

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
2:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
THURSDAY, APRIL 20, 1978

The House met at 2:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

000

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, two matters I wish to raise, Sir.

First of all, I am sure that hon. gentlemen would like to be reminded that today is the eighteenth anniversary of the opening of this hon. House, this Chamber that we sit in today. As members know, before this Chamber was opened on this day I think in 1960, and so the new House of Assembly is eighteen years old, before today all the meetings, as hon. gentlemen will remember, were held down in the old Colonial Building. Now there has been some talk of late, Mr. Speaker, of building a new building here near Confederation Building and of putting extensions on Confederation Building and so forth. And at one stage I believe somebody, I believe it was the hon. the Premier, mentioned that even a new House of Assembly may be built.

I do not think that is proper, Sir, to build Houses of Assembly, you know, every ten, fifteen or twenty years. I think this House, if an extension is put on this building or a new building put up, that this House of Assembly should remain as is.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the other matter I wish to raise has to do with another anniversary, the birthday really I suppose, the tenth anniversary of Mr. Trudeau being Prime Minister of Canada. And I would like to make a motion, Sir, if the hon. Government House Leader would support the motion, that this House recognize the tenth anniversary of Mr. Trudeau being Prime Minister of Canada in view of the fact now, Mr. Speaker, that members on the opposite side are talking about reopening Term 29 and negotiating benefits and assistance with the Government of Canada. But it would be a good gesture, on the part of this House, Sir,

MR. NEARY: and I hope that all members will agree, that ten years ago today, Sir, at 11:29 on Saturday morning, Pierre Elliott Trudeau swore an Oath of Allegiance as the new Prime Minister, Chief of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, head of the Country's twenty-ninth ministry since Confederation. And, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a motion. I hope the hon. Government House Leader will second it, that a message of congratulations be dispatched by Your Honour to the Prime Minister of Canada, a message of congratulations to Mr. Trudeau, who is celebrating his tenth year as Prime Minister of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES:

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

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table a report of leases issued under The Mineral Act, 1976, pursuant to section (3) of that act, and there are copies for everybody. This has to do with the mining companies and so on which took out leases and licences and the areas in the Province where these licences were taken out, the size of the area, in hectares, of course, and when they were taken out. So I hereby table this.

NOTICES OF MOTION:

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Regulate The Discounting Of Income Tax Refunds."

ORAL QUESTIONS:

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

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I have got them all whipped into competitive shape, Mr. Speaker. Healthy competition. Where is the Premier, Mr. Speaker? I had a question for the Premier. Would

MR. W.N. ROWE: the House Leader mind telling us if the Premier is going to grace us with his presence today?

AN HON. MEMBER: He will be here during Question Period.

MR. W.N. ROWE: He will be here during Question Period, Mr. Speaker. He cannot do the House the courtesy of being here when it opens.

I have a question, Sir, for the - since I cannot ask the Premier - for the Minister of Public - where is the Minister of Public Works, Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker, it is a very difficult process to ask questions when ministers will not -

MR. NEARY: Well, ask the former Minister of Public Works, He is involved in it.

MR. W.N. ROWE: I cannot ask the former Minister of Public Works, although he is the man who should be answering it. I will have to ask the House Leader, Sir, on the government side, although, Sir, the success ratio on getting any information from the House Leader is very low.

MR. NEARY: Zero.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Zero. Nil.

MR. NEARY: So narrow-minded he would not even congratulate the Prime Minister.

MR. NOLAN: Not unless he puts him on the bench.

MR. NEARY: He will never make the bench that way.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Will the Government House Leader tell the members of the House whether it is still the procedure of the government, particularly in the Department of Public Works, to draw up lists of contractors with whom they will do business and with whom only they will do business?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Government House Leader.

MR. HICKMAN: As far as I know, Mr. Speaker, the Public Tendering Act is followed very assiduously by the Department of Public Works and Services.

Mr. W. Rowe: Will the hon. House Leader on the government side indicate, Sir, whether it is the policy of this government, the continuing policy of this government as it was up until last year, in any event subsequent to the passing of the Public Tenders Act, by the way, for ministers to direct civil servants as to who shall get particular construction jobs and construction work?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, before answering that question -

MR. NEARY: Do not tell us there is an enquiry on, we know all about it.

MR. HICKMAN: Yes. There is a judicial enquiry -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HICKMAN: I will answer that question, but I want at the same time to direct His Honour's attention to the fact that there is a judicial enquiry set up at the request of this House, and matters that are presently before this judicial enquiry, in my opinion, fall within the sub judice rule, and consequently cannot be commented on in this House.

MR. NEARY: Should we not bring it to the attention of the House?

MR. HICKMAN: And, Mr. Speaker, the question that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition asked me is whether or not it is customary, I say it again, for the Minister of Public Works and Services to direct, or the policy at this time to direct a public servants to follow a list. I am instructed that the answer to that question is, it is not.

MR. W. ROWE: A further supplementary, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. W. ROWE: On the point raised by the minister, I presume by some kind of a half-baked point of order, Sir, I am not referring to any public enquiry that is going on. A public enquiry may be going on as to past practices of the government or present practices of the government on a variety of subjects. I do not know. Surely the

MR. W. ROWE: House Leader does not think that all information and all government must cease while a public enquiry on a certain aspect of government is going on? The scandalous practice, Sir, of the Department of Public Works Minister to draw up a list and direct civil servants to deal only with those, I am not talking about what happened in the past. I am talking about what is happening now. And I would like to ask the minister, Sir, if he is prepared as a member of the present government to tell this House as a minister, Sir, that no department of government, including the Department of Public Works, presently has a list of favourite contractors of any kind whom they will deal with to the exclusion of any others? I would like the minister to guarantee to this House, Sir, that should a list does not presently exist.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: The answer to that, Mr. Speaker, is absolutely not.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile, a supplementary.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question, Sir, arising out of the various types of scandal that my hon. friend is referring to, could the Government House Leader tell the House - and if the minister does not have the information, could the minister get the information? - last night there was a political meeting in Grand Falls, and I would like to know if the two gentlemen who attended that political meeting had the use of the government aircraft to fly them out to Gander in time to attend that meeting?

AN. HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. NEARY: The answer is, no? They did not use the government aircraft?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NOLAN: Tell us, 'Jim'.

MR. HICKMAN: The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy can answer that.

MR. PECKFORD: Yes, I can answer that, Mr. Speaker. I took the government aircraft to Gander last night to speak to the Rural Development Council, and was asked by the hon. member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) and the hon. member for Ferryland (Mr. Power) if they could come along, and I said, yes, and they did come on the government aircraft last night with me to Gander.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: As this was a political meeting of the District Association in Grand Falls, Sir, which these two gentlemen attended, would the minister indicate whether or not a bill will be sent to the P.C. Association or these two people will be charged for their trip? And did the minister just cook up this trip so he could take these two gentlemen out to Gander to get to Grand Falls on time for that meeting.

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

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, as it is customary for all members in the House, Sir, there have been times in the past when members of the Opposition -

MR. NEARY: On business, government business.

MR. PECKFORD: No, no! Have -

MR. NEARY: No district business.

MR. PECKFORD: - gone to their districts on the government aircraft

MR. NEARY: Yes. Well give us some -

MR. PECKFORD: - when the aircraft was dispatched by a minister of the Crown. As it so happened yesterday evening I had to get to Gander within a half an hour after the House closed, and had hired the plane or whatever way you want to put it, to go there and these two hon. gentlemen asked if they could go along with me, and I said, yes, in the same way as in other cases in the past, other hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House have been aboard that plane when it has been under the auspices of some minister or the Leader of the Opposition or whatever.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the original questioner.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am well aware of the fact that the government aircraft being used by ministers have offered members lifts when they are going on official business to their districts. For instance, I went once when the Minister of Fisheries, who was going to Port aux Basques to hold one of those public meetings, offered me a lift and I was glad to take advantage of it.

MR. PECKFORD: Not some of your colleagues, they are just going for the weekends.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like for the minister to tell the House now who has been carried on the government aircraft on political business apart from the two gentleman who were taken out to Grand Falls last night under the auspices of the minister using the government aircraft for official business? Who are they? Put it on the table. Tell us who they were.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the hon. gentleman is trying to get at here. It just so happened that I was on government business yesterday evening -

MR. NEARY: Very convenient.

MR. PECKFORD: It was not convenient. There is no such thing as it being convenient. If the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) wants to start making charges like that, I had the government aircraft hired to go to Gander to speak to the Rural Development Council after the House closed at 6:00 P.M. and in so doing, I was asked by two hon. gentlemen if they could accompany me because they wanted to go to Gander.

MR. PECKFORD: I did not know they were going on a political meeting, and there was no convenience to it. I asked over a week ago -

MR. NEARY: It is a scandal!

MR. PECKFORD: - to go to the Rural Development Council on Thursday and because of my speaking in the House yesterday and my estimates today I was not able to go today so I went last night, and I see nothing wrong with that practice.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary, Sir.

MR. WHITE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. the member for LaPoile and then a supplementary, the hon. the member for Lewisporte.

MR. NEARY: In view of the fact, Sir, that the government aircraft and we have example after example of how it is being abused and misused, would the minister responsible for that aircraft table the logs of all the flights and all the people who have been carried on that aircraft from February of last year up to February of this year? Will the minister table that information in the House?

MR. PECKFORD: I am not the minister responsible for air services and if I am not mistaken -

MR. NEARY: Well, I will ask the Government House Leader.

MR. PECKFORD: - the hon. minister concerned is not in the House right now.

MR. NEARY: Will the Government House Leader undertake to get that information for the House?

MR. PECKFORD: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. PECKFORD: I was trying to answer questions just recently, like ten seconds ago, and in the response to the question I was being interrupted by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) who was up on his feet again for another question.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order, Sir. My question was not to the Minister of Mines and Energy, it was to the Government House Leader, the Acting Premier, who holds down two portfolios, number two and number three. Would the minister undertake to get the logs of all the times that that aircraft has gone aloft since February of last year to February of this year, the number of passengers carried, the purpose of their trip and why the trips were being made and the names of the passengers?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I am not sure what the point of order is.

MR. PECKFORD: The point of order is, Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the hon. the member for LaPoile asked a question. It was not directed to any specific minister.

MR. F. ROWE: The minister was saucy about it.

MR. PECKFORD: Because I had been the minister who was answering the questions up to that point in time, I rose to my feet to answer that subsequent question, in the midst of which the hon. the member for LaPoile got up and directed the question to the Government House Leader. That is the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: I think the point is that the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy regarded the first question as directed to him and he, in fact, wished to answer and was not given the opportunity to date to do so. So obviously the hon. gentleman does have the right to answer the question.

MR. NEARY: No, my question is not for the minister, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I think he is speaking of a previous question.

MR. NEARY: A previous question? Well, apparently the hon. gentleman is not going to answer so my question is for the Government House Leader, the Deputy Premier, Minister of Finance and Minister of Justice, and especially Justice. Would the hon. gentleman undertake to get the logs of the number of times that aircraft has gone aloft since February of last year up to February of this year, the number of passengers carried, the number of trips made, the purpose of the trips, the names of the passengers and, as I say, the reason for the use of the aircraft?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: To that question, Mr. Speaker, I would refer it to the minister to whom it relates.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I had indicated I would recognize, on a supplementary, the hon. the member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: I will not have a supplementary on this, Mr. Speaker, because the supplementary I was going to ask was the supplementary asked by the hon. gentleman from LaPoile with respect to the tabling of the logs. My question, Mr. Speaker, is for the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing and it relates to the controversy in St. John's surrounding the parking garage and the fact that most members of City Council are quite upset about it, the contractors involved in the constructions are upset about it and there is general concensus that the City's reputation is going to be seriously damaged unless a commission of inquiry is appointed to look into the costs of the parking

April 20, 1978

Tape 1250

EC - 5

MR. WHITE: garage. And I wonder if the
minister could tell us whether or not he has had representation
from the City with respect to this and whether he is
considering the appointment of such an inquiry?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I received several weeks ago a request from the city of St. John's to ask if government would set up a public enquiry with respect to the parking garage. Subsequent to that I received some further information from one of the counsellors, About a week or so after that I received some more information from one of the counsellors with respect to a report that was done by a Canadian consulting firm with respect to buildings. Now I was prepared to answer the first request by the city and I submitted it to my hon. colleague, the Minister of Justice, who got back to me, and, as I said, subsequent to that I received some further information, I may receive some more tomorrow. I am going to be communicating with the city today indicating to them that there are two ways to go; number one, the public enquiry route which involves expenditures by the provincial government, the provincial government would pay for that public enquiry; or the other route which would be a commission set up under the city of St. John's Act, under, I believe Section 320. I would of course recommend that because in Section 321 of that act the city would pay for the enquiry.

MR. WHITE: A supplementary Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, so the minister is saying to us - I just want him to confirm this - that there will be an enquiry either, a provincial enquiry or a city enquiry into this particular matter. He is telling us there will be an enquiry.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, what I am doing is communicating with the city asking them for further information as to which route they would like to take. I would prefer that they would take the second one that I mentioned to the hon. member. That route would indicate

MR. DINN: that the city of St. John's would pay for the commission and that is what I am going to indicate to the city in a communication today.

MR. WHITE: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, could the minister tell us if the - obviously if the city agrees to set up its own enquiry then there is no need for a provincial enquiry. But can the minister tell us, to clear up this matter, whether or not there will be a provincial enquiry if the city does not opt for the suggestion that he is going to make to them?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. DINN: I will be communicating with the city today and when that is done the city will get back to me, Mr. Speaker, and under Section 320 they will indicate that they want a commission of enquiry, at which point I will go to government and ask them for permission for the city to hold that commission of enquiry.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Stephenville followed by the member for Conception Bay South.

MR. McNEIL: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Industrial Development. Several weeks ago the minister indicated that a one-man grievance committee would be set up to re-examine the severance pay for Linerboard workers. Could the minister indicate when this committee will be set up and who will chair the committee?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister of Industrial Development.

DR. FARRELL: That matter would probably have been settled a couple of weeks ago. There were some complications. It is under review right now and I expect to have a final decision on it in the next couple of days.

MR. SPEAKER: I have indicated I will recognize the hon. member for Conception Bay South next.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of

MR. NOLAN: Municipal Affairs and Housing. In view of the fact that the Minister of Health indicated yesterday, as he did the day before, that ministers of the Crown did not interfere with the operations of Crown corporations, how does he account for the account in this morning's Daily News that Mr. O'Leary, Chairman of the St. John's Housing Corporation, could not go to a meeting or hold a meeting or call a meeting without permission of the minister? This is stated on the front page of today's Daily News. True or false?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, there are many things in the Daily News some of which are true and some of which are untrue. In that same article headlined "The Government Stops Housing Developments" -

MR. NOLAN: Correct.

MR. DINN: - untrue.

MR. NOLAN: That is not what you said on CBC yesterday morning.

MR. DINN: Government stops no housing developments. With respect to the Cowan Heights development what we have here is a situation whereby, and I am a member of the Board of Directors of the St. John's Housing Corporation, and what we have here is a situation whereby we have a pre-feasibility study on a twenty-six million dollar proposal to develop Cowan Heights. That pre-feasibility study in my opinion does not give us enough information to go forward with that development, so we are waiting for the final feasibility study which will indicate whether this

MR. DINN: development is good or is bad or is financially feasible. When we get that study a decision will be made. As far as directing the Chairman of the Housing Corporation not to hold a meeting, certainly I have not done that. I would expect that the Chairman of the Housing Corporation would not want to hold a meeting simply because he does not have that final report. When that final report is in, which is due, I understand, the end of this month, then a decision of the board will be made. And that is the way it is done.

MR. NOLAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NOLAN: I wonder if I could get back, Again I appreciate the information given by the minister, but from the front page of this morning's Daily News, and I am sure the minister is familiar with the article, "A city official," it says, "did get in touch with Mr. O'Leary by phone Wednesday afternoon and was told no meeting could take place unless it was approved by the minister." Now what I am asking, Mr. Speaker, is, is this the fact? Do all meetings of the board have to be approved by the minister? Has Mr. O'Leary deceived the reporter? Is the reporter inaccurate? I mean, these are the facts we have to have.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the facts, there was no direction given to the Chairman of the St. John's Housing Corporation with respect to not holding a meeting with the city. But the Chairman of the Housing Corporation, wisely I would think, would not hold a meeting with the St. John's Housing Corporation, simply because he cannot discuss the Cowan Hights development as he does not have a final report which would indicate the feasibility or otherwise of the development. So he is saying that he would not like to do that without going to the minister. That seems to me to be a very congenial, a very good atmosphere between the minister and the Chairman of the St. John's Housing Corporation.

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

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, now that the Premier has graced us with his august presence, I would like to revert back to a line of questioning which was abandoned earlier because we could not get any answers from the ministers who were then present.

In the Premier's absence it came out, the scandalous information came out that two members of the House on the government side used the government aircraft for political purposes, flying from here to Grand Falls.

AN HON. MEMBER: Gander.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Gander? Well, yes. From here to Gander to take part in a political event in Grand Falls. Now I would like to direct to the Premier a question which my colleague asked of the House Leader, namely, is the Premier prepared to have tabled in this House the logs of the aircraft, Mr. Speaker, and the helicopters containing of course the purpose of the visit, who was on board the aircraft at the time, and all pertinent information regarding the use of these public aircraft in the last, say, twelve month period, dating back from today's date? Is the Premier prepared to do that?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that any time members of the government, or members of the Opposition, or members of any of these august groups, for want of a better expression, travel in this Province, they are both being political and on business.

MR. NEARY: No.

PREMIER MOORES: If it is possible for the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) to travel on the government aircraft and be non-political, Sir, I would suggest we keep him on the government aircraft all the time.

MR. NEARY: Do not try to brush it off now and be smart.

PREMIER MOORES: I am not brushing it off on anybody.

MR. NEARY: It is a scandal. It is another -

PREMIER MOORES: The introductory remarks to the question itself, I would suggest that there are very few members on the opposite side who have not been on aircraft of one form or another.

MR. MORGAN: On over the weekend.

PREMIER MOORES: Certainly we have made it available on a number of occasions just for the member for the Straits of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) when he was Opposition Leader. I assume it was political business because I cannot think of why the Leader of the Opposition would be going to his district if it was not political reasons. If a minister is going somewhere to speak at an engagement which he has been asked to speak at, and if any member of this House wants to travel on that aircraft during that particular time, they are welcome to do it -

MR. NEARY: Wrong.

PREMIER MOORES: - as are other people, and that happens to be the case, Sir.

MR. W.N. ROWE: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W.N. ROWE: The Premier, Sir, has not answered the question. I asked if he would table the logs and if there is nothing to hide then certainly he would agree to do so. And not having agreed to do so there must be something to hide. That is the only deduction, the only conclusion anybody can come to on this matter.

Now, Sir, I would like to ask the Premier this: Since apparently members of the government, backbenchers on the government side of the House, are permitted by the Premier's own words to use the government aircraft for political purposes to accompany ministers who may be going somewhere on business, to get a lift from here to some part of the Province to attend political functions, will the Premier mention whether he is prepared to notify all members of the House, on both sides of the House,

Mr. W. Rowe: on such times that aircraft are going to be leaving St. John's to go to different parts of the Province, so everybody can get in on this bonanza, this political bonanza, not only that side of the House, Sir, but this side of the House as well.

MR. MORGAN: We are doing that now.

MR. NEARY: They are not doing it. They are not doing it, do not be funny for political purposes. Do not be so foolish!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, without all of this excitement of taking trips the fact is, Sir, that obviously there cannot be an advanced schedule of the aircraft, but I will say here and now any member of this House, on the Opposition side or any other side, if the aircraft is going to a location, whether it be for an ambulance case, whether it be taking a minister to a certain location, whether it be taking anyone else to a location, if any of the members on the other side of the House want to contact, or this side, Air Services to see if a plane is going in that direction at that time they are welcome to use it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W. ROWE: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary, the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. ROWE: The Premier will not answer the question as to whether he will table the logs. I assume he will not table the logs generally, for the last twelve month period. Will the Premier then indicate whether he will table the logs regarding aircraft, which I saw him, and many of his colleagues using during the Twillingate by-election, the last part of the month of November or early December, aircraft flying, helicopters flying back and forth between St. John's or Gander and Twillingate district on a continuous basis, Sir. Now perhaps they were paid for by the P.C. Party. Perhaps they were paid for by the government. I do not know. And many people in that area think, and probably rightly so, that public money was used to transport ministers left, right and centre, back and forth, during

MR. W. ROWE: that very hectic political process.

Now will the Premier table the log for the aircraft? If he will not do it for a twelve month period, will he do it for the months of November and December of last year so that we can clear the air, to see in fact whether aircraft were used for purely political purposes or not?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: The only thing I can say, Sir, is that any aircraft that is being used by us for election purposes has been paid for by the party, to the best of my knowledge, as I assume the Leader of the Opposition's expenses in Twillingate were paid for by his party. I do not imagine it came out of the Opposition Office vote.

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

PREMIER MOORES: I assume it did not. I would certainly hope it did not, Sir.

MR. NEARY: Do not be so low!

PREMIER MOORES: I mean, but we really do not know.

MR. NEARY: Do not be so low!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER MOORES: May he wants to table how the Opposition vote is spent.

MR. NEARY: Do not be so foolish!

PREMIER MOORES: If he tables the Opposition vote to show that it is not there, I am sure he will feel better about it. But the fact is, Sir, that anything that is used for political purposes is paid for by political parties.

MR. W. ROWE: One final supplementary, Sir.

