. I was quite surprised that the member for St. Barbe North was so short. He almost caught me off-guard. However, he promised us that -

MR. F. ROWE: I mean things are relevant. If you are too tall do not accuse me of being too short.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I certain could not have voted for the original motion and I am very pleased that my colleague for St. John's East brought in an amendment that the Speaker in his wisdom allowed.

One of the reasons that I could not vote for the unamended motion to set up a select committee is that I believe it is flogging a dead horse, as it were. There is no doubt about it, Mr. Speaker, the government made a mistake when they tried to put out these so-called tenders. They were not tenders, they were calls for proposals and it looked like a rebirth of cost plus. It was not exactly that, but I think the government was in a hurry, it was unwise, it made a mistake and I think it is sorry. So there is no need to harp on it. Why push it in?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CARTER: Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the government lost a great deal of face by this particular effort because they lost their very best, their most highly regarded minister. Now there are some ministers that are taller than the Member for St. John's East, some ministers that are shorter and some that are probably wiser, but there are none that were or are more highly regarded. And therefore I think that the government is very sorry that it was in such a hurry and therefore I think that, I think the words have been said before, we should give them one more chance.

But the real point -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. CARTER: The real point -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CARTER: These points that I have been making are merely by the way because the real point of what I wanted to say is as follows: I am very alarmed at the expansion of government services generally. I do not have any figures to quote but it seems to me that government, civil service, is growing not by arithmetic ratios but by geometric ratios.

In other words I think that the government service could easily double every five years and it does not take much arithmetic or much imagination to see that in a matter of fifteen years the government service could be five or six times as large as it is at present, and in fact five

or six Confederation Buildings would not house it.

Now we heard yesterday of a very spirited defence and a very interesting defence in enlarging the civil service, particularly in the area of intergovernmental affairs and it was suggested that the more civil servants we have in that particular department the more money we will be able to get out of Ottawa.

Now I certainly agree that we should fight our corner. Newfoundland has been sold short and has had the short end of the stick for far too long and I blame the honourable members opposite for a great deal of this. But at the same time we ought to keep our thoughts straight. Ottawa is not some foreign power. It is not some great milch cow. In a very real sense Ottawa is us. We are part and parcel of the Canadian Nation and to the extent that we take advantage of Ottawa, we are taking advantage of ourselves and I think that this point ought to be made and ought to be very carefully made.

We are in a peculiar economic situation, that is to say the Western world is, we are caught up in inflation and recession at the same time, something that the Keynesians did not think could happen and in fact the recession, or the inflation tends to disguise the recession. If, for instance, at the end of a year you find yourself making five per cent more money than you made the year before, you think you are better off, but you are not if inflation is running at the rate of ten per cent a year, you are five per cent worse off. You are better off in terms of the numerical number of dollars you are taking home but you are worse off by the fact that these dollars will not buy as much.

Now we cannot cure inflation here in Newfoundland altogether. All we can do, all we can ever hope to do is do a little bit better than our neighbours. And so the price of efficiency is eternal vigilance. This brings me

back to housing government employees. If we are going to expand the civil service, we ought to be careful to expand it no more than is necessary and we ought to house them in a no more expensive fashion than is necessary. You know, there are all sorts of little things we can do that turn out upon examination not to be so little. There is a public building in Montreal, right in downtown Montreal, that also houses a transmission station or a distribution centre for power, and the transformers there, the heat that they produce is used to heat the building. This seems to be a very imaginative use. I do not know what the savings are, but I would think they are considerable. They are not great in absolute terms, but for every original, imaginative saving like this a country or Province or a municipality is that much better off.

I would be the last one to suggest that we should stop spending money. The government must spend money and it must continue to spend more money. The point is we should try and get as much money, as much value for our money as possible.