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

MR. W. ROWE: The Premier has tried to strike a bargain, Sir, and the bargain, I think, is a fair one. I will table the audited statements of the Opposition Office, going back from the time the Opposition Office

Mr. W. Rowe: started, on the table of this House, if he will agree - I will do it anyway for that matter - in order to draw something out of the government, something which is very difficult to get, by way of information, if he will agree to table the logs of the aircraft for the last twelve months, and the purposes for which they were used, and the passengers who were on aboard the aircraft. I will do that, Sir, with a heart and a half.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, unlike the Leader of the Opposition I am prepared to take his word for it, and I suggest he takes mine.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W. ROWE: What a joke!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile, followed by the hon. members for Trinity-Bay de Verde, Terra Nova, and Bellevue.

MR. NEARY: Obviously, Sir, there was taxpayers money involved in paying the salaries of these people who flew the aircraft, the attendants and so forth. My question to the Premier now is, maybe it is not directly connected with this, but in connection with salaries generally, would the Premier indicate if the government now favours paying straight across the board increases in salaries rather than percentage increases? Because that has the tendency to make the gap wider, the rich getting richer, and the poor getting poorer.

PREMIER MOORES: What did you say?

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

PREMIER MOORES: What is the question?

MR. NEARY: Would the Premier indicate - in connection with salaries, and there are salaries involved in this thing we are talking about; paying the captains, and the aircraft and so on. What I want to find out, it may be indirectly involved - would the Premier indicate on behalf of the government whether for the next few

Mr. Neary: years they would favour paying straight across the board increases rather than percentage increases? Because the rich are getting richer and the poor are getting poorer. If you give a 10 per cent increase to Bob Cole, for instance, he will get ^{49,750}~~47,500~~ increase a year; if you give it to a man making \$10,000 a 10 per cent increase, he only gets \$1,000 a year. What I am asking is, does the Premier favour straight across the board increases as opposed to percentage increases ?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that as a matter of negotiation between the various vested interests and the people they negotiate with. The collective bargaining system is there for that. What the hon. member says in a theoretical sense I suppose is accurate. But then again, Sir, I would suggest that there will always be wage differences but in the context that he mentions it I do not think it is something that you can answer in Question Period. I think it is worthy of a debate. I think sometime it should be discussed -

MR. NEARY: Well I am going to put it on the Late Show, so do not worry about it.

PREMIER MOORES: - when we talk about the sort of society we want to live in and we want to talk about the values that people receive, I mean, once again you could take the same thing and say I suppose that the various classes which are designated as classes in various sectors of the Civil Service or in other modes of vocation, the fact is that theoretically they should all be the same. But, Sir, that does not mean to say that all people put in the same amount of work. It does not mean that all people deserve the same amount of pay as the hon. member for LaPoile, Sir, should be well aware.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde I have indicated.

MR. F.W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Premier, Sir, in connection with the Action Group and the chairman of the Action Group who, Sir, is a very fine gentleman I might add. Sir, could the Premier indicate to the House what the length of the term of office is for the chairman of the Action Group and if it is in fact determined at this point in the game?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: I would hope, Mr. Speaker, it is indefinite. The situation is as far as the Action Group is concerned we see it on this side of the House as being something that is there for a long time and

PREMIER MOORES: I hope it is. Because while this thing can be attacked as much as people want to attack it, the fact is, Sir, that anything that will curtail or cut down on red tape in getting through to government bureaucracy, and there is lots of it, the fact is, Sir, that that group has had 6,000 phone calls up until the end of -

AN HON. MEMBER: I made 3,000.

PREMIER MOORES: You made 3,000 of them?

MR. F. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, that was not the question I asked.

PREMIER MOORES: I can understand, Sir, with a certain ability to speak and with a mouth that is totally active why he could possibly do that. But the fact is, Sir, that there were 6,000 phone calls which were followed up. There are 2,572 active files. The Fisheries Loan Board, Sir, have up until the end of March had 400 applications this year as opposed to 140 last year. The Rural Development loans and applications have doubled and that can be traced to the Action Group.

MR. F.W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, he is abusing the Question Period. I asked a simple question and the Premier is abusing the Question Period.

PREMIER MOORES: The fact is, Sir, that eighty-five per cent of the people that phoned that group have never approached government before because they did not know how to go about it. So, Sir, when it comes back to the specific question of the length of term of contract for the director of that group I would hope, Sir, it is for a substantial time.

MR. F.W. ROWE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. F.W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, has there been any contractual agreement entered into between the government and the chairman of the Action Group, whichever capacity he may hold, with respect to employment? In case, Sir, I run out of time here, could the Premier also indicate were there any pension benefits or health benefits or insurance benefits associated with that particular contractual agreement if one exists, and will the

MR. F.W. ROWE: Premier be prepared to table such contracts?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there is a contract and I will certainly get the information for the hon. gentleman and make it available in this House by all means. I know the issues he particularly refers to are the same as any other deputy minister in that pension rights have been transferred from his previous employment to his present employment under the present terms that the other deputy ministers have. The terms, Sir, are under the same heading as deputy minister's status will allow for any other person. The details of the contract I will only too gladly make available to the House as we have done with any other person in that same position, Sir.

MR. F.W. ROWE: One final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The thirty minutes have expired.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

On motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! 1901-01

The hon. member for Port de Grave.

MR. E. DAWE: Mr. Chairman, to continue with my remarks that I did not conclude last Thursday, I wish to take the short time I have left to bring to the minister some of the needs of the district. This department is the most important department of government that my district will have to deal with because eighty per cent of the population is under some form of local government. I just want to go over some of the requests that are in to the department now so that the minister could be reminded of some of the needs that we are anticipating this year. I will refer again to the minister the need for, particularly, water and sewerage in the Riverhead part of Brigus. A design has been underway and hopefully this will be completed shortly and naturally then the request will be made to the department. At Bay Roberts itself, as I said the last evening, \$2,100,000 is required for the extension of the water and sewerage at Coley's Point and there is a further need of shared cost paving, sixty-forty, for the town of Bay Roberts for a total of \$343,000.

As I pointed out to the hon. minister, last year we received in grants and in subsidies a total of \$747,000 and this was mostly towards the water and sewerage in Bay Roberts, and then we received further capital works projects of \$1,285,000, mostly for Bay Roberts and Brigus. But I would say to the minister that another division of his department that I think needs more money that has been allocated and that is the Water Services Division. At present I have requests in to your department, Sir, a total of six or seven artisan wells. We have committees formed. They have been formed at Makinsons, Port de Grave, Brigus and just outside Brigus, Brigus Goulds and I have met with them during this last few months and I have made them fully aware that if possible a new policy may come out from the

MR. E. DAWE: department this year and it is my understanding this will be on a seventy-five/twenty-five basis. We estimate the cost of these projects between \$60,000 to \$90,000. I can assure the hon. minister if these are approved that these committees are quite prepared to raise their twenty-five per cent. I am hopeful that at least this amount of money could be found this summer for these programmes.

I would like to also refer to another vote within the minister's department and I feel that it is a vote that is not very well known by the members of this House. I happen to become aware of it this last two months because I have had two of my constituents taking part in this programme and I refer to the Rural Remote Housing Programme. I think this will be one of the most popular programmes of this department of government and none of the other members realize what this would mean. It means that in any community in Newfoundland today where there is a population of less than 5,000 there is a programme where the Federal and Provincial Governments share in the cost of a person's mortgage.

MR. DINN: That is to say, if a person is working and twenty-five per cent of his income is not sufficient to pay this mortgage, the federal government through this Rural Remote Housing Programme will take over the balance. There is also provision made through the Department of Social Services whereby people who are on long-term assistance, instead of the department purchasing houses for them they can go to Newfoundland and Labrador Housing and take out a regular mortgage, and when this mortgage is taken out, seventy-five per cent of the mortgage will come from the federal authorities or from the federal government and twenty-five from the provincial. In this way a person who is on long-term assistance instead of renting or buying a second-hand or used house can move into a new house and over a period of twenty or twenty-five years it will be paid by both the federal and the provincial governments. This mortgage, the amount of mortgage involved is up to \$28,000. The most the persons concerned would be involved with would be the providing of suitable land. As we all know, especially in the rural areas this is no problem because there is usually enough land in some part of their family to suffice. I think, Mr. Speaker, that this programme should receive more publicity than it is receiving. It is my understanding that there are only two or three offices in the Social Services division who are taking part in this programme and I am glad to know that one of them is at Bay Roberts. I think that if this was made better known we would be flooded with requests.

I would like to refer briefly to a plebiscite that, as you know, was circulated at Shearstown. Could we have order please, Mr. Speaker? I would like to refer briefly to a plebiscite that was circulated at Shearstown whereby eighty per cent of the population there voted to form some form of council on their own. Now my position would be this, I think that the government or the department should use

MR. DINN: its influence with the town council at Bay Roberts and have them extend their boundaries to include that part of Shearstown which is not within the boundaries and Butlerville. Then naturally once this is done they will be looking for the extension of the present water and sewerage system to provide them with the necessary water and sewerage services. It is suggested that where we have within the municipality of Bay Roberts four distinct communities, that possibly some consideration should be given to the setting up of a ward system - that is to say that at Shearstown and at Bay Roberts and at Coley's Point and at Country Road - and in that way we would be guaranteed some representation on the council. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that if this were done it would relieve what, I suppose you could say is a bit of annoyance to the people of Shearstown. They feel that they have been neglected by the council at Bay Roberts, but I think if this were done this would relieve the problem and it would be the best thing and the best course to take.

Shearstown itself, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, is not sufficient to go and absorb and be a council on their own, I think it would be disastrous, they have not got the taxing power and they would not have the income. I would like to refer again, Mr. Speaker, as you know and as people are aware, there is a drive over at Bay Roberts and down in that part of Conception Bay to have a stadium erected and from my understanding it is going to meet with wide support. This will be supported

MR. DAWE:

not only by the council at Bay Roberts but by the council at Spaniard's Bay, which is in the district of Harbour Grace. It will be supported by the council at North River, supported by the council at Clarke's Beach, the council at South River and the council at Cupids and the council at Brigus. It is my understanding, Sir, in your department once they collect the sum of \$200,000 there is a grant from your department of \$200,000. And I would not be surprised, Sir, that they would raise their \$200,000 this present year. So they will naturally be looking to your department for the \$200,000 and then the further commitment from the Department of Recreation and Rehabilitation for the balance of the \$300,000.

So, these are the ongoing needs of the district at present. And I would like again to remind the minister that with regards to this Rural Remote Housing Programme that more publicity should be given to it. You would be surprised, Sir, if more publicity was given to this I am sure that the demand that you would have in your department, you would be surprised by. Because I was in that department when we instigated a shell housing programme and that was very, very popular at that time. And I am convinced this would be a similar programme once it is made known.

So, those are my main remarks. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to delay the House, but I would say that within the town of Bay Roberts today they are doing a business assessment property tax. I think it is the right step to be taking because that tax rate is very low at Bay Roberts and that this should be encouraged to include all the properties at Bay Roberts. And I would give my support to this if the council in Bay Roberts could

MR. DAWE:

be encouraged to do a regular property assessment. This is the only way I feel the town is going to progress. Their revenue is too small and this would add greatly to the town's income.

I would like to thank, Mr. Chairman, before I sit down, I would like to go on the record to pay a tribute to the councillors in all these communities. They have been serving, some of them, ten and twelve years and longer. They serve, as you know, without any remuneration in any way. And I think that the time is soon ripe to give some consideration to at least recognizing the services these people give. I do not know if it would come out of the general revenue of each community or a special grant or a special vote from the department. It would be generalized throughout the Province. But I think, Sir, the time is coming when at least some consideration should be given to, say, at least some form of thank you for the men for their services they have given. They are the backbone of Newfoundland as far as public services are concerned today. They are involved in every single, everyday problem in the community you can mention. I would like again to remind the House that - they probably do not realize this - when the Federation of Mayor and Municipalities meet they represent some 450,000 people in this Province, more than 30 per cent. Now no other group only the members of this House represent a larger group in the Province. And I happened to be president of that association for two years and I had some idea of the work that is involved.

I do say to the ministry that this should be made known as well, the contribution that these people are

April 20, 1978

Tape 1257

IB-3

MR. DAWE:

making and will continue to make in the years ahead, service
freely given. In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would like
to publicly

MR. E. DAWE:

to go on record to thank your Deputy Minister, Mr. Withers, and your Director of Local Government, Mr. Corbett, for the most courteous reception they have given me and the delegations I have met with them this year. I have known them down through the years, and other members of your department, Mr. Browne and other people within the planning and the engineering divisions, but these two men in particular, I think, most of the councils had most contact with next to the minister and I would like to go record and use this occasion to publicly thank these two gentlemen for this co-operation they have given me and the members in my district. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, Hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN (MR. YOUNG):

The hon. member for St. John's South.

DR. J. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for an opportunity to say a few words in this Committee on this heading. I certainly agree with a remark that was already made in Committee that this is a most important department, most sensitive department. Probably it has more affect on the people of this Province individually than in any other department except, perhaps, the Department of Finance. And this certainly applies to the urban areas. Hon. members will know that I represent one of the urban areas of the Province essentially, although not totally urban. There is a small rural part in my constituency but mainly an urban area. And whereas the rural areas certainly have their impacts and requirements from this department in things like water and sewer and so on and so forth, the urban areas also have tremendous needs that come under the responsibility of this department.

I would just like to make a few remarks first in regard to the NIP and RRAP programs. There may be a little confusion in this area. I think the remark was made in Committee that these programs were not working very well, that funds that are available under these programs, these federal programs are not being well utilized in the Province. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is certainly not my experience. My experience is that these are excellent programs and they are being excellently used when the right technique is employed,

DR. J. COLLINS: and it might be just worthwhile very briefly just to look at the technique. The first essential step is the designation of an area as being eligible for NIP and RRAP programs. Now the designation is a responsibility of the federal government, federal authorities, essentially through CMHC. Funds are not available unless the designation is made and, as I say, this is purely a federal responsibility. Now the next step after the designation is that there should be a response from the local citizenry. That is the absolutely essential next step. Nothing can happen unless there is a local response, because this program is set up in such a way that it is not put into effect, it is not forced on a community by either federal, provincial, or municipal authorities; the response has to come from the local citizens. I would suggest that if NIP funds that are being made available in this Province are not being used, it may well be that the local response is not there. If the designation is there, a federal move, and a local response is made, the programs can be implemented. And I would suggest that this is an area where the MHA in association with the local municipality has a very big part to play. I know in my constituency I am very happy and proud to have said that we did get a very satisfactory, large NIP program for our area of the City of St. John's, where there was tremendous need for such a program, by arranging that the citizen group be gotten together to make that next essential step.

Now when that step is made the request is forward both

DR. J. COLLINS: to federal authorities and provincial authorities and their agreement must be obtained. Now that agreements is related to guidelines set down by the federal authorities, and the guidelines essentially concern the type of neighbourhood. NIP and RRAP programs are not available for every source of neighbourhood. There have to be certain characteristics of the neighbourhood before they can get in on these funds. But if those characteristics are there, the agreement of federal and provincial authorities is almost automatic. There is a certain amount of time involved but there is really no hold up. So again I do not see where there can have been underutilization of NIP and RRAP funds if the right moves were made. There could not any particular hold up on the provincial government's part because, firstly, they do not do the designation and, secondly, their agreement is almost automatic if the guidelines set down by the federal authorities are adhered to when the citizen group request that the program be brought into effect. So I will just mention that, Mr. Chairman, in case there is confusion over this matter, and from the remarks made I suggest, Sir, there probably has been confusion.

I would like to now just move on very briefly to regional government. This is another matter which is of great concern to my constituents because, as hon. member will know, regional government is a very live issue in the whole area around St. John's and in the area of the Northeast Avalon part of the Province. The regional government that will be brought in here probably will be the model for the rest of the Province. We will have an opportunity, I hope, in this session to discuss this in detail when a bill is brought in. So I will not go into it in any great detail now. I will just make a few points. The first point is that there may have been some impression that this is not an area that the MHA for the city area are interested in. Nothing could not be further from the truth. The city MHA, certainly on this side of the House, have been most actively engaged in considering the legislation or the possible legislation that will come forward. I think the media may have erred

DR. J. COLLINS: somewhat in thinking that most the activity in this year has been on the part of the city of St. John's Municipal Council. Well I do not know if the Municipal Council really have put as much into it as they might have, that is for them to judge, but I certainly know that the legislation that may come before this House has engaged the attention of the city MHA from this side of the House over many months, meetings have been scheduled on a regular basis and every possible aspect of the legislation, looking first to the bill that was initially introduced last year and later withdrawn, looking to that first and expanding upon it that this whole matter has engaged our attention over the last twelve months. And I think that any legislation that will be brought in will benefit greatly from the work that the city MHA have put into it. I might say that we have also met with the Municipal Council over this and I think that it is clear that some of the misgivings of city council really were matters of misunderstanding, in particular the question of dual taxation and dual authority. This I think was quite clearly a matter of misunderstanding and I believe that when the new act comes in, this is our hope, it will be spelled out in no uncertain terms that there will not be double taxation or double authority in this whole matter. The city was also concerned that any municipal work who would go from their authority under the regional government would be adequately protected, and this I am sure will be taken care of in the act. Another matter that I think that will concern all members will be how those in charge of the regional government will achieve their place, whether they will be appointed whether they will be elected or how they will get into a position of authority and responsibility, and this is a matter that will be much discussed when the bill comes forward. In my own case I would certainly hope that these will be, in the not to distant

DR. COLLINS: future, elected officials. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to mention one problem to which I certainly do not have the solution, but I put it forward for the consideration of hon. members and perhaps for the hon. minister and officials in his department. One of the problems that most often comes to my attention, and I suggest that this may apply to most MHA's in urban areas, is the matter of housing for those people who are unemployed. Now there are programmes available, through CMHC and the AHOP programme, for instance, available to people who would have difficulty in financing houses, obtaining mortgages and so on, if they are employed. But these programmes are helpful in that regard. But if someone is unemployed these programmes are not available to him and I would hope that at some point in time, sometime, some programme, I know this is going to be a very difficult thing to do, but I would hope that some programme can be found to help these people. They now of course can get assisted rental and so on and so forth but I would suggest that if some programme could be evolved that would allow the unemployed, and particularly the young unemployed and the unemployed who can look forward in the not too distant future to gainful employment, if some programme can be found to allow these people to get into home ownership and not just merely get into assisted rental accommodation, this would be a tremendous step forward. It would give these people I think tremendous incentive. I think it would certainly increase the quality of the housing that is available to them because with the best will in the world the amount of rental housing that is available to the unemployed through the assisted programmes is quite often of a somewhat low type and low quality. If they could be under some sort of programme - and as I mentioned before I am not certain what that programme should be because one certainly does not want to get into a programme that would be abused, have a totally giveaway type of atmosphere to it. That is not what anyone wants as it would only be self-defeating - But if some programme can

DR. COLLINS: be found whereby these young people - who are having problems because of economic circumstances of achieving gainful employment, at this stage they often have young children and they are now living unfortunately in types of accommodation, rented accommodation which is most undesirable from many points of view, including the health point of view - if some programme can be devised for these people I think it would be a tremendous step forward.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Fogo. Before you do the six hours will expire at 3:30 P.M.

CAPTAIN WINSOR: Mr. Chairman, now that the time is getting very short I do not think it would be fair for me to take the full twenty minutes and not permit the minister time to answer some of the questions which have been raised. So I will try to be specific and ask the minister three or four specific questions relating to Fogo district. The minister must realize by now one of the most serious problems we have, and it applies to Fogo district as it does to a great many districts in the province, and that is the source of a good drinking water supply. The question I would pose to the minister, has the number of committee members been increased from five to fifteen in each community? Is there any intention of the minister to levy a charge to the householder? I have heard rumours that there may be a charge from \$120.00 to \$150.00 per household in order to get a source of water brought to their homes or even through artisan wells. That is the question, Mr. Chairman.

The other question I would like for the minister to comment on is that one of the completion of the water system at Musgrave Harbour. The minister is fully aware that five years ago an attempt was made and half of the community of Musgrave Harbour had the installation of water and sewer, and now we have a situation

CAPT. WINSOR:

there were one half of the town enjoy the facilities of water and sewer and the other half do not. Now that is like, you know, one half of the town is living in the 20th century and the other is living way back in the 19th and 18th and 17th century, etc. etc. So, could the minister perhaps-if he does not want to make it known now I would appreciate discussing the matter further with him in private.

Then there is the matter of grants to the councils. As the minister is aware, of course, Highways have paved many roads through the communities and of course with the paving of the roads I understand that the responsibility of snow clearing and maintenance now lies within the jurisdiction of the municipality. If that is so, will the grants to municipalities be increased in order that those communities can purchase equipment and provide the snow clearing, etc. that is required of them once the road is paved through that community?

Of course, Mr. Chairman, there is the situation we have on Fogo Island. We have ten communities on Fogo Island and it might be worthy of note, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. W. Carter) took time out yesterday in his speech at the Rotary Club to pinpoint the Island of Fogo which he said, and which I know, has become a very prosperous, industrial and self-supporting community, yet there is not one single water supply on the Island. So those are questions, Mr. Chairman, I think perhaps the minister might care to comment on. And I would appreciate that rather than taking the whole twenty minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: I just merely want to put a question or two to the minister, I do not want to hold up the House. I

MR. NEARY:

want to find out, in connection with the regional water supply, I understand that there are already eleven employees in the Department of Municipal Affairs looking after the regional water supply. Now that is going to be turned over to the Metropolitan Board very shortly. Will these eleven employees who are part of NAPE, who are, you know, covered under the NAPE agreement, will they go over to the Metropolitan Board with all the fringe benefits and so forth?

And the other part of that question then, is that fair, you know, to ask the Metropolitan Board to take over the regional water supply and to take over employees that have been appointed by the minister's department? I would like to get the minister's answer to that. And the other question has to do with Port aux Basques, with the stadium. As the hon. gentleman knows, for the last six years the town council out in Channel-Port aux Basques has been trying to get the minister to live up to an oral commitment that was made by the former administration, by Premier Smallwood when he was Premier of this Province, a commitment that was made to every other stadium in the Province. We see now Mount Pearl getting their stadium benefits. The one over on Bell Island was assisted to the tune of \$500,000 that went mostly out to P.C. Party supporters on the Island for renovating that stadium over there, and I will deal with that at a later date. And that one too, by the way, was the subject, I believe, of an RCMP enquiry recently. I do not know if it is still ongoing or not but it was certainly asked for by the town council.

But in Port aux Basques there was an obligation there, a commitment, and the commitment, by the way, was recognized by Mr. Harold Rowe when he was Deputy Minister of

MR. NEARY:

that department, who on more than one occasion gave the town council of Cannel-Port aux Basques a special grant in order for the government to pick up their share of the commitment. The government has reneged on that. The town council have been in - I beg your pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: No way.

MR. NEARY: The government reneged, Sir. The town council have been in on a number of occasions to try to get the matter straightened out. The government withheld their per capita tax, the revenue grant, have withheld it to pay off the loan, a commitment that was made by the Province and they have been subject to all kinds of hardship and arbitrary decisions on the part of the minister

MR. NEARY:

and the government. Mr. Chairman, I am going to make this statement here and now that if the town council in Channel - Port aux Basques can hold out for one more year or a year and a half, whatever time the election is called, that commitment that was made will be honoured. Now the minister undertook recently to rearrange the financing, and this is the question I want to put to the minister, to rearrange the financing to make it easier for the town of Channel - Port aux Basques to meet their obligation or what the minister thinks is their obligation to the government. Now apparently that has fallen through. Now could the minister tell me and tell the House if any arrangements at all can be made to soften the blow, to ease the hardship that has been created as a result of the government reneging on this oral commitment that was made by the former administration and by Premier Smallwood when he was head of the administration of this province?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Port au Port. I think the hon. members realize that there are only about twelve minutes left, but the hon. member for Port au Port is recognized.

MR. J. HODDER: I just want to make a few brief comments, Mr. Chairman. There are many ministers who have visited the district of Port au Port since I have been elected. I believe the hon. the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Education, the hon. the Minister of Industrial Development and the Minister of Fisheries and I think they were treated with great courtesy and regard. However, I believe, Mr. Chairman, that I should tell the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs that I would be concerned for his safety if he were to walk at midnight through the towns of Campbells Creek, Abrahams Cove, Ship Cove, Piccadilly, West Bay because, Mr. Chairman, that minister has in his hands the ability to improve the quality of life in those communities more than any other minister in government and has not done so.

Mr. Chairman, two years ago, three years ago during the election, the former candidate who did not run, the candidate and a

MR. J. HODDER: former leading PC, I believe a former defeated candidate in the PC Party, wandered through the district and behind them came the drilling machine. The third gentleman had acquired a drilling machine and they peppered the district of Port au Port with holes. However after the election was over not one of those wells have had the promised pumps, well houses, lines or anything else done. They still remain after three years holes in the ground.

Now, Mr. Chairman, one of the most serious problems, and I have said it every year, perhaps twice every year, one of the most serious problems in the district of Port au Port is water. The problem has become very intense at the moment because we have now found that we have very badly contaminated water through certain areas. In the community of Piccadilly, I believe I presented a petition earlier, I had a call from a woman who has complained that her children were getting stomach cramps and were sick and she felt it was the water, so I contacted the Department of Health and they tested the water and indeed, and I read the letters in the House earlier this year, and indeed they confirmed that the water was bad enough that children could become sick, it was unfit for drinking. They told the families in that area to boil their water. Later the minister's department also did a survey and they came up with the same results, only more so. I think the report was just a little more harsh than the Department of Health's report had been.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this cannot continue to exist. I have written the minister and I am asking him now to please do something for those areas where they have contaminated water, to test the water to make sure that it is not only those ten or fifteen families at Piccadilly Head that have contaminated water, but to check the whole area because the geography, the topography is much the same throughout the whole area and I believe that the problem may be in other areas. But I would urge the minister to check this. It is urgent. It is important. I had one of the letters that I received from the minister's department which said that they could not do anything at the present time but in the very near future they would look or that when the spring came they

April 20, 1978

Tape No. 1262

JM - 3

MR. J. HODDER: would look at the problem again. I do hope,
Mr. Chairman, that that problem is looked after.

Mr. Chairman, I could talk about some of the problems
with water in the district- the problem at Cape St. George where
\$1 million has been spent and only a few families are hooked up, or

MR. HODDER:

the problem in Three Rock Cove where officials of the department lost the pump when they were supposed to repair it, lost it down the well and then had to retrieve it after several months and then sent it away. I could talk about all those things, but all I want to say to the minister right now is look into the problems of contaminated water in the district of Port au Port because I do not want it on my shoulders, and I know the minister does not want it on his shoulders, that someone would become seriously sick.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. DINN: Mr. Chairman, how much time?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Nine minutes.

MR. DINN: Nine minutes. Well, Mr. Chairman, obviously nine minutes is not going to give me an opportunity to reply to all hon. members opposite. Maybe by leave. But first of all, Mr. Chairman, I have to deal with the hon. member for Lewisporte (Mr. White) who in his speech in this House of Assembly talked about pork barrelling in the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing as it relates to special grants specifically. Now, Mr. Chairman, that was the first thing that happened when the hon. member got up. And I asked in my second time in speaking in this House—or the first time, rather—I asked the hon. member to get to the issues which we should be discussing here with respect to policy, with respect to items in different heads of the Department and so on. The hon. member in his second turn got up and talked about pork barrelling. By that he meant that the monies used in special grants were thrown out and given out to people or districts and members on this side of the House.

MR. DINN:

Well, Mr. Chairman, the first thing that I have to do obviously is to lay upon the table of the House the facts because this cannot continue to go on in this House where hon. members opposite get up and make scurrilous charges. So, Mr. Chairman, I will lay upon the Table of the House, after I read some of the things on this document in my hand, proof that there is no such charge can be laid against the Department of Municipal Affairs, which has been made, against government, which has been made, and against the present minister. Nor, Mr. Chairman, and I will deal with this with respect to what has happened in the past years, can the charge be made with respect to water and sewer.

Mr. Chairman, we spend approximately, I think if we average it out over the past five to seven years, we spend approximately \$20 million per year on water and sewer systems in this Province. Now if hon. members opposite can do a little mathematics, \$20 million times about seven years is \$140 million. That, if hon. members will look in the estimates, they will find that that is approximately what the Newfoundland Municipal Financing Corporation has to pay, that is the bill and that is what we are paying off year by year and this year it will be something like \$12.5 million. Well last year, Mr. Chairman, that amount was \$9,952,286 or approximately \$10 million. That is the debt that the Province is paying year by year, and it will go up next year as a result of water and sewer systems that we will put in this year. But that is what we are paying year by year as the time goes on and that debt is increasing and we are paying an increasing amount.

But, Mr. Chairman, over the past approximately seven years \$140 million, approximately, and if we go through

MR. DINN:

the different few districts, just pick a few at random, I will pick a few from this side of the House and I will pick a few from your side of the House, from the hon. members opposite. We will go through some of the districts. The district of Bay of Islands, water and sewer subsidies last year, 1977-1978, \$136,532.79. And we can go through this, Mr. Chairman, district by district. I have them here on a piece of paper and they are as accurate as they can be made. They were done based on what we paid. And Mr. Chairman, we can go through different districts.

The district of Humber Valley, \$212,000, Mr. Chairman. The district of Grand Bank, \$180,000 approximately, Mr. Chairman. The district of Gander, \$201,000, Mr. Chairman. And the point I am making here is that forget about what happened just in one year. Think about what happened

MR. DINN: in the past seven years, say, or approximately seven years. Now some of these were done previous to that and the debt was carried over. So it goes back to, we will say, the previous administration.

So, Mr. Chairman, we will take a few on the other side of the House. Baie Verte-White Bay \$559,617.21, pork-barrelling that is! That is pork-barrelling in this Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing, a statement which I resent.

Mr. Chairman, Bellevue \$152,127.18. Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir \$511,000, and we can go on, and on, and on, and I would think that if this continues, what is going to happen is that increasing pressure is going to be put upon me as Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing to stop this practice of trying to equalize, trying to provide water and sewer systems on the basis of need.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am going to table this but before I do, I am going to give the final figures and I am going to table it because I want to quell unfounded charges made by the hon. members opposite.

We spent last year, as I said, \$9,952,000. With respect to members on this side of the House we spent \$4,855,093.57. With respect to hon. members opposite we spent \$4,366,843.62, and if we add to that the hon. member for Port de Grave we can add another \$732,349.54, which will indicate that there is over \$5.5 million in the Opposition side, and on this side of the House we are spending \$4.8 million. Now, Mr. Chairman, in an effort, and more members -

AN HON. MEMBER: He charged pork-barrelling.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Chairman -

MR. DINN: - more members on this side of the House, as hon. members opposite would know, obviously they can count up to thirty and they can obviously count with respect to what is on their side of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to deal for a moment, if I may, with Special Grants and it is unfortunate that I cannot deal with the problems expressed by the hon. member for Port de Grave (Mr. Dawe) and, hopefully, I will get an opportunity to speak to the hon. gentleman, as I have in the past, and solve some of his problems. Also, with respect to the hon. member for Fogo (Captain Winsor) because he has particular problems that I would like to discuss with him, have in the past, will in the future, and never close my door to any hon. member.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: With respect to Special Grants, and I think it is very important, because everybody knows, the hon. members opposite know, that Special Grants are at the complete discretion - now down in the Department we set up a finance committee but the grants are at the complete discretion of the minister. I can say, 'yea', or I can say, 'nay'. And, Mr. Chairman, I would like to go through that because I do not want to give the impression to the people of this Province, and through you, Mr. Chairman, I would like to notify the people of the Province of basically what is happening.

With respect to Special Grants we go down and of a total of \$790,162.80 we spent in districts of hon. members opposite, \$473,992.98.

AN HON. MEMBER: More than that!

MR. DINN: If we were to add the \$17,500 for the hon. member for Port de Grave or for the people in his constituency, because we are serving the people here in this House, and we compare that with the Special Grants that are going to hon. members on this side of the House we will see that for hon. members on this side of the House we are spending \$298,669

MR. MORGAN: We are getting a raw deal.

April 20, 1978

Tape No. 1264

RT-3

MR. DINN:

Now, Mr. Chairman, \$807,000 as compared to \$298,000. Now hon. members on this side of the House will say, 'Well, you do not have members in rural districts', and that is true, and that is why we will find that with the finance committee operating as it is, and going through and scrutinizing and making recommendations to me, that I am willing to take any hon. member here in this House down to go through the minutes of the finance committee meeting and have a look at every recommendation that was made and see how many I have turned down, to see how many I have changed. I have had calls from hon. members opposite to say,

MR. DINN:

to add some evidence to -

AN HON. MEMBER: Is that including St. John's and Corner Brook?

MR. DINN: That includes all the districts in this Province and if you want to get onto St. John's, St. John's North, nothing, St. John's Center, nothing, if you want to include St. John's. They do not get it because we are attempting to develop the rural areas of this Province because we think that is where the action is and that is where the action should be.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to place upon the table of the House the evidence that this government is as fair as any government has ever been in this Province, a lot fairer than what the hell went on before.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

On motion, Head XIX, Municipal Affairs and Housing, all items without amendment, carried.

MR. HICKMAN: Head XVI, Rural Development.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Head XVI, Rural Development.

The hon. Minister of Rural Development.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Chairman, it is with great pleasure that I present the estimates for the Department of Rural Development, one time called the Department of Community and Social Development whose main mandate at that time was to move people out of rural Newfoundland. This administration fought against that kind of theory and brought back a revitalized rural development policy.

Mr. Chairman, in beginning my remarks on these estimates and under this heading, I should like first of all to pay tribute to the former minister of the department, the

MR. PECKFORD:

member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) who as one rural Newfoundlander understands and is extremely sensitive towards developmental policies as it relates to rural parts of this Province. If there is one hon. gentleman in this House that I am sure all Newfoundlanders recognize as having a real feel and a real concern for his fellow Newfoundlanders who live in the bays and inlets around this Island and in Labrador, it is the hon. member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan). I think even the old saying, I guess, is appropriate, Mr. Chairman, "You can take the man out of the bay but you cannot take the bay out of the man." And I think that the time that the hon. member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) when he was the member of parliament for Gander-Twillingate and so distinguished himself in the House of Commons, he did not even then, when he went to the big city, forget his roots, forget his ties with the rural parts of Newfoundland and was a real worker for many rural parts of Gander-Twillingate during those days that he represented that federal riding. So I want to, in starting my remarks, to pay tribute to him for the work that he has put into the Department of Rural Development and the new initiative that he has taken that I shall continue to carry out as it relates to that department.

As most

MR. PECKFORD: hon. members know, the Department of Rural Development is a relatively new department of government and that it has been growing in leaps and bounds really over the last number of years and that only recently, in the last year or so, the Department of Rural Development was given the responsibility for developing policy really, developmental policy relating to Labrador through the Labrador Services Division and through enlarging the mandate that the Labrador Services Division has. In other words, Mr. Chairman, years ago the Labrador Services Division was simply an operational division, a maintenance division. It was a division which made sure that the depot stores in various communities in Labrador were operated, that there was food on the shelves, if you will, and did not go too much beyond trying to identify opportunities for growth, for development in Labrador.

In recent months, in the last year or so, government has recognized that, if we are really going to impact upon Labrador the way we should, we are going to have to either enlarge the Labrador Services Division or to include some kind of policy formulation or otherwise do it somewhere else but it has to be done. Since there is this already existing division, which up until hitherto for was simply sort of an operational one, already in existence it was easy to enlarge the scope and mandate of that division. We have done so now, Mr. Chairman, to the extent that we have placed a gentleman, a very qualified man in the Labrador area, physically in Labrador, who has assistant deputy minister status and he is the main liaison now and the big link in the chain of the department as it relates to ongoing Labrador development. His name is Mr. John McGrath and we are very proud to have the gentleman on staff in Labrador permanently to bring all the loose ends together as it relates to the matters of the stores and so on but to formulate, and to help government formulate, new programmes and policies as it relates to Labrador.

In my remarks yesterday, Mr. Chairman, I made note of the fact that government has recently signed an interim subsidiary agreement with Ottawa for some \$10 million or \$12 million for various projects in Labrador, but that is only an interim one. We have now

MR. PECKFORD: before the Federal Government, before DREE, a large proposal which covers all sectors, social and resource, of Labrador and the total package in dollar terms is about \$130 million, to put before DREE as a major, major initiative in trying to develop Labrador both from a social point of view, services point of view, water and sewer and all the rest of it, transportation point of view and also from the point of view of economic and industrial development and cultural development.

So this document, if and when it is approved, is going to be perhaps the main document that will guide the development of Labrador over the next decade. So it is a very important document in our view and so important, Mr. Chairman, that we have now passed it over to a group in Labrador that this government funds, the Labrador Resources Advisory Council, for their views to ensure that this document is the kind of document that not just the Department of Rural Development wants or the Government of Newfoundland wants but that the people of Labrador want. So it will be interesting to see as days and weeks go on how this proposal gets along both with the Federal Government and in our ongoing discussions with the people of Labrador themselves.

As I mentioned yesterday, Mr. Chairman, I think the budget for the Department of Rural Development this year is around \$16 million and \$9 million goes to Labrador and shows in a very tangible way the kind of commitment that we have -

MR. NEARY: Could we have a quorum call, Mr. Chairman?

MR. PECKFORD: A point of order, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for LaPoile was not in his seat.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! A quorum has been called. I would ask the law clerk to ring the bell.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the Clerk count the Committee?

A quorum is present.

The hon. Minister of Rural Development.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Chairman, I was trying to make the point about our ongoing commitment to Labrador and that it can best be demonstrated, I suppose, in a tangible, concrete way by the breakdown in the financing this year under the Department of Rural Development which out of a total budget of around \$16 million has approximately \$9 million committed to various programmes to the Labrador section of our Province.

Mr. Chairman, the Department of Rural Development, as I indicated, has been expanding over the last number of years and we have been having some problems as it relates to not only being programme orientated but to also be policy orientated. It is fairly easy, Mr. Chairman, to develop a programme, provide a programme like the RDA loans and have applications and field staff and so on and to then approve or reject various proposals that come forward for sawmill operations, for fish processing, for additional farm equipment for a farmer or whatever the case may be. That is a very important component of rural development in this Province, unquestionably, but there must also be simultaneous with that commitment an ongoing programme as we have it through RDA, as we have it through the industrial incentives grants with the federal government, through ARDA. We must also have a component in the department which re-examines from time to time the existing programmes which goes around the Province and tries to identify that the kinds of programmes we have in place today are the kinds of programmes which are best suited to developing small business enterprise and resource

MR. PECKFORD:

development in the Province. And hence we have in the department now a number of divisions which deal directly this way.

We have, for example, a division in the department which communicates on a daily basis, really, with field staff, with the Development Association. It was last night that I spoke to all the co-ordinators of all the Development Associations in the Province and the ongoing communication between the Department of Rural Development through its division there to ensure that all the Development Associations are kept fully informed on the kinds of things that the Department of Rural Development do, and we get input and contributions from the Rural Development Council as well as from individual Development Associations.

As most people know we fund the Rural Development Council, which is the umbrella body which encompasses all the Development Associations and they are all members of that Rural Development Council funded - I forget how much is there in the estimates, \$40,000 or \$50,000 a year. And they publish a newspaper to all the rural parts of the Province and of course to the urban parts as well to tell what is going on in various parts of the Province. And I want today to table in the House, Mr. Chairman, a special edition of the Rounder, which is financed through the Department of Rural Development which sort of tries to give in a quick, brief way the kinds of issues that they address and what is going on, really, in rural Newfoundland. And I want to table that as an indication of the kind of work that has gone ahead now between the Department of Rural Development, the Rural Development Council and the Development Association. And this is extremely important. There is no way that somebody sitting here in St. John's or

April 20, 1978

Tape 1267

IB-3

MR. PECKFORD:

even sitting in Grand Falls or Gander or Corner Brook because they are staff people under the Department of Rural Development, there is no way that they can develop the kinds of programmes that will be applicable to a certain part of Green Bay and at the same time

MR. PECKFORD:

applicable to a certain part of Bonne Bay or a certain part of White Bay because the conditions change. What is suitable for resource development in a rural setting in one part of Newfoundland is not suitable in another part of Newfoundland. Suffice it to say that something that can be made viable as for a small industry of eight or ten people employed in Conche might not necessarily be the kind of industry you will be looking at in, say, Woody Point. Hence, it is very important that the development associations, the twenty-eight or thirty of them that are on stream right now, who all get grants from the Department of Rural Development, \$13,000 a year, and then additional financing as proposals come in, that there is this interface between the Department of Rural Development and the individual development association in their areas as well as through the parent body, the Rural Development Council, which has its headquarters in Gander and has a small staff who developed that paper that I just referred to.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would like to put emphasis on the fact that the Department of Rural Development is just not a program-orientated, or a project-orientated department, even though that is important and two or three divisions in the department are committed to nothing else only analyzing projects through the RDA program and through the Industrial Incentives program which are two major parts of the Home Industries division of the department, but also, just as important is the ongoing planning that must take place between development associations and the department, between individuals and field staff out in the field, to change the programs, to modify them, to introduce new programs as we move on with the rural development programs and as we see that different kinds of emphasis must be placed. So, rather than look at the Department of Rural Development as a project-orientated department, it also has a strong commitment to developing new policies and to bringing in new programs which will

MR. PECKFORD: reflect changing conditions as we go forward year after year.

Additionally, Mr. Chairman, before my time runs out I should spend some time on talking about the project-orientated divisions of the department, and that is the Home Industries division under which comes the RDA program and the Industrial Grants program. I am going to table, Mr. Chairman, the statistics for that division for 1977-78. For example, Rural Development Authority, 1977-78, approved 237 loans valued at over \$3,000,000. That is up over last year, 1976-77, primarily because of the Action Group in the last several months, a few months, that have expedited a number of applications and brought more on stream.

Mr. Chairman, just think that in 1977-78 the Government of Newfoundland through the Department of Rural Development, through the RDA program, was able to create 392 new jobs. 392 new jobs. Another Come-by-Chance, through rural development programs, through the RDA program. 392 jobs in 1977-78.

To date, Mr. Chairman, since this program started, the program that was initiated, started, conceived, put into action by this government, the total number of jobs created through this program is 3,318. We have been able to create 3,318 new jobs in rural parts of the Province involving over 1,000 loans. This is the kind of action that we hear very little about on the radio or in the newspapers. These are little jobs that are going ahead every day, a carpenter shop here, a fish-processing plant there, handicrafts - a tremendous performance, Mr. Chairman, in a very short period of time. In 1977-78 just about 400 new jobs created through the RDA program, a tremendous performance.

Under the Industrial Incentives program, which is a grant program shared with the Federal Government, we have a total number of full-time jobs of 158 in 1977-78. 158 new jobs and 413 seasonal jobs through the Industrial Incentives grants program. Mr. Chairman, I would

MR. PECKFORD:

like to table copies of these statistics so each member can have a copy of them, so the press can have a copy of them.

So, Mr. Chairman, from a project orientated point of view we have been able to deliver sizeable amounts of money to small enterprises in rural Newfoundland that have created a lot of new jobs in the places where these people live. Of course that is the whole philosophy behind the Rural Development Department in any case. 3,318 since the programme started back three or four years ago, a tremendous performance, Mr. Chairman, and it continues to grow as each year goes by.

Additionally, Mr. Chairman, on the handicraft side we have in the last couple of years been able to year stimulate the handicraft industry in this province, all over the province. I do not know if there is one area of the province how where you do not have, through some existing organization, through the development association or the women's institute or whatever, a fairly heavy committment by groups of women and men towards handicrafts. It has always been said over the years that when people come here from other places, from other provinces or other countries, they often wonder why they cannot buy some little knickknock which was made and which was sort of native or indigenous to Newfoundland. Well that is rapidly changing, Mr. Chairman, and now today we find a lot of new handicraft shops and a lot of new things being done in that field.