Now, Mr. Speaker, although you yourself were not in the Chair when this amendment was allowed, I think it is permissible to speak of the Chair in a collective sense, the Chair being not only the Speaker and Deputy Speaker but also the clerical assistants. I think that the admission of this particular amendment was a very brilliant piece of work. I think it was brilliantly proposed and brilliantly accepted. I do not agree that it gets the government off the hook. The government has as much as said that it regrets the situation that occurred, and I am sure it is not going to happen again. I feel quite confident that future construction will be made at or near Confederation Building grounds. There will be a continued attempt to centralize government services.

We all want to do things in a hurry. But some things cannot be hurried. So, there is not going to be any cost plus. Nor are there going to be any negotiated proposals, no project management, no short cuts, no euphemisms, no nonsense. We voted for a government that would stop all this. I still have confidence that they will do that. So, I say to the government, do not let us down.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEAPY: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to add a few remarks, Sir, to the amendment proposed by the Member for St. John's East. I might say **straightaway**, Sir, that I am inclined to agree with my colleague, the Member for St. Barbe North that this amendment is just motherhood. I will vote in favor of the amendment, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, let us just go back over the history of this matter of the government calling or awarding contracts without calling public tenders. Let us go back to the beginning, Sir, and just trace the course of events right up to the present time and see precisely what happened. Well, Sir, the first indication that we had, that the public had, that the people of this Province had that there was trouble brewing was when the Minister without Portfolio, the Member for St. John's East, jumped overboard, leaped out of the cabinet, bailed out. That was the first indication, Sir, that we had. We had been hearing rumors for several months past, Sir, that there was dissension within the cabinet. We had heard that the Member for Bonavista South, for instance, had threatened to resign at one stage. We had heard that the Minister of Health, the Member for Carbonear, had threatened to resign. We had heard, we had been hearing reports that the Member for St. John's South on two or three occasions threatened to resign from the cabinet.

And we had heard that the Member for St. John's North, the member who just took his seat was going to, not resign from the cabinet, Sir, resign from the party the Member for St. John's South - the Member for St. John's North threatened to resign and cross the House. And finally, Sir -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: - finally the whole thing broke open just like a sore that had been festering for months and months, seething beneath the surface, finally burst open and the Member for St. John's East was the first casualty, was the victim. The member took a stand, I would submit to Your Honour, that was probably admired by a good many people. The former minister, the member may have gotten a little praise from quarters that he would least expect to get praise. I was one of the members of this honourable House, Sir, that thought to myself and expressed it to some of my friends that the honourable Member for St. John's East had done a very courageous and a very honourable thing, He had stood by his principles. He was a man of honour. He was a man of high moral principle. The man had great courage. The man had placed the affairs of this Province before his own personal political ambitions and had resigned from the cabinet.

But then, Sir, lo and behold! the Hon. the Premier came on television and told the whole world, told the people of Newfoundland, told the whole world that the real reason for the Minister without Portfolio resigning from the cabinet was not over the Dobbin affair, the awarding of contracts for this new building over here at Wedgewood Park, this new government building without calling public tenders. That was not the real reason at all. The Hon. the Premier told us that for months previous, and he had discussed it with the Minister without Portfolio, that there was no longer a place for the honourable member in the Premier's cabinet. He was superfluous. He was completely irrelevant. Not needed.

MR. EVANS: What did Joey say?

MR. NEARY: And the Hon. the Premier told the member that in due course he would have to leave, he would have to go. And we were told by the Hon. the Premier with a straight face in living colour on CBC Television

that the minister accepted this in good faith, and that the minister knew the time would very shortly come when he would have to leave. And all was sweetness and light, all was - there was a harmony. There was no dissention in the ranks at all as we had been led to believe by the rumours that we had been hearing for months passed.