I mentioned earlier the fact that we had through the Department of Rural Development put a proposal to DREE as it related to Labrador totalling \$130 million. Mr. Chairman, we have not only made a major sizeable committment to Labrador but we have also identified that we must keep reviewing our programmes, as I said, and we have now also put before DREE for a new rural development programme, a new subsidiary agreement, a rural development subsidiary agreement to deal with specifically a new handicraft programme that takes us over five years to be cost shared,

MR. PECKFORD: some things fifty-fifty other things ninety-ten. We have put before them - this is a three component kind of proposal, a community development scheme for the next five years and thirdly we have put before them a new industrial incentives programme. The industrial incentives programme has now run out. We are a tiny bit behind on it and hopefully we will get the industrial incentives component part of the development plan signed in May so that we can go ahead with that programme. The old one has run out but the other components are new and they represent about \$18 million. We are hoping that we will be able to cost share \$18 million over the next five years in those three areas of rural development.

So, Mr.Chairman, as you can see there is a lot of work going on in the Department of Rural Development as it relates to policy formulation, programme development and precisely projects that are going ahead. 3,000 jobs since the programme started and 400 jobs last year.

Mr. Chairman, I have tabled a statistical list as it relates to the home industries division, the amount of money spent to date, the number of loans, the number of jobs created and so on. I am not prepared as Minister of Rural Development to table the names because I think it would be unfair to the applicants concerned to table the names for the loans. We do not do it for the Farm Loan Board, we do not do it for the Fisheries Loan Board, and I do not think it would be fair to the applicants to have their names tabled here in this hon. House so that you could get -

AN HON. MEMBER: You are ashamed.

MR. PECKFORD: Not a bit ashamed. But, Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to have the hon. member who is the shadow minister over on the other side if he so desires to come down to the Department of Rural Development to show him the names - if he so desires, if he thinks there is something scurrilous or underhanded or something going on. But I am not prepared to table the names here in the House so that it gets out in the paper

MR. PECKFORD: and somebody's name down in Toogood Arm or Hibbs Hole and somebody next door says, "No wonder this gentleman is prospering. He has the government on his side or he has some kind of grant" which some people still translate as being welfare when it is not. It is a loan which is paid back under the RDA programme. And so I am prepared to do that, Mr. Chairman, to show my good faith in saying to the Opposition

MR. PECKFORD:

opposite that if they want the names of the firms and the individuals concerned, if they want to take a look at that, I am prepared to have a designate from the other side come down to the Department of Rural Development and see those names so that he will see that there is nothing, we are not hiding a thing. But we do not think it is proper to do it this way when people in good faith have put together a financial package. I am prepared to go that route, to do that kind of thing and I think that is the proper way to go.

Mr. Chairman, I think you have indicated that my time has expired and I appreciate any questions from the opposite side and I will try to do my best to answer them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Chairman, in his opening remarks on Rural Development the minister talked about resettlement and we in the Opposition thought that this was the red herring that he would drag in to the whole affair. However he did not stay on that too long, the resettlement thing and how this is how it started out. All I want to say in connection with that, and no doubt other speakers who know more about it than I do will expand on that, all I want to say, Mr. Chairman, about resettlement is go down and ask the people who live in Arnold's Cove, go down and poll these people, ask those people how they feel about resettlement and they will tell you that it is the best thing that they ever did. I speak of Arnold's Cove, Mr. Chairman, because it is in my district.

Mr. Chairman, the question that should be asked in Arnold's Cove, I think, or perhaps the answer that should be given is, tell the people in Arnold's Cove what

MR. CALLAN:

time they will be getting a gymnasium or a gymnasium or an auditorium onto their school. There are 300 students there and for the last six years under this administration they have been waiting to get a gym put on their school as a result of the influx of the population that came in there who were happy to resettle in a big town. But now, of course, naturally they want the facilities that go with fairly large towns.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. CALLAN: Well, I do not know, it has been expanding every year. It is no more than eight or nine years old but it has been expanding.

Anyway, Mr. Chairman, that is not what I want to talk about in the twenty minutes that I have here. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to address too many remarks or to talk too much about the present minister, either, because I rather doubt that the minister who now is holding down this department has his heart in it. He already has one portfolio, Mines and Energy and for the past two or three days looking across the House, Mr. Chairman, I have been noticing that the minister who is now the Minister of Rural Development as well as Mines and Energy has been reading a book, I have seen it as he has been reading it there, I have seen the back of it, the cover, Galbraith, The Age Of Uncertainty. Mr. Chairman, I would say that the minister feels a little bit uncertain about this department which brings me, Mr. Chairman, to a very important question. Why did the former minister resign that department of government?

Mr. Chairman, the former minister gives as his reason for resigning from the Cabinet the fact that the Premier had reneged on a promise to expand the Central

MR. CALLAN:

Newfoundland Hospital. Mr. Chairman, I contend that that was just a smoke screen, I contend that the former Minister of Rural Development had other more important reasons for leaving the Cabinet and giving up this department of government. I contend, Mr. Chairman, that this department, which was created in 1972 under this administration, that this department was in such a mess, some of it created by the former minister, the minister who preceded the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan), the first minister of this department, this department was in such a mess, there was so much money given out. This department, Mr. Chairman, is like a Crown corporation.

MR. CALLAN: It has all the trappings, political interference, political patronage, and so on. I would say, Mr. Chairman, that the real reason why the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) left the Cabinet and therefore left this department of Government is because he knew what was happening there and he wanted no longer to be a part of it. Mr. Chairman, I believe that the former minister saw the sinking ship, he was on board that sinking ship, the Administration of the PC Government is the sinking ship that I am referring to, he saw it as a sinking ship, the Leader of the Government, the Premier, grabbing for straws to try and hold on, and in so doing, caused a bigger mess than existed beforehand.

Mr. Chairman, I would say this that it is ordinarily the rats that leave the sinking ship, but in this case I do not think it was. I think that many of the rats still stayed there. Some of them indicated during the Easter recess that they were going to join the member for Grand Falls in leaving the sinking ship, but for some reason they changed their minds.

MR. FLIGHT: Seven of them.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Chairman -

MR. FLIGHT: The Ministers of Tourism, of Labour-

MR. ROUSSEAU: Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. minister.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I think the hon. member, being the gentleman he is, would not like to refer to people over here as rats, and I think maybe -

MR. FLIGHT: Hon. rats.

MR. ROUSSEAU: -it might have been a lapsus linguae and he would be prepared to withdraw that as it insults all members on this side of the House.

MR. FLIGHT: How about hon. rats?

MR. CALLAN: Figuratively speaking.

MR. NEARY: That is not a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

To that point of order,

MR. CHAIRMAN: To that point of order. The member was unparliamentary, I am sure. The words chosen are not suitable for the Committee and I ask the hon. member to withdraw that remark.

MR. CALLAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Obviously, the minister knew that, of course, I was using the sinking ship and the ship of state, and so on, figuratively. Anyway, if it offends any hon. member opposite I withdraw that remark, of course.

Mr. Chairman, I think the last straw, again I am speaking figuratively, of course, the straw that broke the camel's back, I think, for the former Minister of Rural Development, the straw that broke the minister's back and set him on the road to resignation was the straw that was created and was announced on January 26,

AN HON. MEMBER: That he was fired.

MR. CALLAN: - 1978. That was the night, Mr. Chairman, when the Premier of this Province, after leaving us in suspense for two days, came out with a grandiose announcement. I, out in Bellevue, do not mind saying that for two days I waited in anticipation of this great announcement that the Premier of the Province was going to make over the airwaves. In two days time, he said, 'I will be making a big announcement'. I obviously thought that the announcement would regard the re-opening of the Come-by-Chance oil refinery. I understand from the member from Stephenville (Mr. McNeil) that he was also anxiously awaiting the announcement because he thought it had something to do with the re-opening of the linerboard mill. What was the big announcement, Mr. Chairman? Action Group, 737-3990.

Mr. Chairman, if I may refer to an article in a newspaper written about that time, and this bears out the point that I am trying to make with the member for Grand Falls dissatisfaction over what was happening and how he was being insulted, Mr. Chairman,

April 20, 1978

Tape No. 1271

RT-3

MR. CALLAN: reading from this newspaper, it says,
'There is something that sounds pretty phony about the new Action
Group announced this week. To start with, it is not needed because if
the need for it exists then a large part of the staff of the
Newfoundland Development Authority and the Newfoundland and Labrador
Development Corporation, and I include in that the Rural Development
Authority,

MR. CALLAN:

should be fired. Also in line to be fired should be the officials in charge of various commissions, boards and committees which are responsible for handling of government loans, grants and subsidies, the Department of Rural Development, to businesses and individuals. All these people should be fired,' says this article, 'because according to the Premier they make it too difficult for an applicant to get approval for a loan, a grant or a subsidy. These officials have created so much red tape the Premier had to set up this new super agency called Action Group which is supposed to jump smartly to attention and pass out your money if you dial 737-3800.' Mr. Chairman, I would say that this Action Group undermined the Department of Rural Development as it undermined other departments and boards and corporations of the government.

The article goes on to say, 'I would think the people already doing the job of handling government development funds are really proud of their record for dealing with applications and getting the money out to these who meet the regulations. Yet these very people' -and this includes of course the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Lundrigan)- 'yet these very people have to accept the insult of being told that they are making a mess of things and they have to put up with this new super agency which has been stuck on the end of a telephone with a staff of seven already in place and no doubt plenty more to come. This sets up a new level of red tape for the applicant who now will be phoning Action Group instead of Development Authority.'

'What is so surprising is that up to now the government has been very proud of its record for small enterprise development. It boasted of this record in the

MR. CALLAN:

House of Assembly and was pleased to issue press releases to show how many applicants' applications were approved. Now all too suddenly that record is all wrong and sports announcer Bob Cole has to be brought in to put things right,' says the article. 'It is pretty tough on career civil servants and Cabinet ministers, I insert that part - 'who have sweated it out for half a lifetime to get to the top job only to see some wizard slid in without having to touch first base. What makes this look so phony is that it is not necessary to set up this Action Group under a television personality. A change in the rules would cut out the need for red tape, a change in the rules.'

'But now that Cole is there, his Action Group will be credited with all the approval made by the Development Authority and the Development Corporation. That is good election material. This whole business has an election smell to it and you should not be surprised if the television clips you see advertizing the Action Group turn up again as part of the P.C. election campaign. That is one way of using public money to finance a party's election expenses,' says the article. If you guessed that Bob Cole is going to be a candidate in the next election you could be right.

Anyway it is a sad week when the civil servants and some Cabinet ministers who have been doing a good job get hell blasted out of them because it suits the Premier's purpose to hurt them. Their plan becomes Bob Cole's glory. That, Mr. Chairman, is one of the straws that broke the camel's back and therefore led the former Minister of Rural Development to throw in the towel, to resign.

Mr. Chairman, the former Minister of Rural Development was also the former Minister of Industrial

MR. CALLAN:

Development. Let us look at the record, Mr. Chairman. I want to ask this question. I asked this question last year. Is there really any need or was there really any need for this department of government? What is and what was there happening in this department that could not have been happening at the same time

MR. W. CALLAN: in the Department of Fisheries, Mr. Chairman? The Minister of Rural Development and the Minister of Industrial Development talks about the grants and loans made to fish plants and fish processing. Mr. Chairman, these things could just as easily and just as well been handled within the Department of Fisheries. Why not? We also see in that list just tabled logging, sawmilling, planer mill, wood debarking, boat building -

MR. NEARY: Rags, rag manufacturing.

MR. W. CALLAN: What is there, Mr. Chairman, -

MR. NEARY: Wiping rags.

MR. W. CALLAN: What is there, Mr. Chairman, that could not have been just carried out just as well and just as efficiently within the Department of Fisheries or within the Department of Forestry and Agriculture?

Mr. Chairman, I think, and it is my personal opinion, that this was an unnecessary department of government. Mr. Chairman, let me refer to another newspaper article. It says, "Famous Promise. On June 2, 1971 the Premier," who was not the Premier then -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. CALLAN: No, no, dry. "On June 2, 1971 Frank Moores surfaced at the Newfoundland and Labrador Press Club to make his famous promise to reduce the size of the Cabinet (when he became Premier) from nineteen to twelve members." From nineteen to twelve. "As it turned out, Moores' first cabinet, formed the night of January 18, 1972 had fifteen members including himself and that is the smallest it has ever been."

Mr. Chairman, is there a need for this department? What is it doing? What is it accomplishing that could not have been just as well accomplished in other departments of government and of course in line with that and referring again to the straw that broke the camel's back as far as the former minister was concerned and caused him to resign using the Central Newfoundland Hospital as a smoke screen, what caused him to resign was the setting up of another department of

MR. CALLAN: government, even though it is not called that, another department of government with the highest paid -

MR. NEARY: Another level of bureaucracy.

MR. CALLAN: That is right, the highest paid minister of all, \$47,500 a year.

MR. NEARY: More than the Premier makes, by the way.

MR. CALLAN: More than the Premier makes. Mr. Chairman, what has been accomplished in the last years? What has been accomplished? What has the Department of Rural Development and the Department of Industrial Development to show? What industries have been created? Mr. Chairman, I can think of one industry that was created.

MR. NEARY: What about the -

MR. CALLAN: It cost an awful lot of money to create this industry. It is not an industry at all, I suppose, Mr. Chairman. Perhaps it is better to call it a plant and this plant, Mr. Chairman, has the best brains in the province behind it. It is located on the eighth floor of this building. And what does this plant produce, Mr. Chairman? This plant turns out moth balls. They manufacture moth balls so they can put the Come by Chance oil refinery into moth balls, so that they can put the Labrador Linerboard mill into moth balls and so they can put these sawmills that are described here - the many grants and loans that have been made available to set up sawmills that have closed down. They have closed down.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to know how much money is owed to the Department of Rural Development. How much? How much is owed? How much was given out? How much was Federal, by the way? Let us hear! Tell us how much of this was Federal money and then tell us how much was given out and how much is presently owed? I know of cases myself, Mr. Chairman, where loans and grants were given out and not one copper returned. But anyway, Mr. Chairman, if I can conclude, I have been told I have one minute but I will be getting back to this later on, I assume, for another few minutes. But if I can get back to that moth ball plant that is located on the eighth floor of this building, Mr. Chairman, I would say

MR. CALLAN: this, that there are lots of use for these moth balls, lots of places to put them, and I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that some of the people who created that moth ball plant are using these moth balls as well. Obviously they must have some in their ears if not they would hear the shouts of shame and despair that are heard throughout this Province under this administration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the minister responsible for Rural Development, Sir, tabled this afternoon in the House two or three sheets of paper, Sir, showing a list of the capital cost, the amounts, so the minister told us, of grants and the jobs that were created as a result of giving out these grants.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the hon. gentleman does not think, Sir, that we are going to be satisfied with this vague, general information that was tabled by the hon. minister. What we want, Mr. Chairman, what we want and what this House demands and what the people of this Province want to know, is who received this \$3 million that was approved by the Rural Development Authority? Give us the names of the people who received these loans and grants. If the hon. gentleman has nothing to hide, Sir, the hon. gentleman would table, as has been the custom and tradition in this House all down through the years, that when public money is expended, when money is approved by this House, loans and grants are given to people, that a list of the loans and the people who received them and the companies that received them have to be brought into this hon. House.

Mr. Chairman, the Premier is quick on the trigger when it comes to bringing in information on telephone bills of the Opposition. The hon. Premier is not so quick to bring us in any information in connection with these loans and grants that were given out to 237 people in this Province. Who are they? Mr. Chairman, on this side of the House,

MR. NEARY: Sir, you have a group of intelligent, responsible people who are not going to abuse any individual or any company in this Province who genuinely receives loans and grants from the Rural Development Authority. We would be glad, Sir, and we have done it ourselves when we were in the administration.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. the Premier, Sir, went around this Province for six years condemning the former premier of this Province, calling him a rogue, and a crook and calling him all kinds of names, concealing information, hiding information from the public. Now, Sir, who is more guilty of concealing and hiding information from the people of this Province but the hon. gentlemen themselves? Because, Mr. Chairman, the former Premier of this Province, in the twenty-three years that he was Premier of Newfoundland, not once, Sir, did the hon. gentleman refuse to table lists in this hon. House, no matter how damaging it was to him or his administration, no matter how damaging it was. Under the Financial Administration Act of this Province these lists, Sir, should be tabled and for two years now running, and this is the third year in a row, we have asked the Minister of Rural Development for a list of all those who have been given loans and grants from the Rural Development Authority and the minister has refused to give the House the information, which indicates to me, Sir, that the minister and the government have something to hide, and if they did not, Sir, they would lay the list on the table of this hon. House.

Mr. Chairman, we all know of political hacks, Tory hacks who have gotten their mitts into this Rural Development Authority. I know one gentleman that I defeated on two occasions, who got his hooks into the Rural Development Authority. It was a PC candidate, got his hooks into the Rural Development Authority for \$15,000 or \$20,000 or \$25,000. I doubt if one penny of it has ever been paid back and the same gentleman got his hooks into the Newfoundland Farm Loan Board for another \$15,000 or \$20,000 or \$25,000 to buy a

MR. NEARY: farm tractor that was never used for farming and to build green houses that have never been used and are now over on Bell Island idle.

PREMIER MOORES: Defeated Liberal candidates availed of those funds too.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Premier says defeated Liberal candidates have availed of the fund too. Well, Sir, if that is so, then sobeit, put the list on the table. But I am telling the hon. the Premier about one example of abuse that I know of - not only one,

MR. NEARY:

I know of a dozen, but I know of that one. And that tractor has since been sold and what I would like to know is if the money is being reimbursed to the Newfoundland Farm Loan Board or to the Rural Development Authority. Was it? Can the minister tell me if the tractor has been sold or has it been written off? And the gentleman now is no longer associated with green houses or farming, never did do any farming, got about I would say over a two year period \$30,000 to \$40,000 from the Rural Development Authority and from the Newfoundland Farm Loan Board. And I want to know if it has been written off what steps the government has taken to recover that money? An then they are talking about creating jobs. How many jobs were created as a result of the loan that was given to that gentleman? The hon. Premier knows the gentleman whom I am referring to. Mr. Chairman, we want to know, in order to evaluate this Rural Development Department, Sir, in order for us to be able to assess the value of this department we would like to know the names of the companies, the names of the individuals that got these loans so that we can go out and see if they are still in operation. How many have closed down? How many of these companies and individuals are using taxpayers' money when they should be using their own money? They found a milch cow^{now} they do not have to use their own money to expand or to put an addition on a building. they can use the taxpayers' money. They found a sucker in the taxpayers. How many of these individuals and companies have come to the Rural Development Department that have money running out of their ears and, because they were supporters of the party in power, got their loans approved? Mr. Speaker, there is no way that we can assess the Department of Rural Development intelligently unless we have the information before us. The minister is getting up and making statement about creating so many jobs; the number of jobs, he says, is 3,318 jobs. How can we dispute this? How can we question it, Sir, unless we have the information in front of us, unless we know where these jobs were created? Mr. Chairman, I know the hon. gentleman

MR. NEARY: is including in his total jobs that were created for twenty-four hours and then,abolished jobs that were created for a week or two and then wiped out. This is just a gigantic bluff, Sir, It is a farce,it is not true!

AN HON. MEMBER: They are giving a gross total.

MR. NEARY: They are giving a gross total. And how many of these jobs were there anyway in the first place,and how many of these jobs would have been created anyway even if there was no Rural Development Authority? This is the pork barrelling department, Sir.

And the hon. the Premier shoots across at me and says well some Liberal defeated candidates got loans from this Rural Development Authority too, and well they may have. They may have been legitimate loans,and some of the Tory hacks that got loans,they may have been legitimate loans,but we do not know.There is no way, Sir, of us knowing unless the information is put on the table of the House. And these three or four sheets that were presented by the minister this afternoon are not going to satisfy us. I beg your pardon?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Did not the minister invite you down?

MR. NEARY: The minister did not invite me down, Sir. The minister said the spokesman could go down.The minister did not invite me down because the minister is scared to invite me down.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

PREMIER MOORES: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon? What was that remark from the Premier?

PREMIER MOORES: (Inaudible) any member (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Any member, Well, Sir, have the hon. gentleman come back to his seat and confirm what the Premier just said,that any member can go down and look over this list. Because if that is so I will stop talking right now and I will go down to the office and I will get the information and bring it into the House.

April 20, 1978

Tape 1275

DW - 3

MR. NEARY: Can the Premier confirm that any member can go down? Well what is this? The hon. the Premier is the boss, the head of the administration. The hon. Premier hires and fires-mostly fires. Why does not the hon. the Premier get the minister back in the House and tell us if I can go down and have a look at this list because I will go right now!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY:

Where is the hon. minister? He is not in his seat.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY:

The hon. Premier is not a dictator, he is not a leader either and therein lies another problem, Sir, which we can debate some other time. But, Mr. Chairman, we are not going to be satisfied with just being brushed off with this vague, general statement that the minister tabled this afternoon. The hon. the Premier has a little smile on his face again now.

PREMIER MOORES:

I would like to know what you know about being a leader and winning conventions.

MR. CALLAN:

Do not make empty promises like the ones in 1971.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. the Premier is awfully sensitive and touchy, Sir, for the last week or so and gone down drastically, by the way, in the eyes and in the estimation of members of this House who thought that the hon. gentleman was not a vindictive man, but now we have found out, Sir, that the hon. gentleman is a vindictive man. We saw it happen in this House a couple of days ago. But, Sir, let us see how fair minded the hon. gentleman really is. Can we have a look at the list of all the loans and grants that were given out to people in this Province involving taxpayers' money? Give me a simple yes or no. Can we? Will the Premier say yes or no to that question?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Yes or no.