And then the Member for St. John's East lashed back at the Premier, decided that he was not going to take this lying down, he had taken his stand and he had shown the people of this Province that he was a man and not a mouse - I wish the Hon. the Premier were in his seat to hear what I am saying - that he was a man and not a mouse, and he was going to fight back so he made a few flicks at the Premier. And then I think the following night we saw the Member for St. John's South, the Member for St. John's North, and the Member for St. John's East appear on CBC Television in living colour to give their version of this whole matter of awarding contracts for public buildings without calling public tenders. And if you ever want to see, Sir, a wishy-washy honourable crowd in your life there they were.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: They were so precise and old-womanishness in their approach to this matter! Remember, Mr. Speaker that a cabinet minister had resigned over this matter he thought it was so serious, and it affected his morals and principles so much that he told us he resigned. And there they were going along - the only thing, I think I said this in the House before - the only thing that I could see the three honourable members had in common was that they were all three wealthy honourable gentlemen, going off on

their own trying to show the people they were asserting a little bit of independence and playing their little cat and mouse game with the people of this Province. And, Mr. Speaker, they stayed. I was expecting them within a matter of twenty-four hours that all three honourable gentlemen would leave the party that had committed this mortal sin and come across the House, not necessarily sit with the -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: No way.

MR. NEARY: - not necessarily sit with the official Opposition although, Sir, I must say that I would welcome all three honourable gentlemen if they were to come across the House and wanted to join our caucus. I would be very happy to welcome all three, Sir. I think they would be a real asset, all three gentlemen, would be a real asset to the Liberal caucus. So, I was expecting, Sir, over this great issue, this burning issue, this issue that had tormented these three gentlemen, had tortured them - they could not sleep a wink - Pardon?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Could not sleep a wink, Sir, they were so tormented and so worried about this. So, naturally, Mr. Speaker, would you not expect these three honourable gentlemen to say to the honourable Leader of that Party, we have reached the parting of the ways. We have threatened, I know there was a number of threats to resign, we have threatened to resign before on a number of issues but this one is the crowning touch. We can no longer stomach it. We cannot take it any longer and we are going to leave your party and we are going to move our seats across the House. It would not be the first time in this honourable House, Sir, that I have seen members go back and forth in my fourteen years in this honourable House, nothing to be ashamed of, not a dishonourable thing to do if you have the courage of your convictions. And I would have suspected, Sir, that on this issue when feelings were running high in Cabinet for days, statements were being made, contradicted by the Premier, contradictions by the Minister without Portfolio who resigned, that you would expect, Mr. Speaker, that these gentlemen would stick by their convictions and that they would leave that Party. But no, Sir!

What have we seen since then? We have seen some of the most blatant political gymnastics, Sir, that I have ever seen in my fourteen years in this House of Assembly. The Member for St. John's East, who gained some credibility when he took his stand has now lost, Sir, whatever credibility he did achieve in that move and now we find him stick-handling and dippy-doodling and trying to endear himself again, once again to the honourable Leader of that Party.

Sir, I would have hoped, I would have hoped, Mr. Speaker, that on this issue, which is a very, very serious and a very important issue, that the Member for St. John's East would have stuck by his convictions and would have shown the people of this Province by his example that at long last a little honesty had been put back into politics in this Province. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, the people of this Province are pessimistic, cynical about politicians. They are fed up with sweet-talk and promises made by politicians and every man, woman and child in this Province looked to the ex-minister, to the Member for St. John's East to show at long last that there was a politician in this Province that was not going to tolerate hanky-panky, that was not going to tolerate anything that appeared to be improper or dishonest, that even had the appearance, Sir, and it may not even be dishonest. It has been nipped in the bud now. But the people were, I believe, for the first time in a long, long time were looking to the honourable member, as I was looking to the honourable member and other members of this House were looking to the honourable member, to do the right thing and disassociate himself completely with an administration -

MR. EVANS: According to that it could be anybody then.

MR. NEARY: - that would go back on their word, that would break their solemn word and their oath to the people of this Province as this administration did in this particular case.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: You sound so sincere.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Sir, I am sincere. I am sincere.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: After all these years.

MR. NEARY: Yes, after all these years, Sir, -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Ah, Mr. Speaker, I have had investigations done on me, Sir, that have taken two years. I am not afraid of an investigation.

MR. EVANS: Another one coming up yet on you.

MR. NEARY: Yes. I am not afraid of it, Sir. I am prepared to lay my integrity and my honesty on the line any time at all in this honourable House with any honourable member of this House.