MR. NEARY:

Can we have a list? Can the Opposition have a list?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Yes or no.

MR. NEARY:

Will the hon. the Premier look me straight in the eye, stop writing for a moment and give me a simple yes or no answer? I am asking the Premier, who is the head of this administration,

MR. NEARY: who is covering up this information, who is allowing it to be covered up, who is hiding the information from the House and from the people of this Province? Will the Premier give me a simple answer? Can we have a list?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) this afternoon.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, we did not get it this afternoon. Can we have a list, Sir? A simple yes or no answer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Could I get the hon. the Premier's attention for a moment?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes or no.

MR. NEARY: A simple yes or no answer. Can we get a list of all the loans and grants that were made by the Rural Development Authority in the 1977-1978 fiscal year? Can we get a list? Mr. Chairman, I am asking the hon. Premier a question.

PREMIER MOORES: The hon. Premier is ignoring it.

MR. NEARY: The hon. Premier is ignoring it. In so doing, Sir, the hon. gentleman is turning his back on this hon. House and on the people of this Province. The people of this Province are entitled to have this information because they are footing the bills. The dwindling number of taxpayers in this Province are the ones who are paying for the extravagance and the waste and the pork barrelling that has gone on in this department over the last three or four or five years. Is the hon. the Premier saying no, we are not going to get that information? Is the hon. the Premier getting hard of hearing? Are we going to get this information?

PREMIER MOORES: It depends on the minister.

MR. NEARY: It does not depend on the minister! It depends on the Premier, the head of the administration, the boss, the number one man.

PREMIER MOORES: The ministers now have some autonomy. When you were there you had none, but I understand -

MR. NEARY: At least when I was there we had leadership

MR. NEARY: and that is more than I can say they have on that side of the House now.

PREMIER MOORES: Or dictatorship, whichever way you want to call it.

MR. NEARY: Well, I would call it leadership. They have neither on that side of the House now.

PREMIER MOORES: It was leadership in that you always did what you were told. But I notice you are not doing it now.

MR. NEARY: The hon. the Premier talks about dictatorship. Well, I remember the hon. the gentleman was down South when seven members of his party threatened to bail out, seven, led by the Minister of Industrial Development -

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: - who has boasted about it outside of this House. Seven threatened to leave, seven were going to cross the House and the hon. gentleman came back and whipped them into line and we never heard a peep since.

PREMIER MOORES: I thought it was twenty-eight.

MR. NEARY: No, seven. The hon. Minister of Industrial Development can confirm my figure, because he has already confirmed it outside the House, that seven were going to walk across the House, were going to bail out. But when the hon. the Premier came back and snapped the whip, that was it, he whipped them all into line, including the Minister of Fisheries and the Minister of Tourism and the President of the PC Party, the member for Ferryland (Mr. Power), and the member for Mount Pearl (Mr. N. Windsor), who has now got his own troubles, and the member for Placentia East (Mr. Patterson) and the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Young) I would ask the hon. member to be more relevant.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The number of loans approved, so we are told by this document, 237 with a value of \$3,135,000; the number of loans executed, 156, value of \$1,000,897. And all we have to show for that, Sir, are two sheets of paper telling us, one, the number of jobs created in agriculture, boat building, construction, electrical and mechanical, manufacturing, and I suppose, Sir, the number of full-time jobs -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order.

MR. WOODROW: The member said, and which is now in Hansard, that I said I was going to resign, or the Premier chastised me. It is right to say that never at any time since they got re-elected did I say I would resign from the P.C. Party. I think that should be stricken from the records of the House of Assembly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I feel it is not a point of order, but more of a point of explanation and I would ask the hon. the member for LaPoile to continue.

MR. NEARY: I think, Sir, The hon. gentleman for his penance should stay in the administration, make the hon. gentleman suffer. I think the hon. gentleman should stay where he is and we will deal with the hon. gentleman in due course. But for a penance the hon. gentleman should stay right where he is and continue to support this hon. crowd of - what shall I call them? - am I allowed to call them rogues, Mr. Chairman? That would be unparliamentary, so therefore I will not call the hon. gentleman rogues, I will not call them political misfits. The hon. gentleman

MR. NEARY: can carry right on supporting that hon. crowd as long as the hon. gentleman wants to.

AN HON. MEMBER: Careful! Watch your speech!

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Chairman, we have one of the highlights of this list that I have in front of me, one of the big industries that was created, a wiping rag production industry. I would like to know if that is still functioning where it was created. Now, Mr. Chairman, looking over this list I see industries that were created, for instance, a dairy industry, a meat processing industry, food processing industry, boat building industry, taxidermy, printing, fertilizer, asphalt plant, concrete. Now, Mr. Chairman, the question I want to ask here is this, How many of these industries have been financed by the Rural Development Authority to go in competition with private enterprise that has not had one red cent from the public treasury? How many? I know over in the head of the bay represented by the Minister of Transportation and Communications, a substantial number of these loans and grants have gone in the head of the bay, and in some instances, Sir, because I had the people come to see me, loans and grants were given to people to go in competition with garages, opened up Handy Andy stores over in the head of the bay, competing with garages that are selling the same item. The garages were not financed by the government, and these people were practically forced out of business because the government had given grants and loans, a form of welfare, to party hacks, to the people who supported the hon. gentlemen in the election to go in competition with them.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: And how often has that happened, Sir?

MR. NEARY: Looking over this list, Mr. Chairman, I cannot see how half of this stuff here can be fitted into the terms of reference of the Rural Development Authority because these industries are all ready there, Sir. Asphalt plants - How many asphalt plants do we have in this Province? We have them running out of our ears and here is the government out financing asphalt plants! And if the truth were known that loan, Sir, was probably given to a party hack, a supporter of the government. But the only way we can find out if these loans have been properly used - not abused, not a form of welfare - the only way we can find that out, Sir, is for the minister to have the courage, to have the intestinal fortitude to lay the list on the table of this House so we can see how much pork barrelling and how much abuse is going on in connection with the Rural Development Authority in the last five or six years.

Mr. Chairman (Mr. Young): The hon. member for Placentia.

MR. PATTERSON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak very briefly on the estimates of the Department of Rural Development. I represent a district that for twenty years, twenty-five years, it was largely depend on the whims of a foreign Congress. We were totally depend on the American Bases. And that was something that caused me great concern all down through the years. And that was why in 1960 I had the honour of forming possibly the first development association in Newfoundland. I think my hon. friend there from Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) was involved at the same time in setting up these associations. So he and I were the first, I would say, in Newfoundland.

But from modest beginning up there with that small development association it grew and flourished and the results are to be seen there today. The development association there is responsible for building a small fish plant that this year will employ over one hundred persons. Last year the development association went to Red Island and built a wharf, built a wharf and built a shed. They could not get funding elsewhere for these projects. And we are also looking at another island out there.

Now I am not trying to cut in on my hon. friend for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Canning), but quite a number of men from Placentia district go out there to fish each year. So he and I are on the same wave length on that. I am not going to drag the resettlement programme into this. You know, I could do it, I could consider myself an authority on the resettlement programme, but those people who were involved in it, -

MR. CANNING: Do not bring the resettlement programme into this.

MR. PATTERSON: No, I am not going to do it, Sir. No, no, those people who were involved in it, it was a blunder, it was a mistake.

MR. CANNING: What do you think of (Inaudible) Do not mention it. You might ignorantly (Inaudible)

MR. PATTERSON: No, no, no. I will yield to you if you want to speak on it. I will certainly yield to you. I am not going to drag the

Mr. Patterson: resettlement programme in,

MR. CANNING: No, that is right.

MR. PATTERSON: I could consider myself an authority on it. And when Patterson says something, Patterson means it. I am not going to do it. It would not serve any purpose. The men who were at that were genuine but they made mistakes, so it is up to us to make that resettlement programme work.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Right, right!

MR. PATTERSON: The other day the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) mentioned errors or mistakes or something happened with the boatbuilding industry here in Newfoundland. And I can assure you that boats can be built much cheaper in Cape Breton, and in New Brunswick, than we can build them here in Newfoundland. They can put a forty foot longliner in the water in thirty days, four men can. And the way they build their boats there they put the timbers in last, they lay out a keel, they bore holes in the keel to receive the timbers, then they lay out however many tin plates are needed to form the boat. The planks used there are an inch and three-quarters wide, an inch and a quarter thick. And one is laid on top of the other and nailed down. And when the boat is framed they whip out their tin plates, hang them on the wall, and steam the timbers and put them in. It is a fascinating process, and it is one that we are going to adopt here in Newfoundland.

MR. HICKMAN: How much will it cost?

MR. PATTERSON: Oh, away cheaper, way, way cheaper. I do not have the figure, but, you know, I think you would get a sixty-five footer there for \$70,000.

So we are really being taken to the cleaners here on boats, there is no doubt at all about that. And up there they - I had a word from a friend of mine there today and they told me that herring are being taken out of the Port au Port, the West Coast and they are being smoked up there in New Brunswick. Now there are 102 smokers in New Brunswick and they are into the bloater business there,

Mr. Patterson: where the herring are soaked for six days in brine, then they go into the smokers. And I think that they have a market in the Third World countries, because I have seen their products. And I am quite sure that that is where the market is, In fact, I am dealing with a man there that has a \$6 million order. and I am trying to interest him to come over to Argentina.

So what we are hoping to do through this small area development association down there now is set up a smoker - smokers are not labour intensive, but the canning process would be better. Up at the community of Little Harbour,

MR. PATTERSON: that community it totally dependent on a small industry there. A new community stage was built and a wharf put in by the provincial government and now they are packing herring there, no unemployment. In fact, the employment is so high there they have to go outside the community to get men to come in and work on LIP projects.

Up at Fairhaven, the same thing, a small fish plant there and that is operating. I think it processed 3 million pounds of squid last year. So I do not think we should laugh at the small industries. Neither do I think, as my hon. friend from Kilbride (Mr. Wells) says, we should kick out the big ones. We made a few mistakes with big ones and we all make mistakes occasionally, So it is no good of us dwelling too much on the past. I think we have to look to the future.

Now, for the past - well, since 1970, we have been building boats in Placentia in an area development shed there, some beautiful longliners. But they are costly to build and I think they are costly to push through the water, They are heavy and in this day and age when energy is so important I think we have to make drastic changes in our boat building. I have discussed this with the Minister of Fisheries here and I have quite a bit of information to pass along to him now, and pictures of the different methods to use. Our boats have to be built on an assembly line process as they are being built up in New Brunswick.

The Come by Chance refinery: While it appeared to be a blessing when it came, in my opinion, it is not all that great a blessing. The way the refinery was operated in the last days I was scared stiff. You had huge tankers VLCC's, very large crude oil carriers, going up and down that bay without pilots, and that was

MR. PATTERSON: contrary to the Atlantic Pilotage Act. If they were to have a spill up there from a very large crude carrier, not only Placentia Bay but the whole Southwest coast would be wiped out; it would become a complete desert, you would wipe out all the little small industries up there. And my hon. friend from Bellvue (Mr. Callan), in Southern Harbour, in Arnold's Cove they are all quite happy there and they are all working in the fish processing business.

With regard to reopening that refinery I think we have to tread very, very softly, very, very gently, because what we may do is create 300 jobs and turn the bay into a desert.

Now, the crab industry is something that could be developed in Placentia Bay, but the crabs are in the deep water, the 600 foot depth, and that is the tanker route. So while we are running around looking for people to reopen that refinery, if we do find an operator I think we have to sit down with him and say to him, Boy, look here, these are pollution regulations and we are going to strictly enforce these regulations.

I think the Rural Development Department can play a big part in the development of the Argentia base, the North side, which was turned over to the federal government on a lease and which was subleased to the provincial government. All the facilities are out there, Mr. Chairman, and it is just a matter of time now.

Under the first terms the base did not lend itself to economic development because of a thirty day re-entry clause. That was taken out and the terms were made more favourable. I think the beginning of a great fishing industry has started out there with the announcement a few weeks ago, and, in fact, the awarding of contracts for the rebuilding of two cold storages.

MR. PATTERSON: We are negotiating with a fish company to take a look at a very fine building that is a there.

So there again, all these things are small but when they are all summed together they make a lot of people happy and there are a lot of people bringing home a paycheck and that is the most important thing.

The negotiations on that transfer of the properties: It took a while but it was certainly worth the time it took. I would like to make mention here now that one of our great friends in that in the press was the Evening Telegram because they wrote numerous editorials on the surplus properties at the base and suggesting that, and asking why there were delays in the transfer of these properties. I just quote to you here from

MR. PATTERSON: an editorial in The Telegram, I just do not know the date, but it mentioned, it said, "The North side of the base has been abandoned for a number of years and some of the buildings are now at the point where they may have to be removed. However, there are still enough facilities and buildings to give the base a high potential for development, With a good harbour and a good wharf, with its location in one of our best ice free fishing bays and with its nearness to the offshore fishing grounds, Argentia appears to be a natural for a multi-purpose fish processing and storage facility, geared to all species and built to handle the inshore and offshore catch.

"Other possibilities include shore facilities for offshore drilling operations and warehousing for the distribution of food and general wares. The airport there should also be kept up because it is a plus factor in considering the future development of the base for military or industrial purposes. Apart from any industrial or commercial use of the base, it is an ideal location for a naval establishment and for a coast guard operation. The merits of Argentia as a North Atlantic defence base have been pointed out more than one time and presumably the naval bosses in Ottawa are aware of its strategic advantage over naval bases located hundreds of miles away.

"The same might be said for search and rescue operations. Argentia would put the Navy and the search and rescue ships and aircraft out there if they are needed, if only the politicians had the wisdom and the courage to recognize the value of Argentia, its future as a military base and as a place of high employment."

Now I would like to say at this time that I would like to congratulate the Minister of External Affairs, Mr. Jamieson, the man I dealt with quite a bit working toward the transfer of the base, and also the Justice Minister and the Minister of Industrial Development. And I am sure there is no one on the other side of the House - I am sure they were all with us on that, and let us hope that that area

MR. PATTERSON: out there will become self sufficient. So I am going to finish. That is as long as I can talk so I am going to let someone else go ahead. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a few brief remarks. I agree with our spokesman who spoke earlier in this debate when he questioned the validity of the existence of this particular department, not its philosophy, not the philosophy to develop small industry in this Province, not against the philosophy of developing rural Newfoundland - no, certainly not against that philosophy, not against it at all - but just wondering whether this particular structure is necessary. And I am just wondering, I am questioning and I am going to raise some questions that the minister can answer and maybe convince me that indeed the present structure is necessary. but on the basis of the information that I now have, I am questioning the existence of this department.

I am just wondering, for example, whether the minister can tell us, and I realize that it varies, but the question is how long does it take to process applications? Now I know it varies depending on the kind of business, but my experience has been that it takes a long time, particularly if there is anything with lands involved, Crown lands. I have got a particular person in mind in Charlottetown who has been trying for two years to try and process an application. Now again land is involved in this. Well, maybe that is a different issue, but the question is how long does it normally take all things being equal, and my experience is that it takes a tremendously long time.

Mr. Chairman, I find it offensive that we have had to put in another level of bureaucracy to get this department to work, the Action Group, and again I want to say that I am not condemning any of the people involved in the Action Group. They are good people, good people. I am not questioning that at all. I am just questioning the additional level of bureaucracy and I

MR. LUSH: might say also that I found the minister's staff to be very co-operative people. The people who are working in the authority, I found them to be very co-operative people, people who will supply you information very quickly. No complaints about that operation at all, about the people there, no complaints about the people in the Action Group. I just find it offensive that we have had to allocate so much of public dollars just to advertise this department, people with no authority at all, just people to tell you where to go.

April 20, 1978

Tape 1231

EC - 1

MR. PECKFORD: It was not set up just for Rural Development.

MR. LUSH: Right, I know what it was set up for.

MR. PECKFORD: It was set up for all avenues of government (inaudible) to direct people (inaudible).

MR. LUSH: That is right. And I find it a tremendous waste of public funds that we have had to do that, to set up an Action Group to tell people where to go. And how many other levels of bureaucracy can we expect? Can we expect these levels to be added on to the Department of Fisheries so that we can inform the fishermen as to what programmes there are there? Can we expect another level of bureaucracy, another Action Group to be attached to the Forestry and Agriculture Department?

MR. PECKFORD: Listen to what I just said. The Action Group, you know, and you are a reasonable man -

MR. LUSH: I know exactly what the Action Group is for -

MR. PECKFORD: It is not attached to any particular department, it is for all government.

MR. LUSH: - it is to advertise the Rural Development basically -

MR. PECKFORD: No!

MR. LUSH: - and to tell people where to go when they are looking for certain funds -

MR. PECKFORD: For everything.

MR. LUSH: - but basically it serves the purposes of Rural Development.

MR. PECKFORD: No! It is for the other departments just as much.

MR. LUSH: And, Mr. Chairman, it is an atrocity, an unspeakable atrocity that we have had to lay on this level of bureaucracy to advertise what programmes that there are available in this Province to the people who call this famous number, 737-3800, and to be directed to the FDBD or the Rural Development people, you know, it is unnecessary, completely unnecessary. But let me assure the hon. members that the people of this Province know what Action Group is all about. Nobody was conned, nobody was taken in by this Action Group. Initially there were some people who thought this was a new group set up to give out monies, but it did not take them very long to find out what this group was, an unnecessary addition to government, another level of bureaucracy.

But, Mr. Chairman, again I want for the minister to provide me with an answer to this question inasmuch as he can, how long it takes to process applications. And as I have said before, I realize that it varies, depending on the nature of the application. but there must be some average time, there must be some time frame that people can expect to have their applications processed. In my own district, Mr. Chairman, I do not know exactly how many people have applied to the Rural Development Authority, but I see industries there as I look down through that have been carried on in my own district, logging and sawmilling, as is boat building. Some of the best boat building in this Province is now going on in Glovertown, some great boats being built there, and I think it is going to develop into a great industry. Also there is great potential there with fishing. We have one plant in

MR. LUSH: Salvage, but in the last few years, and I have mentioned this to the Minister of Fisheries in correspondence several times, - that there is a rejuvenation of the fishing with respect to herring in the Musgravetown area, several tons of herring caught each year. And this is an area for expansion and an area for further development.

One further question I want to ask the minister, Mr. Chairman, in looking down through this group is the one under orthodontic - is that orthodontic or orthodontic? - Orthodontic is it not?

AN HON. MEMBER: Orthodontic.

MR. LUSH: Orthodontic - it is orthodontic here - anyway, orthodontic appliance. Now, Mr. Chairman, I fail to see how this particular item or whatever we want to call it - not an industry certainly; well, I suppose it is an industry, one of the most lucrative in Newfoundland. And I cannot see how we can use the public dollars of this Province to finance, as I have said, the most lucrative business in this Province, the orthodontic business - ripping off people right, left and center, no competition, Mr. Chairman, that field is wide open, and how the government can bring this into its regulations to see fit to allocate funds for orthodontic appliance -

AN HON. MEMBER: Where is it?

MR. LUSH: It does not say, it just says 'orthodontic appliance' and it is labeled as manufacturing.

AN HON. MEMBER: Which company is it?

MR. LUSH: It does not say, just one,

Mr. Lush: And the capital cost was \$5,720, and the amount of the grant was \$2,079.

A further question to the minister, are these outright grants or are they loans? These figures here that I am now quoting from. The number - what do we call it? Home Industries Division Resume. All of these labelled there, are they grants or loans?

MR. PECKFORD: The first two pages are RDA, which are loans, the last page is industrial incentive grants.

MR. LUSH: So these are grants that I am looking at. This orthodontic appliance was a grant, an outright grant.

AN HON. MEMBER: It was not a grant, it was a gift.

MR. LUSH: A gift of \$2,079.

MR. PECKFORD: That is right.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is it insurance or what?

MR. LUSH: This orthodontic - if I am - I assume it is for orthodontic work because that is what it said. And this \$2,079 was the profit was gotten back, this grant was gotten back, Sir, in less than a week, if the fees that I pay my orthodontist are any indication of what other people pay. I disagree with this. I see no reason for this particular item to qualify. When I find people in my own district getting disqualified on genuine industries, sawmilling, logging - even though there are people who have qualified, there are several who have not, and genuine cases as well - and when I see this orthodontic thing in there, Mr. Chairman, I find it very, very offensive.

A further question to the minister. I mentioned about sawmills. I would like to know what the status of the sawmill in Gambo, one of the most modern sawmills in Eastern Canada, I expect, when working to its peak level, can employ upwards to eighty people and it has been lying idle now for the past two years right in the centre of the best forest, the best wood in Newfoundland, lying idle with many men there who can operate that sawmill, all down through Bonavista Bay, the hon. member's district from Bonavista North, my own district in Terra Nova, several people there who can operate that

Mr. Lush: sawmill and make it a viable venture, just a hundred yards away from that sawmill, the one that I am referring to in Gambo Pond, is a sawmill being operated at a very successful operation, and this one can operate as well. I am just wondering what the situation is on this particular sawmill, whether the minister has any plans to try and get that sawmill activated, to try and get someone to take it over, and to get the thing into production so that we can employ the people who badly need employment in that area. And as I have said before, it can employ upwards to eighty people when it is working at peak production, and there is no better time, Mr. Chairman, to get that sawmill operating than now, when unemployment is so high and, as I said before, right in the centre of prime forest, and yet we have the mill there lying idle, lying idle. And I think this is a terrible thing that that mill should be lying there idle when so many men are there who can operate the thing successfully, and when the timber is available.

So I would like for the minister when he rises to speak on the debate that he will address himself to these few questions that I have directed to him.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The hon. Minister of Rural Development.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Chairman -

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if you could rise the Committee for a minute.

On motion that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Chairman of Committees.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report having passed items of expenditure under Heading XIX, Municipal Affairs and Housing, and have directed me to report having made further progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received and adopted,
Committee ordered to sit again presently.

MR. SPEAKER: It being five o'clock I now inform members of three matters for debate at five-thirty and they are in the order in which I received notice of them. First, notice given by the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) arising from a question asked the hon. Minister of Industrial Development; and the subject matter, the establishment of the Buchans Development Corporation. The second matter, notice given by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) arising from a question asked the hon. Premier; and the subject matter, percentage increases as opposed to across the board increases in the public service. And the third matter, notice given by the hon. member for LaPoile arising from a question asked the hon. Minister of Mines; and Energy and the subject matter, the use of the government aircraft. These are the matters for debate at five-thirty.

On motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! 1601-01.

The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Chairman, I would like to get an opportunity to -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKMAN: The last speaker was the member for Terra Nova.

MR. NEARY: The minister was speaking when the Committee rose.

MR. PECKFORD: Would the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) on two counts, one - keep that opening in the front of his head closed, and two - when he does open it, could he please say something intelligent.

MR. NEARY: Is that becoming -

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Chairman, there are a number of questions that have been asked by a number of hon. gentlemen that I would like to respond to before we get too further along in the debate so that then it becomes somewhat out of date and I have to deal with matters that came up by other speakers. So I would just like to take a few minutes to go through some of the things that have been said.

I fully appreciate the remarks of the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush). I thought he tried to address himself in a very reasonable and rational way to some of the issues. Now, Mr. Chairman, the one point that really bothers me in some of the comments, both from the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) and also the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) is questioning the existence of the department. Now, Mr. Chairman, in my view I do not see how you could do the kinds of things that we are trying to do with the development associations - helping them plan new projects, get into new experimental projects; to bring along, if you will, or educate or train individuals in development associations into proper rural development planning. This kind of area that I tried to stress when I started my remarks that we are getting into. I do not see how you could do that through a particular department of fisheries, which has nothing to do only to try to bring fish plants on stream, if you will, to give it the raw basic thing I am trying to get across, or in forestry, where the great emphasis would be on say sawmills or pulpwood contractors and so on. I think you need the visibility that a department, and the strength that a department brings to that kind of development procedure so it becomes the - it expedites all the projects which are in rural Newfoundland. I think if you had it the other way you would be getting into all kinds of problems because you would have, for example, a group or a man or whatever in,

MR. PECKFORD: say, take Gambo, for example, or any place, coming to the Department of Forestry and Agriculture, talking about a sawmill operation, so many jobs in Gambo. You might have somebody else coming to start a little fish processing - I know Gambo is a bad example for fish - but you can get lots of areas of Newfoundland where three or four different kinds of projects may be viable by either individuals or businesses or the development association, and if they are done individually through different departments you are going to find a whole, from a very practical point of view, a lot of duplication that is totally unnecessary. Now you get your rural development specialist, or whatever you want to call him, in Gander who will go out

MR. DINN: and who will help that individual not only make out his application and bring him along but will contact the Department of Fisheries for him, or the Department of Forestry and Agriculture for him, or help him through the Crown lands process or whatever and hence you get a concentration of developing in a more rational way the rural parts of the Province taking into consideration all the resources in that area by one or two people or by one department. And in that sense I think a Department of Rural Development is extremely valuable and can continue to play a very valuable role. We are moving out of, as I tried to indicate in my opening remarks, out of just being project orientated for the sake of being project orientated, for the sake of just creating a couple of seasonal or permanent jobs, but getting more policy orientated to bear on the process, the region as a whole. If you take, for example, the Green Bay area which I know so well, the development association, with the people in the Department of Rural Development who deal with development associations together are not looking at just tourism, they are not just looking at fisheries, they are just not looking at forestry or agriculture but they are trying to bring it all together so that then you can get a developmental strategy or plan for the next five or ten years on how it should be developed. And as individuals come in then to the Department of Rural Development, even by-passing the development association, sometimes for example; or lots of times they will be led back to that whole idea. "Well now just one second, John Jones, the development association and the department have done a survey on this fish resource here in Halls Bay and even though you get quite a few turbot out of your nets there is really not enough there to get into the kind of turbot processing that you say you want to get into. But here is what we think you should be directing your energies to, your entrepreneurial skills to, here is where you should be putting your risk capital and here is how we would like to help you and it can only be done if you have a sort of, if you will a

MR. DLNN: clearing house, again I am just groping for the right kind of words to indicate what I am trying to say and why I think a Department of Rural Development is absolutely, is not only necessary now but it is absolutely necessary because otherwise you are going to have ad hoc development which is so indicative of the governmental process when you have the categories of the Department of Fisheries and the Department of F and A and never the twain shall meet, They have their little games to play, if you will, and the fisheries have their little games to play and it is difficult to co-ordinate it all together, to insure that that area, because that is what we are talking about, we are talking about rural development in areas in Newfoundland and bringing it down to the regional level of smallest possible, like, for example, that development associations do. And even then you are into trouble because the North shore of Green Bay is not the same as the South shore of Green Bay, the North part of the Southern Labrador is not the same as the South part of Southern Labrador and so you have different resources that are brought to bear on how you want to develop it and so therefore on that plane, in that way the Department of Rural Development is playing a very, very major role. And as we get more and more into that planning process so that we have within the development associations themselves and the regional offices that kind of information pool that is necessary, because the guy in the fisheries will be most interested in the more technical aspects of a fish plant or fish processing plant. It is going to be hard to get on stream in a resource department that is directly concerned about one resource, the kind of planning thing that is needed to bring the guy along in the right and proper fashion. What have we done, for example, and how would you organize this? One of the major things that has been done in the last year for the development associations is a major vegetable storage facility in Green Bay for example, through the Green Bay Agricultural Society and the Green

MR. DINN: Bay Economic Development Association for all the farmers. It is a planned facility, so one farmer did not come in and say, I want an ARDA grant through the Department of Agriculture or the Farm Loan Board to have a storage facility on my farm; another one goes in and does the same thing and you have an ad hoc kind of situation which cannot work with the kind of acreage we are talking about, with the kind of capital outlay that will be needed by each farmer. He would not be able to sell his vegetables and compete with the New Brunswick and PEI spuds come December or January, but if you have a vegetable storage centrally located where all the farmers can feed into it, you cannot do that if you go the other route because it becomes too specific and too particular to allow the kind of planning exercise that is necessary and hence, to use a specific example, that is how I would justify it, through the development associations and also through the kind of programmes which bring to bear all the information from all the other departments.

Now, Mr. Chairman, on the second point as it relates to the Action Group,

MR. PECKFORD: the Action Group was not set up as an adjunct to the Department of Rural Development, It was set up, as the Premier said in his statement when it was established, to assist individuals around the Province who have some kind of an idea but they are not sure where they are going. It might be a guy who wants to set a grocery store and he might not be aware of the offices of FBDB that are now located around the Province, and a phone call might only consist of telling him, You have an FBDB in your area, you can go there and I will call or whatever. So it deals with all government departments provincially and federally too, or whatever other information can be given to assist that individual in getting to the source to find out whether, in fact, he can apply for a certain programme or get some proper information or whatever. So it is not an adjunct, or a part of, or just orientated towards the Department of Rural Development, but it is orientated toward all government bureaucracies so that the individual in rural Newfoundland by calling this number collect can get information quickly and get answers quickly - yes, no, yes, no, kind of thing.

Very often individuals will contemplate, "I do not know if I do qualify or not. I do not think I will bother or perhaps I will." If he phones he might an answer yes or no; Yes, you should apply; no, I do not think you should; it is better for you to go here or somewhere else. And not only that, it is not a new bureaucracy. Most of the individuals in the Action Group are civil servants, are taken from the departments themselves. There is one in there from Rural Development, Forestry and Agriculture and all the way along. Only the director is a new position, if you will, or another person. So you have some continuity because you have people in the group from the given department who have a knowledge of the various sectors of government, of the provincial government especially.

MR. PECKFORD: So is not just an adjunct to the Department of Rural Development but it trying to do a job of leading people in the right direction on all fronts, for all governments, both provincial and federal and sometimes perhaps, even municipal.

Mr. Chairman, that is where that stands as far as I am concerned, and I think it is doing some good work. We have almost doubled our loans now. Each week or each second week now we are having more applications processed for that month than we did in a corresponding month last year, up almost 100 per cent. So it seems like it is working, and it is going to take some time to really see if it is or not, it is going to take more time to really see that, but we will soon know.

Now, Mr. Chairman, some people said, Look at the record - the hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) - there are no industries created and so on. Every hon. member in this House - I have lists here as long as my arm of little industries - the hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir knows them - little industries that have been created around this Province both sawmills, pulpwood contractors, manufacturing, all around the Province that have created tens and tens and hundreds of jobs. This past year 400 jobs have been created.

MR. NEARY: Give us an example.

MR. PECKFORD: The hon. member knows as many examples as I know.

MR. NEARY: Well, give us some.

MR. PECKFORD: All kinds of them.

MR. NEARY: On the list.

MR. PECKFORD: All kinds of them. There has been some real good pulpwood activities in, for example, Baie Verte - White Bay in the last couple of years financed

MR. PECKFORD: through -

MR. NEARY: Give us an example.

AN HON. MEMBER: Baie Verte - White Bay.

MR. PECKFORD: I know four or five individuals. I am not going to mention their names. I am not going to mention their names, you can forget that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Chairman, may I be heard in silence, please?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!
The hon. member wishes to be heard in silence.
The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. SIMMONS: Taxidermy.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Chairman, may I be heard in silence, please? The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) is interrupting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!
The hon. member, I think, has indicated quite clearly that he wished to be heard in silence.
The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. So talking about that the hon. member for Bellevue does not know any industries that have been created at all - as a matter of fact, in the past year there has been \$73,000 given to individuals and enterprises in the district of Bellevue.

MR. NEARY: How much?

MR. PECKFORD: \$73,000 creating twenty-three new jobs, permanent jobs. Twenty-three new jobs, you see. So here is the hon. member for Bellvue, does not even know his own district because there is now \$70,000 or \$80,000

April 20, 1978, Tape 1285, Page 4 -- apb

MR. PECKFORD: new dollars to create new
jobs in the district of Bellevue. That is a pretty good
record, that is

April 20, 1978

Tape 1286

DW - I

MR. B. PECKFORD: new jobs, that is beautiful, new jobs, that is wonderful new jobs, that is the kind of jobs that the member for LaPoile does not want to hear about. He has just got to keep talking over there now because he does not like hearing about all those new jobs, 3,000 new jobs since the program started - 3,000 ! - 400 last year. The hon. member for LaPoile does not want to hear it, he does not want to hear about all those new jobs. He does not like that. He wants us to see just how many failures there were. He does not want to look on the positive side of things. It is just too bad.

MR. NEARY: How many in LaPoile?

MR. B. PECKFORD: There are a number of questions the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) asked about Rayo Forest Products. I do not know if he is within earshot, if he can hear me now, if he is just outside the door or not. I think the Rayo Forest Products, the sawmill at Gamba was financed by the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation and, as I understand it, there are moves underfoot right now - I was talking about it yesterday, as a matter of fact - to try to reactive that mill. But I think, from what I can understand, there have been some problems, there was some problem with the design of the mill, believe it or not, the design of the mill. It was designed in such a way as to make things somewhat more inefficient than they should be,

and that the product coming out was a fairly expensive product, a good product but very expensive. And it was a bad design on that plant was one of the problems, and there is some thought now, there are some individuals around who have spent a long time in the sawmilling industry who are interested I think in getting into that facility if it is changed around, if it is changed.

MR. NEARY: Who designed it?

MR. B. PECKFORD: I do not know where they got the design. I do not know off the top of my head. I can find out for the hon. member. But all I am trying to do is answer the question now for the member for Terra Nova that there is some interest being shown in reactivating that facility, that the design leaves something to be desired, and we are looking into trying to get that moving.

MR. B. PECKFORD: Right now, as a lot of people know, the lumber industry is a sort of a boom or bust kind of thing: one year it is up, the next year it is down. We have brought in a program of sawmill assistance to help some of the smaller sawmill operators through the bust period, but right now in the Province there is a high, high demand for lumber, very high demand. Most sawmill operators who are into the 2 million to 3 million board feet, a year thing have told me that they just cannot keep up with the demand and that they are trying to expand their operations. It is a fairly lucrative business right now. This time next year it might not be so good, but right now it is real good and on the Rayo Forest Products there are moves underfoot to try to help that situation out and to get it back on stream again.

Mr. Chairman, in the hon. member's district, for example, Terra Nova, I think there has been over \$86,000 worth of projects there in the past year, eight different projects which created a few jobs. I do not know how many jobs that works out to be - fourteen or fifteen new jobs. So when you go right around the Province you can see just what this means. Now the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and his ongoing - the only thing that the hon. member for LaPoile can contribute to this debate, and if you look - somebody could just look at the way this debate has gone so far, the hon. member for LaPoile his only point, the only point that I can get out of it: "Give me the names. Stop hiding things. Stop trying to cover up so called very questionable activities." That is the only thing he can contribute to this debate. He was not a tiny bit interested at all in finding out, or contributing to the debate and how we should develop rural Newfoundland, whether some of the programs should be changed or tailored in a different way - no, no! He was not concerned about that at all. The only thing he can contribute to the debate was to just condemn, to be negative and to try to indicate through innuendo that we were doing something less than being honest, which is totally untrue. As I have indicated, if the hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) who I understand is the gentleman on the other side who speaks on rural development matters, and he and I, if he wants to get

April 20, 1978

Tape 1286

DW - 3

MR. B. PECKFORD: together with me in the next few days in the weeks to come to go over the projects, I would be only too happy to talk to him about it and to show him the names of the people who have received grants and Rural Development Authority loans. I think that is the way, the proper way it should be done rather than just throwing the names out across the floor of the House so some hon. members opposite-not all of them, there are some gentleman opposite who would use the information in a very honorable and responsible way, there are other members who would use it in less than an hon. way and hence it is for that reason that we feel that it would not be in the best

MR. PECKFORD: interest of the applicants to release that kind of information. So, Mr. Chairman, I do not know if there was anything else there of any consequence.

The hon. member for Bellvue is trying to justify the resettlement programme. I think the whole point there is that in most instances I think there are places where it did work to some degree - in most instances, in the majority of cases it was a fatal blunder, and it was a blunder that was imposed upon the people of Newfoundland by the people from outside that the Leader of the Opposition brought in here, this is the present Leader of the Opposition. I hope he participates in this debate because I would like to hear his - has he been converted? Has the Leader of the Opposition been converted? Can the hon. member for Bellevue convert the Leader of the Opposition? Can the hon. member for Terra Nova, who seems to have a feel for rural development in this Province, can he convert his leader to believing that there is something good about rural Newfoundland, that the way to go about rural Newfoundland is not to move people out but to develop the resources where people are?

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chariman, I have been wanting to get into this. It is my understanding the minister only has twenty minutes. I watched the clock when he got up. He started at five o'clock exactly, he has now gone on for twenty-two minutes and I would suggest that somebody else be given an opportunity to have a few words.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, to that point of order. If hon. gentlemen will recall at five o'clock sharp, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SIMMONS: Two minutes to five.

MR. HICKMAN: - Mr. Speaker took the
Chair as he is obliged to do -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. SIMMONS: I could not get up (Inaudible).

MR. HICKMAN: - and he was there for at
least three minutes, and I hope the hon. gentleman from
Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir is not questioning the Chair.

MR. WHITE: Time is up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!
For hon. member's information,
at the Table the times are kept from the angle that we can
see the clock here and I would like to assure hon. members
that the hon. minister is still within his time although
very close to the expiration time.

MR. PECKFORD: Once again, Mr. Chairman,
we have seen a great display by the member for Burgeo -
Bay d'Espoir who tries to pretend he knows it all and
ends up knowing nothing. Just once again a display of
utter ignorance by the hon. member on anything intelligent,
which is his wont for the last several years. I am some
happy, Mr. Chairman, to have the opportunity to say that
your ruling once again shows so clearly that the hon.
member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir personifies everything
that is not right about this House.

MR. SIMMONS: To a point of order, Mr.
Chairman. I could not agree more with the minister that
just about everything I have done in the last few years
have been daft and I want for the record to point out
that I hired the minister.

MR. PECKFORD: That is not a point of
order, sit down.

MR. SIMMONS: I hired the minister.

MR. PECKFORD: Sit down.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

I do not believe I have anything to rule on at the moment. I would point out to the hon. minister that his time has, in fact, elapsed.

MR. PECKFORD: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Every time in somebody's life when they do something right the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir has to -

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, he has reason to hurt and he is only hurting half as much as he is going to before we are finished with him over here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: The ministry of Mines and Energy is one where you cannot really see whether a fellow is doing a good job or not because he goes off once in a while to Calgary somewhere and then eventually comes back and tells you his version of what he said to the crowd up there. Or goes to Ottawa and tells you his version. But now we have him in a department, Mr. Chairman, where he is going to be exposed to the ordinary Newfoundlander, the kind of Newfoundlander who visited him in the last day or so -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: - and wanted a few minutes with him. I heard a brief summary of what went on in that meeting, and if you have never seen arrogance, Mr. Chairman, disguise yourself and get a meeting with his eminence. Get a meeting with him if you can.

MR. NEARY: His holiness.

MR. SIMMONS: Get a meeting with his eminence, his holiness, if you want to see arrogance at its best and worst. And now I am glad he is in a portfolio, Mr. Chairman, where he is going to be exposed, and that is the word,

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, exposed to the ordinary people of Newfoundland. Then they will judge from something other than press releases.

Mr. Chairman, he says, How should we develop rural Newfoundland? And he says my colleague from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has not given any suggestions. Well, we have a few, Mr. Chairman, and we said them. He might not have understood them but we have said them and here they are again. One, stop leading the people of Newfoundland down the garden path on this rural development programme.

MR. WHITE: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: That is number one, stop leading them down the garden path. All this talk about jobs. In 1974 was the last time we had a list of the people who had received loans for rural development purposes. Since that time the Opposition has identified publicly only three names, all Tory hacks, all political hacks, all former Tory candidates.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right!

MR. SIMMONS: There were hundreds of names on that list that we have never divulged. We do not want the names as such; we want the names only in the sense that we want to see where the projects are going and whether they are as sugary coated as the Minister of Rural Development says they are.

Now I have the list,

MR. SIMMONS:

the last one that the government had the courage to give to us up until January, 1974. There are hundreds of names, it seems to me, on this list. We have ever only referred to three. All three of them were Tory, P.C. hacks, every last one of them. And I submit, Mr. Chairman, that is why there is a freeze on these lists anymore.

Now, we heard in the last day or so, we talked about telephone bills and other things. We heard the Premier preaching about the public paid for it, so the public have a right to know. Where is that creed now, Mr. Chairman? Where is it now when we talk about rural development loans? Suddenly a need creed! How convenient! They want suggestions, Mr. Chairman, and my number one suggestion is one that we have been saying here for months but nobody seems to hear over there, stop leading the people of Newfoundland and Labrador down the garden path on this rural development programme. That is number one.

Number two, stop shipping off the taxpayers very scarce money to your buddies in Montreal, the P.R. crowd up there. Number three, we use no taxpayers money on Goldfarb, Mr. Chairman, no taxpayers money on Goldfarb.

MR. PECKFORD: I hope not.

MR. SIMMONS: The minister can keep hoping. But the minister and his clique, Mr. Chairman, his hon. clique have used the taxpayers money on their buddies in Montreal and on their contractor buddies here in St. John's. That is the third suggestion I have; stop lashing out your money, the taxpayers money without tenders to your contractor buddies in St. John's and in Mount Pearl, may I add, and in Mount Pearl. That is your third one, stop lashing out the money to your buddies.

MR. SIMMONS:

In short, Mr. Chairman, number four, practice what you preached in 1971 about no patronage and that kind of thing. And then we hear this business today about how the minister, the first day he is on the job almost, called in the civil servants, who have their own security to protect, Mr. Chairman - you cannot blame them if they did not rebel and walk out of the office because they have learned early to fear this administration. They have learned early what a diabolical crowd these fellows are and they have learned that they have a choice, to keep their jobs or stand up for their principles, and they cannot do both sometimes. That is the choice they have got. They learned that early from the former Minister of Rural Development, as we had read in the paper this morning, and as I have known for some time and others in this House have known for some time including the Premier.

AN HON. MEMBER: Public Works.

MR. SIMMONS: I want to talk about projects. We do not know them all, Mr. Chairman, but we know one.

AN HON. MEMBER: Got a leash?

MR. SIMMONS: The Premier would like to see me on a leash very much.

AN HON. MEMBER: You are all dog.

MR. SIMMONS: Ah, ha! Mr. Chairman, I know this is a tender subject for the Premier, Mr. Chairman, when I talk about taxidermy, when I refresh his memory on taxidermy, the Bishop's Falls - Bay d'Espoir intersection, a piece of land that nobody else could get, development control would not give it to anybody else, and then development control got an instruction from somebody to give it to a friend for a taxidermy business right on a main intersection, a protected highway.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Is the Premier going to tell me I am on a leash? He should be on a leash.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

Does the hon. member wish -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, the Premier will be stuffed in good time. He will be stuffed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, it is not quite five-thirty yet. I have the floor. It is not five-thirty.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

I was going to request of the hon. member -

MR. SIMMONS: What a guy! What a guy!

MR. CHAIRMAN: - if he would wish to raise the Committee as we only have about a half a minute left.

MR. NEARY: Well, will the hon. Chair recognize the hon. gentleman after supper, at eight o'clock?

MR. SIMMONS: Okay, Mr. Chairman, I realize it is a very tender subject for the Premier. I will tell him some more details at eight o'clock. I will yield to the government House leader if he wishes to rise the Committee.

MR. NEARY: No, you rise it 'Rodger', you rise it.

MR. SIMMONS: I move the Committee rise, -

MR. NEARY: And not report.

MR. SIMMONS: - report progress and so forth, whatever the Chairman wants to say.