MR. EVANS: Let us know and we could be prepared.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Ah, Mr. Speaker, I will put my integrity and my honesty up against "Conflict of Interest" any time, any time he wants to challenge it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. EVANS: Refer to him as the honourable minister, will you?

MR. NEARY: That is why, Mr. Speaker, there are only a few of us left, very few of us left, Sir -

MR. EVANS: Thank God.

MR. NEARY: - in this Province. There are a few. I was hoping, Sir, that they would surface during this whole dispute, that they would surface in this issue, and that they would show the people of this Province that there are politicians who are prepared if necessary to take drastic action to keep the government honest, to keep them straight, and to make sure that they keep their promises. But, Sir, it turned out in the final analysis to be a great source of disappointment because judging by the behaviour of the honourable Member for St. John's East since he left the cabinet - I must

say the Member for St. John's North was a little stronger today, a little stronger than his colleague, the Member for St. John's East in this matter. I have a feeling, Sir, that the Member for St. John's North is still smarting under the whole affair, still not satisfied although he says with tongue in cheek, we will give the administration another chance. I wonder, Sir, how sincere it is. Certainly it is inconsistent. That is what we hear from the honourable Member for St. John's East. We will give the administration another chance.

He has either been thrown out of the cabinet or he resigned over this issue and after taking this courageous stand then he turns around and backs down, loses his nerve, and says, we will give the administration another chance. So, Mr. Speaker, we are right back to square one again, right back to square one, Sir. We do not know now and we will probably never know just how much of this sort of thing has gone on in the last three years. I suppose the day will come, Mr. Speaker, when we will find out how many contracts have been awarded, Sir, by this administration without calling public tenders. This was a promise. This was a plank in the platform of the Tory Party when they campaigned in two provincial elections. This was one of the greatest criticisms that they had against the former Liberal Administration, one of the things that I saw my honourable friend crusade for in this honourable House for the last four or five years or however long the honourable member has been here.

MR. CARTER: Would the member permit a question?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Why did you not do something about it then before?

MR. NEARY: Certainly. I am just yielding for a question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I was going to ask the honourable Member for Bell Island when it was that the Liberal Government of which he was a part stopped giving contracts to their friends?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Or handouts.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I think I will choose to ignore that question, Sir. That, Mr. Speaker, as the honourable member knows when he gets up with his Oxford accent is the commonest technique, the McCarthy type technique. They ask a rhetorical question knowing the answer before they ask it. That is the commonest technique.

MR. CARTER: I do not know the answer.

MR. NEARY: Well, -

MR. CARTER: When did you stop?

MR. NEARY: The honourable - Sir, we have not yet had a Roberts administration in this Province and when we see the performance of the Roberts administration, then the honourable member can get up and ask me that question. We, Sir, we agree with the first part of this amendment. My colleague told the House already that we agree with it. It is like motherhood and, Sir, should the people of this Province choose the Roberts administration after the next election, Sir, we will strictly adhere to the first part of this amendment. It has always been a part of my philosophy, Sir, and my ideology, always, -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Ah! Mr. Speaker, that is - when my honourable friend was over trying to build up a fleet of little, yellow bulldozers and graders and water and sewer line equipment, I was in here fighting the battle, sometimes alone. And when the honourable member was out making his millions and getting involved in appearance of conflict of interest, I was here fighting the battle both on the eight floor and on the House.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: No handouts.

MR. NEARY: No handouts, no, Sir, I never received a handout from any government that I have ever been associated with and I never will.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: And I have no equipment, Sir, no yellow bulldozers, no yellow graders, no trucks. I have none. I came into this House, Sir, owning the suit I had on my back and that is probably the way I will get out. No, I did not own it and that is probably the way I will go out of the House but I will be proud, Sir. I will be able to hold my head high that I did not fleece the people of this Province.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: You fleeced the Department of Welfare.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, I did not. Five hundred and sixty of my constituents, Sir, are living in better homes today as a result of that snotty remark from the dumb dumb from Bonavista South.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! The debate was rather interesting up to about thirty seconds ago. The honourable Member for Bonavista South made some comments which were certainly uncalled for and the honourable Member for Bell Island replied in comments which certainly were uncalled for. I suggest that when an honourable member is speaking he does have the right to be heard in silence, and the honourable Member for Bell Island, who has the floor, use parliamentary terms.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Sir. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I have dwelt at some length with the actions and the behaviour, the peculiar behaviour, I must say on occasions of the three loaners, especially the Member for St. John's East. I must say, Sir, in the end it had turned out to be a great disappointment, a big fuss apparently about nothing because the member now is quite - and, you know, Mr. Chairman, I will tell you something else, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you something else, the unkindest cut of all, I suppose, was the seating arrangement that was made following the minister's getting the boot or leaving on his own, we are not sure which, you pay your money and you can take your chance. The seating arrangement, Sir, was I would submit deliberate. That was the unkindest cut of all. That was the last flick given to the minister. I do not know if it is too late, Mr. Speaker, I really do not know if it is too late for the honourable member to stand up and be counted, to stand up and show the people of this Province that this was not a cat and mouse game he was playing. This was not politics. This was not a wishy-washy affair. This was not a Sunday school picnic he was at, that he was very sincere and genuine and not just playing games with the people of this Province. I do not know if it is too late to do that, Sir. I would like to see the honourable member move his seat, not necessarily to come over with us but move his seat across the House, disassociate himself.

MR. MARSHALL: May I ask the honourable member one question?

MR. NEARY: Well, if it is a sensible question. Is it a sensible question?

MR. EVANS: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, we are getting too near six o'clock, Sir.

Mr. Speaker -

MR. MARSHALL: The honourable member -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker -

MR. MARSHALL: The honourable member -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the honourable -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member, Sir, the honourable member, I do not know if I can trust the honourable member to ask me a sensible question. I would like to think that I could.

MR. MARSHALL: Gladly.

MR. NEARY: A sensible question, all right, Sir. I will yield for a sensible question.

MR. MARSHALL: I would like to ask him. If the honourable member thinks my actions are peculiar, would he not think them twice as peculiar if I wanted to cross over to the other side and sit with the honourable members opposite?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, why would I think that -

MR. MARSHALL: Answer the question.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, why -

MR. MARSHALL: Answer the question now. You said you would answer.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, I would think that it would be quite normal and proper and would be in keeping with what the member had lead the people of this Province to believe that the government - that he had disagreed with the leader of the party and the government -

MR. THOMS: The member for Burin did.

MR. NEARY: - and that he wanted to disassociate himself -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

AN HON. MEMBER: Crosbie, Earles, Hickman.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is not uncommon, Sir, it is not, believe me, uncommon for a member when he disagrees violently with his leader and the administration to leave that administration. It is not uncommon, Sir. And it is to be expected of any honourable decent gentleman who has very strong beliefs and convictions. It is the natural thing for him to do, Sir. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, he is just clowning. He is just playing games. Sir, that must be as obvious as the nose on your face.

MR. REID: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, I am not. I am quite sincere, and I am quite genuine, and the Hon. Member for St. John's East knows that.

"Conflict of interest" is too busy, the dollars and cents are clicking over in his brain. But, Sir, this is a very, very serious matter.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would you -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, you would hardly expect - well, it is not worth commenting on, Sir. You would expect better from honourable members. But there are three honourable members, Sir, involved, three honourable members involved who are playing for pretty high stakes. I would say, Sir, that all three gentlemen wish to remain in public life in this Province for some time to come.

MR. CARTER: You are giving me doubts.

MR. NEARY: I am not giving the honourable member - I may be giving him pangs of conscience but not doubts. Sir, I would like to see even at this late stage either one of these honourable gentlemen stand up like a man and have the courage of his convictions and disassociate himself with the administration and with the leader who broke a solemn pledge, who broke the trust that had been placed in them by the people of this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Could the honourable member adjourn the debate?

MR. NEARY: Could we call it six o'clock, Mr. Speaker? I would like to move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been noted that the Hon. Member for Bell Island has adjourned the debate.