On motion that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, carried. Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred and made some progress and request leave to sit again.

On motion report received and adopted. Committee ordered to sit again presently.

April 20, 1978

Tape 1288

IB-4

MR. SPEAKER: It being five-thirty a motion to adjourn is deemed to be before the House. The first subject matter for debate, the establishment of a Buchans Development Corporation.

The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, in the five minutes that I am allowed, I want to bring to the attention of the House, and to all of Newfoundland for that matter, an unbelievable, incredible situation. And I will read, Mr. Speaker, a question that was asked in this House yesterday - asked by me with regard to the Minister of Industrial Development insofar as the government's activity as it relates to the recommendations of the Buchans Task Force report as it relates to industrial development in Buchans to this point. And the question specifically, Mr. Speaker, was, Would the minister indicate if they, the government, have pinpointed any one particular development that the government is prepared to fund or pursue? Can the minister name for the House one recommendation of the Buchans Task Force of all the possible recommendations, one possible development, industrial or otherwise, that could have been undertaken or has been undertaken to shore up the Buchans economy when the mine closes?

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: Can the minister indicate to the House if there is any one specific undertaking by way of development that he is aware of that his department is looking into and putting in place in Buchans or in the Buchans area? And the answer, Mr. Speaker, every member of the House, the press of Newfoundland should listen to this, Mr. Speaker, no, because that I feel, is up to the people, that is what they are working on. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Forestry must have felt like passing through the floor when he heard the hon. the Minister of Industrial Development say that. I was present as a private citizen at a meeting when that gentleman came in and set up the Buchans Task Force report and he was specifically asked,

MR. FLIGHT: 'When the work of this task force is complete, when the recommendations are made, given the situation we are in, can the minister guarantee us that the government will take this report seriously and implement his recommendations?' And the minister said, 'If I did not believe that I would not be here.'

AN HON. MEMBER: So what?

MR. FLIGHT: Well, if that is the case the minister should not be here right now, because, Mr. Speaker, do not the members of this House realize that having said this report was submitted on June 6, 1976, almost two years, having said on that report for two years, only eleven months left before the total, absolute, complete collapse of the Buchans economy, that this government have not even acknowledged one recommendation, have not undertaken any industrial development, have not set out to pursue, to look into the possibility of implementing one of those recommendations? Two hundred thousand dollars, forty to fifty people involved, resource people from the administration, seven dedicated people from Buchans - thirty-five or forty from Buchans dedicated, and not one recommendation, and the town of Buchans closing, shutting down, the economy gone - 500 men who have contributed for fifty years, a whole town - and four or five more towns being adversely affected, and the minister stands up on behalf of the Government of Newfoundland, saying that having spent \$200,000, having said on that report for two years, knowing that the Buchans economy is in absolute jeopardy; unless there is a miracle in the mining industry it is gone, it is over. And they have not moved on one recommendation. And to add insult to injury, Mr. Speaker, the minister then went on to say that we are depending on the committee - he is referring to the Buchans Action

MR. FLIGHT: Committee, a committee of dedicated, concerned people which was set up out of frustration. That committee came as a result of absolute and total frustration in Buchans because people could not see anything happening, they could not see any proof that government was involved. It was set up to put pressure on government to implement the recommendations of the Task Force report, and now the minister has the gall - and he knows that that committee who are simply dedicated people in Buchans who are concerned about their town, concerned about the ability of their fellow workers, themselves and their families to continue to live there, is a committee that again, and I quote, 'was set up out of frustration because of the lack of any evidence that the government was concerned.' And now the minister says it is up to that committee! They use the Buchans Task Force report for a year and a half, they sit on the report for two years, and now they are going to use the Buchans Action Committee to slough off their responsibility to the people of Buchans. That committee was put in place, Mr. Speaker, to put pressure on the government, to put pressure on me, the member, to see that I did a half decent job on their behalf. They have no funds. Is the minister going to fund them now that he gives them the responsibility to determine what industries will be set up? Is he going to fund them so that they can come in to St. John's and talk to the resource people? It is incredible, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member's time has expired.

April 20, 1978

Tape 1289

EC - 4

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, with your approval - and it is a coincidence, I met the gentleman in the elevator long after I had submitted this request to debate - I would like to welcome to the House the Chairman of the Buchans Action Committee, Mr. Don Head, and his colleague, Mr. John Budden.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

DR. FARRELL: Mr. Speaker, when I took over this resource policy group a short time ago, I had the honour of meeting with the Buchans Task Force, all its members, with the resource policy group, and at that time we had a wide ranging discussion concerning this interim report and the potential for the Buchans area and it was decided at that time to set up a Buchans Action Committee, which we have received the names of since and which we are hoping to meet in the very near future.

Now when the hon. member says that nothing has been done or nothing has been entered into, when he asked me that question, was there any actual one item in that report that had to be implemented at this time, I said no and that was quite correct. Quite a good deal of work has gone on in, for instance, Forestry and Agriculture for one, in the possibility of the sawmill area, a possible road system for the sawmill, and negotiations with the Price people which was decided upon at that time for the possibilities of establishing a larger sawmill in the area; and if you remember from the original task force, there were high potential areas mentioned such as sawmilling. I mentioned Bruit which some work has been done on. At that time it was told the Buchans Task Force that the resource policy committee, and particularly the Department of Industrial Development, will be establishing an industrial development officer specifically to deal with the Action Committee, set up by the Buchans Task Force and hopefully, when we get this meeting off the ground this will be established. There are many areas of high potential as I stated already.

One other area was the Christmas tree industry and many other areas. What I meant by saying, from an industrial development point of view, that normally we look to and hope for and expect and are delighted to help anybody who comes to Industrial Development with a good feasible project or idea and only in that context that I say it is up to the people. We know there are lots of

DR. FARRELL: fine people in the Buchans area where there is a lot of expertise, not alone in the mining industry, I know that seventy-one per cent of the people of Buchans depend on the mine and I know there is a short period left.

MR. FLIGHT: One month.

DR. FARRELL: I know that very well, Sir, and since taking over this we have expedited as much as possible all these particular areas that we are interested in. As I said, we will be arranging in the very near future this meeting to discuss in detail with the Action Group all the areas which were pointed out in this special sub-committee report.

As I said, the development corporation, or the Action Group will have appointed an industrial development officer in the very near future, specifically whose work will entail the expediting of any possible projects which can be affected in the Buchans area. And I understand the hon. member's concern. He has expressed it many times, especially since I have been in the House in this session. I missed a bit of it last year. And he has always, every opportunity, expressed his deep concern for the people there and for that I admire him and certainly, as far as I am concerned, since taking over this particular resource policy group, which will be working closely now, hopefully, on a regular basis with the Buchans Action Group and hopefully I will be able to set that meeting up and the hon. member I hope will be able to attend that meeting and get things moving as rapidly as possible. I hope the answer is satisfactory.

MR. SPEAKER: The second item for debate, the subject matter is percentage increases as opposed to straight across the board increases in the public service.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

April 20, 1978

Tape No. 1290

NM - 3

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a C.D. Howe Research Institute study is among the latest to state that despite DREE programmes, the years of AIB restraints, and Canada's massive social security programmes, the rich are still getting richer and the poor poorer. Mr. Speaker, the gap between the haves and the have nots and the have less is widening and I am certain that

Mr. Neary: with the phasing out of the Anti-Inflation Board we are going to see the gap widened still further.

Mr. Speaker, I am not an economist, I am not an expert in this field, but I do believe that in simple common sense thinking on the problem that I see an opportunity for Newfoundland to set an example to the rest of Canada, and show that the gap between the haves and have nots cannot not only be held but probably lessened. Here, Mr. Speaker, is my thought; no matter what the percentage increases permitted in salaries and wages, the high paid executive profits at the expense of the low paid rank and file worker. If a deputy minister, for example, in our own Provincial Public Service, on the public payroll is given a 10 per cent increase on a \$45,000 salary, his gain is \$4,500. If a senior clerk in his department gets the same 10 per cent increase on a \$9,000 salary, his gain is only \$900, and the gap between the two has been widened by \$3,600.

Mr. Speaker, if each had been granted an increase of a flat \$1,000 there would not only have been no increase in the gap, but because of the federal and provincial income tax structure the gap would really have been narrowed. Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that Treasury Board, in future wage and salary negotiations with all people who are dependant on the Public Treasury for their salaries, for remuneration, deal only in terms of flat uniform dollar increase and refused to be trapped into the unfair and unjust percentage increases upon which we can blame so much of the inflation and economic hardships of the ordinary people of Newfoundland and Labrador. And let us hope, Sir, that the government will adopt this policy and that the private sector will follow their example.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to reply to the question or the comments on behalf of the hon. the Premier. First of all, I might point out that the total public service in the Province of Newfoundland is unionized, except for the very high level management

Mr. Maynard: personnel. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is impossible for Treasury Board or government to set a definitive policy of either -

MR. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On a point of order.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, certainly the minister is one who can address himself very intelligently to the subject of dollar increases. But for the record, who are we hearing from now? Is it the President of Treasury Board?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: For the record, Mr. Chairman, it is important to know. This is a good debate, and I would like to know as a member of the House who it is we are hearing from?

AN HON. MEMBER: We are supposed to hear from the Premier.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, yes. But I can understand the Premier is not here, Mr. Speaker, But is it the President of Treasury Board we are hearing from now? And if so, the Premier has got some apologies to make to the House for misinforming the House last Friday on the subject.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: I am not sure if there is a matter to rule on. It has been established in our precedent that another minister or any minister may reply on behalf of another, and indeed that a parliamentary assistant reply on behalf of a minister. So it is not out of order, even though the question was asked to someone else, it is not out of order for the hon. the minister to reply.

MR. SIMMONS: No, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps Mr. Speaker misunderstood my point of order. I am not objecting to the minister who was standing a moment ago replying. Mr. Speaker in addressing him, in recognizing him, referred to him as the President of Treasury Board, and I wonder if that was a slip of the tongue or indeed what title he now holds and in what capacity he is now addressing the House?

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

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

MR. PECKFORD: I mean, this is absolutely foolish for the hon. the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) to get on in such a manner as this. A minister on this side of the House has been delegated obviously by the Premier to respond to a question that is now on this part of the proceedings. And obviously the hon. minister is expressing governmental policy on the question asked, number one.

Number two, everybody knows except the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir that the hon. gentleman happens to be President of the Treasury Board as well as having other responsibilities. Now usually if there is going to be a question on matters such as salary increases and so on, is it not natural that if the President of Treasury Board is present that he would be the one logically to answer the question and that is what he is doing. The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir, you know, is using indergarten tactics in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, for the edification of the hon. member I would like to inform him that I am Minister of Forestry and Agriculture still, president of the Treasury Board, President of the Council and Chairman of the Committee on MUN's affairs as well. Now the policy of the government of the Province of Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, in regards to salary increases, whether they be a flat across the board rate or a percentage rate, is of course dictated by collective bargaining. We cannot and neither should we because of the fact that all of our employees are unionized, dictate or try to dictate to the union that they should accept one or the other but it is a matter that is worked out across the collective bargaining table. I might point out that in most cases if not all cases where collective agreements are signed while most of them are on a percentage increase basis there is always a provision in there for a certain minimum amount which takes care somewhat the lower -

MR. NEARY: The gap is still widening.

MR. MAYNARD: I agree with the hon. member for LaPoile that the gap does widen, but the trend seems to be in all collective bargaining or collective agreements that unions who represent employees will ask for certain percentage increases. Sometimes they will vary, depending on the rate scale of the persons involved, but not too often. It is usually a certain percentage. They will of course negotiate into the collective agreements a certain basic minimum that can be received within that. So the policy of the government is dictated by a collective bargaining process and is not the policy that is passed down by an order in council. There is nothing we can do about that except over the bargaining table.

MR. SPEAKER: The third subject matter refers to the use of the government aircraft.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, last year in this hon. House it was revealed, Sir, that the Director of Air Services used the government aircraft to go down to Port au Choix, I think it was, to get his flippers, to bring

MR. NEARY: a meal of flippers, not a meal, to bring back a year's supply of flippers. The Minister of Manpower can confirm because the gentleman was responsible for transportation at the time. When I put the question to the hon. gentleman, lo and behold! the whole House was shocked in the afternoon when the minister came back with the information that the Director of Air Services had abused his privilege and he and the president of the development corporation had indeed used helicopters and government aircraft to get their year's supply of flippers.

We also know, Sir, that the Minister of Tourism when he was Minister of Transportation used helicopters to get down to his district down in Bonavista, an abuse of a privilege. We also know, Sir, that the Minister of Industrial Development makes extensive use of the government aircraft not only within the province but outside the province, as I made reference to recently, in one case violated the criminal code of Canada by transporting aboard the government aircraft an illegal weapon. We also, Sir, know that the Minister of Mines and Energy has abused his privilege. I was standing in the lobby of the Mount Peyton Hotel in Grand Falls one day when the hon. gentleman came down in a helicopter after being flown out to Gander aboard the government aircraft and took a helicopter from Gander down to Grand Falls to speak to a service club, the most expensive dinner in the history of Newfoundland. It cost the taxpayers about \$2,000 to get the hon. gentleman down there.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, I was -

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order has come up. The hon. minister

MR. MORGAN: A point of order, yes. The hon. gentleman mentioned my name in his comments in regards to, and he used the term, "illegal" use of the helicopters in travelling to my district of Bonavista South. The use of helicopters by me as the Minister of Transportation in different parts of the province was used strictly and solely for

MR. MORGAN: government business. On many occasions I found myself visiting parts of the Bonavista Peninsula accompanied by officials of the Department of T and C -

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

MR. MORGAN: Accompanied by officials of the Department of Transportation and Communications on official government business. Mr. Speaker, the point I am making is the statement was made

MR. MORGAN:

that I, as one minister, used the government helicopter services illegally. And I want, Mr. Speaker, for that statement to be retracted because I did not use government helicopters illegally.

MR. SPEAKER: On the specific point, an allegation of illegality, in my opinion that is unparliamentary and should be withdrawn.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order, Sir. Your Honour may want to check Hansard but I did not use that term, Your Honour. The hon. gentleman is merely daydreaming, Sir. I did not use that word.

MR. SPEAKER: Fine. Then we will leave it at that. My decision is that to attribute illegality is out of order. When I see exactly what is written then I will know whether it was used.

MR. NEARY: Fair enough, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: It is out of order if it was used. If it was not used, well -

MR. NEARY: Fair enough. Democracy rules again.

Now, Sir, the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Peckford), Sir, abused his privilege in my opinion by taking advantage of the government aircraft and the helicopter to fly him down to speak to a service club. And I was there in the lobby when the helicopter landed. Now, Sir, today during the Oral Question Period we discovered that the President of the P.C. Association is being flown around the Province aboard the government aircraft. And he and the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) were flown to Gander last night in time to attend a P.C. District Association meeting down in Grand Falls - another misuse and abuse of the government aircraft. How many more examples do we need, Sir? How many examples do we need in order to shame this government into

MR. NEARY:

tabling the logs of the aircraft, of how it is being used. I beg your pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is no excuse. The hon. member now will get up and say, ah but the member for the Straits (Mr. Roberts) has used the government aircraft. Sir, that is no excuse for misusing and abusing government planes and cars and government facilities. That is no excuse, Sir. What they are trying to do is weasel their way out from under by saying, ah but one of the members on the Opposition side used the aircraft to go to his district. That is no excuse, Sir. The logs of this aircraft -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is time, Sir, to lay on the table of this House the logs of the aircraft showing the number of times it went aloft, the destination, the names of the people that it carried, how much booze was served on board, how much grub was put aboard of her and the purpose of the trips. I think, Sir, that in all fairness to the taxpayers of this Province that this information should be made available to this House and in so doing made available to the people of this Province. We have all kinds of scandals before us now. The fishery scandal, the car wreck scandal, the Health Science Complex and Carbonear Hospital scandal, the Public Works scandal, the t.v. set scandal, the hunting regulations have been violated and, Mr. Speaker, I am not talking about the Premier's television when I am talking about the coloured television scandal either. We are the verge now of another scandal with the aircraft. It is time, Sir, to put the information on the table of this House so that the people of this Province will be able to see how

MR. NEARY:

their facilities, how their aircraft and how the government cars are abused by ministers such as the Minister of Tourism (Mr. Morgan).

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

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, that is as despicable a display of human behaviour that I have ever seen, absolutely despicable and it is almost beneath contempt. One should never, even though I am going to, one should never, and I am thinking out loud, feeling out loud, that one should never even give the hon. gentleman the decency of a reply to such a scandalous display of so called human 'behaviour'.

I do not know if the hon. member opposite, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is speaking for all his colleagues on the other side. I do not care if he is or if he is not. I do not know if he is speaking for every last individual there. If he is, fine, you know. I just do not understand the motivation. I just do not understand the intent. I do not know what makes the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) tick. I have never been able to figure it out that this hon. gentleman can almost daily in this House, that this hon. gentleman can drag around in this House innuendo almost every day to try to smear individuals.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: That is a false statement, Sir. The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) does not use innuendo.

MR. NEARY: I go direct for the jugular, Sir, when I go. And I have the information and the facts to back it up. And

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. NEARY: I do not think that any member of this House has any right to impute motives of another hon. member as the hon. gentleman just did by getting personal, by using smear tactics, character assassination of the worse kind, and I believe if Your Honour does not check that it is going to lower the decorum of the this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, you know, -

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

MR. PECKFORD: - to that point of order. If I said anything that in any way breaks any rule, any procedure in this House I totally and absolutely and unqualifiedly withdraw it.

MR. SPEAKER: That disposes of the matter.

The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I remember a number of occasions when the hon. member for LaPoile asked me if I was going out on a helicopter or a government aircraft. I remember it. I do not know if the hon. member for LaPoile now remembers it, and I hope he will be willing to admit that he would would have like to come along on that government aircraft or that government helicopter.

MR. NEARY: On official business.

MR. PECKFORD: You were coming on official business. As a minister of the Crown I was going and that you wanted to come along because I was going in any case, in the same way as yesterday evening two hon. gentlemen in the House came along because it was going. It did not cost the taxpayer one cent extra for those two people to be aboard the plane as if they were not there. In the same way, it could not have cost when the hon. member for LaPoile has gone on occasions on government aircraft. He specifically asked me on a number of occasions when I was going to his district, when I was Minister of Municipal Affairs.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order has arisen.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is lying to the House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. PECKFORD: Ho, ho, ho!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Before hearing anything further on the point of order I will require the hon. member for LaPoile to withdraw that.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw. But the hon. gentleman, Sir, is stating an untruth.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: And I think, Sir, the hon. gentleman, -

MR. PECKFORD: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: No, it is not. Is stating an untruth, Sir, -

AN HON. MEMBER: No it is not, It is 130 in Beaufort.

MR. NEARY: It is stating an untruth, Sir, and I ask Your Honour to ask the hon. gentleman to restrain himself, that he cannot use an untruth in this House, that he has to produce the facts. And the hon. gentleman, Sir, is not doing that.

MR. PECKFORD: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I will hear briefly the hon. Minister.

MR. PECKFORD: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. I have nothing to withdraw. I have indicated that the hon. member for LaPoile on a number of occasions asked me if he could come with me on a government aircraft when I was going to his district a couple of years ago.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. PECKFORD: That is it, that is a fact.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! On the point of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: I did not.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman knows -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Whether another hon. member asked another this question or that question is a difference of opinion or memory with respect of that, the difference of opinion based on their memory or their power or recall or based on whatever. But it is a difference of opinion.

The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, you know, so the hon. member for LaPoile cannot have it both ways. He cannot get up as the prima donna and act the white knight suddenly, and then turn around and from time to time to activities of his own to do with his district that he makes use of the same kind of privileges that he is now accusing us.

MR. NEARY: Sit down. There is a point of order.

MR. CALLAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. It is a well known fact that the now Minister of Tourism as the Minister of Transportation and Communications on August 15, 1977 which was a Sunday afternoon, set down his helicopter in the district of Trinity-Bay de Verde on a Sunday afternoon, and the minister has been saying what the member for LaPoile talks about is all nonsense, Now we know. It has been published in the newspapers, there are people who will testify to the fact that the minister on a Sunday afternoon -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order! Some of the procedures would appear to show that there is great confusion with respect to what is a point of order and what is a difference of opinion. And these matters, who used the helicopter or who did not, and where it landed, or if it landed, all of these are differences of opinion and not points of

Mr. Speaker: order, and the Chair can do nothing about it.

The time has expired.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: And the motion before the Chair -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The motion before the Chair is that the House now adjourn. Those in favour "Aye", contrary "Nay"

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Nay.

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion the "Nays" have it. I will leave the Chair until 8:00 P.M. this evening.

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
8:00 p.m. - 11:00 p.m.
THURSDAY, APRIL 20, 1978

The House resumed at 8:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MP. NEARY: A point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of privilege.

MP. NEARY: Yes, Sir. A very grave and serious point of privilege, Sir, I might add. Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at 6 o'clock I would like to draw to Your Honour's attention and to the attention of the House that the Minister of Tourism raced across the House after my colleague, the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) -

MP. MORGAN: After the House rose.

MR. NEARY: After the House rose.

MR. MORGAN: That is not a point of privilege.

MR. NEARY: Oh, yes!

AN HON. MEMBER: No, no!

MR. RIDEOUT: Let us hear it.

MR. NEARY: Let us hear the point of privilege first.

MP. RIDEOUT: Let the Speaker decide. You are not the Speaker yet. I know that, though.

MP. NEARY: I might refer Your Honour to citations 109 and 110 of Beauchesne, by the way, in connection with the matter that I am about to raise. And the hon. gentleman, Sir, harassed my colleague, the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan), insulted my colleague, threatened him and challenged the hon. gentleman to fight.

MP. W.N. POWE: Oh! A big joke, is it?