It being six of the clock I leave the Chair until three o'clock tomorrow.

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

APRIL 23, 1975

Apr 23/75

Answer to Question No. 37
Asked by the Honourable Member for
Bell Island on Order Paper Dated April 1, 1975

QUESTION:

What is the number of journeys involving public business which he has made since April 1, 1974 to places outside Canada, showing for each journey:

- (a) the names of the countries visited;
- (b) the dates of the journeys;
- (c) the total cost to the Government for hotel accommodation, meals, ground and air transportation, and other expenses;
- (d) whether or not any member of his staff or any other public servant accompanied him for all or a portion of his journey and, if so,
 - (i) what is the name of each such person,
 - (ii) what is the title of the position each such person holds or held,
 - (iii) what was the total cost to the Government for hotel accommodation, meals, ground and air transportation and other expenses for each such person;
- (e) the nature of the public business attended to on the journey?

ANSWER:

No journeys were made during the fiscal year beginning April 1, 1974 by the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations outside of Canada.

ANSWER TO QUESTION NO. 34 ASKED BY
THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR BELL ISLAND
ON ORDER PAPER DATED APRIL 1, 1975

QUESTION

What is the number of industrial accidents reported that have occurred since March 31, 1974 as of a current date?

ANSWER

There were fourteen thousand five hundred and seventy-two (14,572) industrial accidents reported to the Workmen's Compensation Board for the period 31 March, 1974 to April 1, 1975.

Answer to Question No. 38 asked by The
Honourable Member for Bell Island, on Order
Paper dated April 1, 1975.

38 (1)

Name	(a)	(b)	(c)
G.L. Steele, O.C.	1.1.75	Two Years	Chairman
A.F. Caule, O.C.	1.1.75	Two Years	Vice-Chairman
F.W. Russell	1.1.74	Two Years	Member
R. Gosse	1.1.75	Two Years	Member
G. Gillingham	1.1.75	Two Years	Member
M.J. Pinsent	1.1.74	Two Years	Member
J. Walsh	1.1.75	Two Years	Alternate Member
A.H. Crosbie	1.1.75	Two Years	Alternate Member

(2)

(a)

* 25. less than half-day
 50. half-day
 105. normal working day
 140. more than normal
 working day.

(b)

Travel, Meal and accomodation, expenses paid in accordance with Treasury Board Regulations.

(c)

No salaries paid to members.

(3)

(a)

No per diem allowance paid to Chairman.

(b)

Travel, Meal and accomodation, expenses paid in accordance with Treasury Board Regulations.

(c)

\$5,000. per annum

(4)

(a)

No per diem allowance paid to Vice-Chairman.

(b)

Travel, Meal and accomodation, expenses paid in accordance with Treasury Board Regulations.

(c)

\$3,000. Per annum.

(5)

(a)

No other members

(b)

Nil

(c)

Nil

(6)

J.J. O'Neill Q.C.	(a) No per diem	(b)	(c) 3740.10
G. L. Steele Q.C.	No per diem		3494.60
A.F. Caule Q.C.	No per diem		736.51
A.G. Ayre	\$ 770.		No Salary
F.W. Russell	845.		paid to
S.J. Dyer	525.		members.
G. Gillingham	2965.	848.30	"
M.J. Pinsent	2825	1328.02	"
A.H. Crosbie	410.		"
R. Gosse	105.		"
J. Walsh	130.		"

(7)

No staff employed by the Board.

(8)

Twenty-two meetings held.

(9)

J.J. O'Neill	10
G.L. Steele	19
F.W. Russell	16
A.F. Caule	5
R. Gosse	4
G. Gillingham	19
M.J. Pinsent	18
A.H. Crosbie	9
J. Walsh	2
S. Dyer	7
A.G. Ayer	7

(10)

Subhead 05030602

ANSWER TO QUESTION NO. 39 ASKED BY
THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR BELL ISLAND
ON ORDER PAPER DATED APRIL 1, 1975.

	(a)	(b)	(c)
39. (1) Andrew G. Rose	14-11-72	At Pleasure	Chairman
Harold W. Duffett	14-11-72	At Pleasure	Member (Rep. of Management)
Frank Taylor	14-3-75	At Pleasure	Member (Rep. of Labour)

(2) (a)		
More than normal working day		\$140
Normal working day		105
Half day		50
Less than half day		25

(b) Reasonable out of pocket travel, meal and accommodation expenses for members who have to travel outside their home municipality.

(c) No annual salary payable to any member.

(3) (a) More than normal working day	\$200
Normal working day	150
Half day	75
Less than half day	40

(b) Reasonable out of pocket travel, meal and accommodation expenses if required to travel outside of St. John's.

(c) No annual salary payable to Chairman for his performance in this respect.

(4) Not applicable as there is no Vice-Chairman.

(5) Not applicable as there is no person employed in this capacity.

(6)	(a)	(b)	(c)
Andrew G. Rose	1115.00	66.97	Nil
Harold W. Duffett	870.00	21.85	Nil
Chesley Beck	1355.00	869.22	Nil

(7) Not applicable as there are no part-time or full time staff employed in the service of said Body.

(8) From April 1, 1974 to March 31, 1975 the Board held seven meetings and four days of public hearings.

(9) Andrew G. Rose	11
Harold W. Duffett	11
Chesley Beck	10

(10) Subhead 05030601005

ANSWER TO QUESTION NUMBER 23 ASKED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR
 BELL ISLAND DIRECTED TO THE HONOURABLE THE MINISTER OF
 TRANSPORTATION & COMMUNICATIONS APPEARING ON ORDER PAPER OF
 MARCH 13, 1975

Answer:

(1) \$1,608,050.65

(2) NAME	AMOUNT	
Catharine O'Brien	12,000.00	Land
Anthony Murphy	2,250.00	Land
Samuel Walsh	190.00	Land
George Dooley	195.00	Land
Nellie Murphy	55.00	Land
Arrow Development	5,780.00	Land
Canada's Packer's	540.00	Land
Coleman Collingwood Allen	1,200.00	Land
Mrs. Sadie Short	52,700.00	House and Land
Edmond Sparkes	175.00	Land
Frederick Noel	150.00	Land
Mrs. F. Carter	150.00	Land
William Croke	150.00	Land
R.E.W.A.	170.00	Land
Lewis Walsh	165.00	Land
Thomas Horan	2,000.00	Land
George Burling	1,000.00	Land
George Richie	610.00	Land
Edward Morrall	265.00	Land
Mrs. Wm. Stoyles	300.00	Land
Alfred Fleming	130.00	Land
Herbert Noseworthy	130.00	Land
John Chafe	130.00	Land
Dermont Shano	500.00	Land
Cyril & Miss F. Noseworthy	500.00	Land
Alexander Smallwood	530.00	Land
David White	130.00	Land
Mabel Shortall	530.00	Land
Mrs. Ellen Sinnott	625.00	Land
C.C. Cousens	5,200.00	Land
Mrs. Anne Byrne	700.00	Land
Mr. Kirby	100.00	Land
Edmund J. Williams	100.00	Land
Samuel Chafe	120.00	Land
Alice Dyke	50.00	Land
Mary Turner	100.00	Land
Leo Barid	260.00	Land
Edward Turner	350.00	Land
Margaret Lane	120.00	Land
Wm. O'Rilley	200.00	Land

NAME	AMOUNT	
Dulice Guest	120.00	Land
Kenneth Meadus	150.00	Land
Charles McNeil	360.00	Land
Cecil Puddester	1,000.00	Land
John Kent	700.00	Land
John Harding	750.00	Land
George Bowden	900.00	Land
P.F. Collins	5,460.00	Land
McLouglin Enterprises	45,000.00	House and Land
Samuel Healey	70,000.00	Commercial
Robert Grenning	16,000.00	House and Land
Nfld. Armature Works	150,000.00	Commercial
Maxwell Parsons	60,000.00	Commercial
James Kenney	45,000.00	Commercial
(Belmont Club) City of		
St. John's	25,000.00	
F. J. Wadden	80,000.00	Commercial
Ella Andrews	20,000.00	Commercial
Richard Harris	17,000.00	Commercial

NAME	ESTIMATED VALUE	
Nfld. Light & Power	700,000.00	Commercial
Freehold to Newman and Hutchings Estate	50,000.00	

ANSWER TO QUESTION NUMBER 1 ASKED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR BELL ISLAND
TO THE HONOURABLE THE MINISTER OF TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS
APPEARING ON ORDER PAPER OF MARCH 6, 1975

Answer:

- (1) Yes; to McLean Public Relations
- (2) Driver Education
- (3) \$88,931.12
- (4) Requisition No. 49; Order 01638, May 3, 1973

ANSWER TO QUESTION NUMBER 7 ASKED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR
BELL ISLAND DIRECTED TO THE HONOURABLE THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC
WORKS AND SERVICES APPEARING ON ORDER PAPER OF March 10, 1975

Answer:

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	MANUFACTURER AND TYPE	REGISTRATION	OPERATOR	COST
1	Piper Aztec	CF-XOX	Air Transit Ltd.	\$15,000
1	Piper Aztec	CF-	Labrador Airways	30,802
1	DeHavilland Otter	CF-FSU	Labrador Airways	33,300
1	DeHavilland Beaver	CF-BJY	Gander Aviation	23,504

*Mr. Mc Donald
to examine the answers
to these questions in all
cases. It would be
convenient if you
could contact
the
Consent*

APR 23 1975

MR. NEARY (Bell Island) to ask the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

- (1) Are any contracts or agreements or any payments made by the Department of Forestry and Agriculture during the fiscal year ending March 31, 1974, to date, to Cabot Group 4 Limited? NO
- (2) If the answer to (1) above is affirmative, what was the total amount paid to said company for any work done? N/A
- (3) If the answer to (1) above is affirmative what was the total amount paid, or to be paid, to said Company? N/A
- (4) Were public tenders called for this work and, if so, on what basis were contracts awarded for this work? N/A

CONTENTS - 2

Oral Questions (continued)	Page
Reaction sought to the statement that British businessmen are steering clear of Newfoundland. Mr. Neary, Premier Moores.	4990
Information sought on government's steps to determine local effects of a proposed reduction in the number of Canadian National employees. Mr. Neary, Premier Moores.	4991
Query as to ministerial awareness that the St. Bride's Road is impassable and children cannot attend school because of its condition. Mr. Neary, Mr. Rousseau.	4992
Status of the proposed Harbour Arterial Road Agreement. Mr. Neary, Mr. Rousseau.	4993
Action taken to protest an application for air fare increases by Eastern Provincial Airways within the Province. Mr. Neary, Mr. Rousseau.	4994
Query as to what form the Newfoundland Government protest will take against applications for increased air fares. Mr. Neary, Premier Moores.	4998
Query as to whether CFLCo was reimbursed for the use of its jet to transport Premier Moores and his party to Halifax. Mr. Neary, Premier Moores.	5000
Information sought on Newfoundland's membership on the Atlantic Transportation Commission. Mr. Neary, Mr. Rousseau.	5001
Information sought as to why the Newfoundland Government failed to make representation to a federal hearing on beef prices held in St. John's. Mr. Neary, Mr. Dawe.	5002
Query as to the amount of notice given the Province concerning the hearing. Mr. Neary, Mr. Dawe.	5002
Mr. Neary gave notice that he was dissatisfied with the answer and that he wished to debate the issue on the adjournment.	5003
Orders of the Day (Private Members' Day)	
"That a Select Committee be appointed to enquire into and report upon all circumstances surrounding any decision or decisions by the Government to acquire any office or other accommodation by rental, purchase or otherwise since January 1, 1973 etc."	
Mr. Marshall	5003
Mr. Rowe	5013
Mr. Carter	5026
Mr. Neary	5029
Moved adjournment of the debate.	5039
The House adjourned	5040