MR. NEARY: This is no joke, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: The members have the right of the protection of the Chair of this House coming and going to this House, whether hon. gentleman are aware of it or not. And the most serious thing that happened, Sir, was that the hon. gentleman called my hon. friend a punk. Now, Sir, according to the dictionary -

MR. SPEAKER: A punk, is it?

MR. NEARY: A punk -p-u-n-k. According to the dictionary, Sir, a punk means a young hoodlum, a worthless person, a prostitute.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: It sounds like you.

MR. NEARY: I ask that the hon. gentleman withdraw that, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I must ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw his former remark, the hon. member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan).

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, I hope that the rule is applied equally when I do withdraw, as I do. What did I do, Your Honour, that I am suppose to withdraw?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! My understanding was that the hon. gentleman's remarks were an indirect allegation against the hon. gentleman to my right.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, if an indirect allegation was made certainly I will have to withdraw if I made an indirect allegation.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, to proceed with my matter of privilege, Sir, citation 109, I might for the benefit of the hon. gentlemen who do not have Beauchesne in front of them quote the relevant section. "In the Commons, on the 12th of April, 1733, and on the 1st June, 1780, it was resolved that it was a high infringement of the privilege of the House, a crime and misdemeanour, to assault, insult or menace any member of the House in coming or going from the House." And then it goes on, Sir, Your Honour has the citation there, "or upon the account of his behaviour in Parliament; or to endeavour to compel members to declare themselves in favour of or against any proposition "and so forth and so on. And then further down in citation 110.

"It is a breach of the privilege to molest any senator or member of the House of Commons on account of his conduct in Parliament. Courts have decided in the United Kingdom that contempt was implied in the following instances: Challenging members to fight on account of their behaviour in the House or any committee thereof, or even on account of remarks made outside the House

MR. NEARY: which touched proceedings in the House. "Now I need not go any further, Mr. Speaker, because on all counts the hon. gentleman is guilty. And I want to draw to the Speaker's attention that when the situation occurred over here, Your Honour, just outside the Opposition Common Room, I asked one of the constables if he would intercede and see that things were taken care of and the constable did go forward. And I told the constable that members of the House have the same privilege outside the House coming and going as they do in the House.

MR. MORGAN: Do not be making such a fool of yourself, for Heaven's sake. Sit down!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: You are making an absolute fool of yourself.

MR. PECKFORD: You are wasting the time of the House.

MR. NEARY: So that constable, Sir, was a witness to the behaviour of the hon. gentleman and my hon. friend restrained himself, Sir, even though he was being provoked and intimidated by the hon. gentleman and insulted. And I believe the other constable, Sir, who is also looking after the House, I believe the other constable was within hearing distance of the language and the challenges that were flung at my colleague. Also in attendance, Sir, right outside of the Chamber, listening the same as I was, was the Deputy Speaker of the House if Your Honour needs another witness. My colleague the member for Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe), my colleague the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) and, I believe, the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) was there.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Deputy Speaker.

MR. NEARY: The Deputy Speaker, I just named the Deputy Speaker.

MR. MORGAN: Watch yourself and get the facts straight this time.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: He hit a nerve now.

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, this is a very, very serious matter, Sir, a matter that deserves the immediate attention of Your Honour. If necessary, Sir, we are prepared to move the appropriate motion, but I believe Your Honour is quite capable of advising the House of the action that is necessary in this particular case. But I cannot help but reiterate, Sir, it was a disgraceful display on the part of the Minister of Tourism, and the reason I am raising it is, Sir, that I hope we will never see a repeat of it again in this session of the House. It is the kind of a thing, Sir, that we saw happen in previous sessions of the House that led, actually, to fisticuffs. That was an explosive situation this afternoon and but for my colleague, the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan), I am afraid that it would have ended up in a brawl.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, to that point of privilege. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon when the House of Assembly closed - First of all, may I say, Mr. Speaker, that because you were in the Chair at the time prior to the House closing and recessing for the Committee rising, Mr. Chairman was in the Chair at the time, there was a point of order - I am sorry, Mr. Speaker was in the Chair, your Honour was in the Chair - it was during the late show between 5:30 and 6:00. While the hon. gentleman from LaPoile was speaking about the use of Government air services including the Government aircraft and helicopter services, the hon. gentleman from Bellevue stood in his place on a so-called point of order, which was not ruled as a point of order after by Your Honour, pointing out that I had used a helicopter to land in a certain place on a Sunday afternoon in some part of Trinity Bay and that I was using the helicopter in an improper way, and he could prove that, and that was his point of order.

MR. MORGAN: At the time it was ruled out of order as not a point of order. When the House of Assembly rose this evening I was here gathering my papers, Mr. Speaker, when the same hon. gentleman from Bellevue came across the House over here - at the time I recall there was at least one constable here on the floor of the House - he came across to my place where I was sitting, gathering my papers, and said, "Now I got you, now I got you, Morgan, now I got you", and I said, "What are you talking about?". He said, "Well it is in the press". What he was referring to, Mr. Speaker, was a little article in some local paper out in the area which reads as follows, and I have the clipping here:-

"A helicopter landed in Mr. Hector Driscoll's yard on Sunday, August 15, at 2:30 P.M. Mr. James Morgan, Minister of Transportation and Communications, occupied the plane, he and another gentleman friend of his. Mr. Morgan's district is Bonavista North". That is a mistake, obviously, it is Bonavista South. That was in the paper. He referred to that clipping which is on my desk, saying, "Now I have you, Morgan, are misusing the Government helicopter". I said, "Look, if you want the information, I will give you the information". As he was crossing the floor he said, "I got the information, You were misusing Government helicopters, and I will make it public". I was standing here and I challenged him to make the statement outside the House of Assembly so I could take him to court on a court case.

In standing in the doorway over there, and I was standing over here, he repeated his charges again. I crossed the floor, Mr. Speaker, and I again in no way mentioned fight, in no way challenged to fight. I challenged him to make his statements outside the House of Assembly so that I could sue him in court for statements made about me which are untrue, that I was misusing Government helicopters. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, the case the hon. gentleman is referring to is on a Sunday afternoon I happened to be working, doing the public business of the Province, on a Sunday afternoon, in the weekend, out meeting with

MR. MORGAN: a delegation in the community of New Chelsea where that person lives, and witnesses were there; the Highways foreman for the area was there on Sunday afternoon, there was a committee of at least four people there that met with me who can all verify it. A Mr. Phipps of the area, a Mr. Phipps who asked me to come out on two occasions by telegram, twice by telephone, and once by letter, on an urgent matter he wanted me to see personally, that he could not get resolved regarding Government matters. I took it upon myself to do it on a Sunday afternoon, my time off, Sunday afternoon, to go to an area to do a job as a Government minister, and I get criticized with innuendo saying I was misusing Government helicopters. Mr. Speaker, the fact is I did not challenge him to any fight, I challenged him to make a statement outside this Assembly so that I could go through the proper court procedures to take action against him, because I find myself and other colleagues of mine in the House of Assembly lately being swayed by innuendo almost on a continuing basis and finding

MR. MORGAN:

no way to defend ourselves. And I again tonight, Mr. Speaker, reiterate by saying that what I said this afternoon when the House of Assembly rose, I can repeat in the Chambers and repeat it with a clear conscience. If the hon. gentleman has the courage to make the same charge as he made to me in the Chamber after the House closed this afternoon outside the Chamber, he will find himself in court. It is as simple as that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, it is rather unfortunate of course that it was after six o'clock, the House of Assembly tapes were off, I presume, and therefore all we can do is go on the way the minister describes what happened and the way, of course, I describe what happened. The true facts of the matter are that I, after the House closed at six, all I simply did, what I said, Mr. Speaker, I said it before the House closed at six - the tapes are there - and when I walked across the House to the Minister of Tourism's

desk after six o'clock, I walked over with a smile on my face but for some reason, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman was in a rage. The gentleman went into a rage.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CALLAN: In no way did I tell the member that I would prove that he landed in a helicopter. The member had that little piece of paper that he read from three or four days ago because I sent it across the House as a joke three or four days ago.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. SPEAKER:

It would be much better if we heard the hon. gentleman, and anyone else, without interruptions.

MR. CALLAN: That is right, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Essentially I have to hear the two hon. people directly affected. There are no tapes to go to. There is no Hansard to go to. I have to hear what each says. Obviously the account is somewhat different from each but I have to hear what each says and see what happens then.

The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, Mr. Speaker, as I said, when I walked across and spoke to the gentleman - I spoke to another hon. gentleman before that, Mr. Speaker, just to say, well it has come up now, it is out now. But as far as saying, "I have you now" or - what was it the member said? - "I got you now," no such words were uttered. And the minister was in a rage. Mr. Speaker, I think it is fair to say that the anger that the minister showed had nothing to do with what was said this afternoon. It was just a build-up to the way that I had been criticizing the minister on previous occasions, yesterday and today, about the miles of pavement that have gone into his district when I did not get any in mine.

So, Mr. Speaker, after I went across and I saw that the minister was angry, I preceded over to the common room to get some papers and then go downstairs. The minister chased me over and I came back to see what he had to say and, you know, the minister was out of his mind with anger. So then the minister said at least a dozen times, "you punk" and so on and he said, "If you are not careful, I will have you in court." That is all the minister said, Mr. Speaker, "If you are not careful, I will have you in court." He did not say any such thing as, "Make those statements outside the House and I will have you in court." All he said was, "If you are not careful,

MR. CALLAN:

one of those days, I will have you in court." So, Mr. Speaker, that is the plain truth of the whole thing.

MR. SPEAKER: I think what we should do now is probably leave the matter there. It is essentially these two hon. members who are directly involved. I have heard the account of both of them. I certainly cannot give any decision now. I will have to think about it. I may have to speak to both of them in private for further elaboration or clarification. That is really all I can do now.

Motion is that I leave the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! 1601-01

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, we have been asking over here for some time for the list of companies and persons who have received RDA grants over the years. We were given a list until early in 1974 and we have not had any list since. If we did, Mr. Chairman, if we had an up-to-date list we would not be forced to draw such general conclusions from the information as we are obliged to do. We have today a summarization of the industry and the number of jobs created and that kind of thing. I, Mr. Chairman, submit to you that I could prepare this kind of a list too and put it out to the committee. I am not suggesting that anybody has deliberately misled the House but I am saying, Mr. Chairman, that we have no way of testing, checking on the authenticity of the information in those statements. Indeed, if you took the statements of the Premier about the number of jobs that his administration has created since he came into power you would not have the dismal unemployment rate of thirty per cent or whatever we have; we would have about two jobs for every person if you add up all the jobs that the Premier claims to have created almost single-handedly since his administration came into power. I say to him and his administration that the only jobs I know of, the only jobs I know of that they have created are in Montreal where the McConnell Agency seems to be doing fairly well.

This document that we have today from RDA is not worth the paper it is written on, not worth the paper it is written on. It is just a summarization, You do not know where the projects are, you cannot check their authenticity, you do not know if it is a false document, you do not know what it is. Now I have heard the Premier say today to the Leader of the Opposition, "Why does he not take my word for it?"

When we were talking about some other matter today, "Why does he not take my word for it?" I took his word, Mr. Chairman, for years about what was going on in Public Works and found out almost too late that I was being led down the garden path. I took the word of the present Minister of

MR. SIMMONS: Manpower when he stood in his place and gave us a statement about what was going on in Public Works, March of last year and, Mr. Chairman, I found that I could not take their word for it. I took the word of the Minister of Municipal Affairs last year about the Mount Pearl arena and I have learned now that I cannot take their word for it. I took the word of the member for Mount Pearl (Mr. N. Windsor) when he stood in his place an evening or so ago and told me that he would be glad to have an investigation and then I get information which is to the contrary. I get information -

MR. N. WINDSOR: When did you get it?

MR. WHITE: Do you want it all?

MR. SIMMONS: If the member can tell me where I got the information.

AN HON. MEMBER: I know where you got it. Tell us what you got.

MR. SIMMONS: Ah ha! I have got a lot, Mr. Chairman, that is not even directly pertinent to this subject of rural development, but I have something that is very pertinent to the member's statements a couple of nights ago. Indeed I have to check the Hansard first and see if, in the light of what I have, he misled the House the other night. I have to see if that is the case. I will not say that, I just got this in the last hour or two and I just want to determine whether indeed the member for Mount Pearl (Mr. N. Windsor) misled the House on the subject of the Mount Pearl arena.

MR. N. WINDSOR: A point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order has come up.

MR. DINN: The point of order, Mr. Chairman, is that the hon. member is saying here in the House again, as he said during the estimates of Municipal Affairs and Housing, that, for example, I did not come clean on the Mount Pearl arena and if I had given the information to him he would have known last year and that I would not be stuck with things and so on. The fact of the matter is that the hon. member said in this House yesterday that the police were into my department, were into the minister's office -

MR. SIMMONS: No, Mr. Chairman. No, Mr. Chairman -

MR. N. WINDSOR: - took the records of the Mount Pearl arena and the Hansard can be checked -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

April 10, 1978

Tape No. 1298 (Wight)

AH-3

MR. DINN: - took the records of the Mount Pearl arena from the minister's office. That is untrue, Mr. Chairman, and here he goes again spewing off at the mouth.

MR. SIMMONS: To the point of order, Mr. Chairman. The member cannot use the mechanism of a point of order to spread some more falsehoods in this House. Now I will refresh his memory and you can check the Hansard all you want because I will tell you what the Hansard says because I wrote it down so I would be particularly correct in what I said. At no time did I mention the word raid or that the RCMP had raided anywhere. Here was the structure of the lines, here is what I said, and

MR. R. SIMMONS: members will recall that I said about a half dozen lines and the structure of the sentence in each case was the same. "Documents relating to the Mount Pearl Arena which were in the office of the council in Mount Pearl are now downtown." Then I said, to skip over into the point the minister has made, "Documents relating to the Mount Pearl Arena which were in the minister's office are now in the RCMP office." At no time did I say the RCMP was in his office, at no time did I say there has been a raid of his office.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

In regard to the point of order, I think hon. members will recognize that there is a difference of opinion here. I do not think that in anyway gets into the range of disorder in the House. There is not a point of order that I can rule on. Hon. member.

MR. R. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the Mount Pearl Arena is another subject that I want to talk about. I now have a big, fat file to help me talk about it then I will do that at the appropriate time. The member may not be surprised of what I have but he will be disappointed I have it.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Not at all.

MR. SIMMONS: So he should not stick his neck out too far.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Table it.

MR. SIMMONS: He should not stick his neck out too far. I will table whatever I read from.

MR. N. WINDSOR: I will make sure you do.

MR. SIMMONS: Indeed I shall and I will invite the member to be present to keep me on my toes on that point. I now make the promise to him I will do that.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what I have been saying in the last minute or so before I got sidetracked a bit on the Mount Pearl Arena issue, which is an issue I would very much like to talk about tonight, is that we have difficulty taking anybody's word on that side of the House, given the record. And so when I am given this document this afternoon.

MR. HICKMAN: A point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (DR. COLLINS) A point of order has come up.

MR. A. HICKMAN: That comment by the hon. gentleman for Burgeo - Bay d' Espoir (Mr. Simmons) is totally out of order and totally unacceptable in this forum. I ask that he be directed to unequivocally withdraw.

MR. R. SIMMONS: What is it? What is the point?

MR. A. HICKMAN: No hon. gentleman can cast reflection on the honesty of any other hon. member of this House, and when the hon. gentleman stands and says that he is not prepared to take the word of any hon. member or minister opposite that most assuredly casts reflection on an hon. member.

MR. W. N. ROWE: To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W.N. ROWE: There is a distinct difference between saying that the member is a liar or the member is dishonest or you cannot believe a word the member says and what might my hon. colleague have said when he was making his few remarks. What he in fact said was that based on the experience that he has had with hon. members opposite he finds it difficult to take their word. Now that does not mean that any gentleman is a liar over there or that any hon. gentleman is not in fact telling the truth at the moment, Mr. Chairman. What he says is that based on the experience, shared by myself, I might add, it is very difficult. Now that is not to say that he cannot be persuaded that they are in fact telling the truth on any given occasion, but based on his experience, particularly with the Public Accounts Committee, he finds it very difficult to accept what has been told him. That is the essence of what my hon. colleague has said and he is in no way calling anybody across the House dishonest or a liar or in any way dishonourable, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

It seems that we are in a somewhat of a difficult area here. I think it is clear, and hon. members of the Committee will recognize that it is clear that hon. members cannot accuse

MR. CHAIRMAN: others of misleading the House in a deliberate way. I emphasize the word 'deliberate'. It cannot be ruled out of order if an hon. member says that the House has been given information that is not correct because often information is interpreted by the person who is giving it. But it must not be stated in any way that there is a deliberate attempt to mislead the House or to deliberately give the House incorrect information. We have the difficulty because when things are stated clearly like that it is easy to rule; when words are used in some of the same context but not as clearly stated as that, it does make the job of the Chair somewhat difficult. As far as I understand, the words in question, at issue, are "take the word" - "we cannot take the word". So one has to reflect on whether this means deliberate misleading or whether this means that information has been given which can be interpreted as being incorrect information, not necessarily deliberately incorrect, but incorrect. I am sure hon. members will realize that this is a difficult point to decide. I would think that the best way out of this would be if the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir did clarify to the House that he in no way meant that there was any deliberate attempt to mislead by other members on the other side.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, of course I do not particularly want to take the time of the Committee on this one or get members' blood pressure up on the subject, Mr. Chairman. The record - perhaps I will clarify, I was going to say the record is clear, but obviously it is not clear because I have been asked to clarify. When I sit in this House, Mr. Chairman, and see the Premier, in response to a question of this side, say that no political influence was used in the Exon House case -

AN HON. MEMBER: You are right.

MR. SIMMONS: - and then, Mr. Chairman, see him on T.V. the next night or see somebody else report that the Premier intervened directly to get an individual into the Exon Home, then I find it difficult to accept what I am being told in this House, Mr. Chairman. Now if you make me say I am going to accept it I will do it for Parliamentary niceties. I find it difficult. I find it difficult to take the answers that I have been getting on the Public Work's issue here in the House because they do not jibe with the facts that are now coming out in a public enquiry, that came out in the Public Accounts Committee. I find it difficult to accept, Mr. Chairman, because the realities are so different from the sugary coated reality that the boys on the other side would like to have us accept and swallow hook, line, and sinker. We are not so dumb as they think we are, and the people of Newfoundland and Labrador are not so dumb as they think they are. And that is what I find difficult to accept, Mr. Chairman.

Now if this government, Mr. Chairman, would give us a list of RDA loans for the last four years, I would be in a position then, Mr. Chairman, to decide whether or not, Mr. Chairman, they are being any more fair and square about the RDA since 1974 than before 1974.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, does the Minister of Justice have a problem other than the ones we know about? I am trying to make a speech over here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please!

MR. HICKMAN: The Chairman asked you to clarify your remarks or withdraw.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please! In order to dispose of the point of order without any doubt, would the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) inform the Chair whether it his conviction that there was no deliberate attempt - I have to emphasis that these are the operative words here - that there has been no deliberate attempt to mislead or give incorrect information to the Committee?

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, if you want my convictions on the matter I will just state them. If you want me to stay within the rules of Parliament I shall say this, I will withdraw any implication, any verbal, any stated implication that there was any deliberate misleading.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

I think that point of order has been disposed of.

The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W.N. ROWE: You never said they were deliberately misleading.

MR. SIMMONS: That is right.

MR. NEARY: The hon. House Leader is daydreaming.

The hon. member's blood pressure is up.

MR. SIMMONS: Now, Mr. Chairman, if we had the list of individuals, companies, enterprises, the numbers of jobs, and the dollar figure in terms of grants, we could decide whether the government has been any more fair and square since 1974 on RDA than they were before 1974. Now, Mr. Chairman, let us do away with one myth that we will hear about a dozen times in Committee when one of the minister's gets up and starts ranting and raving on this subject, that we want to spread names all over the country. We have a list of hundreds of names here, I have had them in my possession for four years, Mr. Chairman, and we as a group over here altogether have only ever mentioned three of these names publicly, three and three only. Each of the three have excellent credentials as representatives of the Tory Party.

Am I right on that?

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. SIMMONS: Three people only have excellent credentials -

MR. NEARY: I defeated one twice.

MR. SIMMONS: - including one on Bell Island, and a couple of others we know about, three of them, and not necessarily living in rural Newfoundland, and we exposed that, name and all, because we think it should be exposed, because we were told that RDA was going to be for certain noble purposes and we find that it was being used as a slush fund.

Now I want to know, Mr. Chairman, if since 1974 they stopped using it as a slush fund? Because I have clear proof that up until 1974 they were using it as a political slush fund, RDA was a political slush fund. I do not know what has happened in the past four years, Mr. Chairman, I do not know if it has changed. But if you do not want to take my word for it, take the list called Rural Development Authority Loans-Grants made to January 15, 1974 and go through them, the hundreds of them as I did, total up the figures, look at the areas involved - leave out the names of the people, I am not talking about the names at all - look at the kind of enterprise and the district and you will come to some fairly interesting conclusions, Mr. Chairman, some fairly interesting conclusions. You will find that the total grants for that period was \$3, 535,000 given out in loans and grants during the period up to January 1974.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this government talks about developing rural Newfoundland,

MR. SIMMONS: I would assume that does not particularly mean St. John's or Corner Brook, indeed in the context we know the rural community, I would think that you are talking about communities of 100 people, 200, 2000 maybe, 3,000 maybe but certainly once you get over 4000 people in Newfoundland you think in terms of a town rather than a little rural hamlet. Indeed I went to the people involved at the federal level, and I do not mean federal government but at the national level, who are involved in subjects related to rural Canada and they tell me their definition of the rural community is a community of under 4000 population. Now, Mr. Chairman, using that guideline, Mr. Chairman, using that guideline -

AN HON. MEMBER: Organize your speech.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I will not only organize my speech, I will also give it out the way I want to. If the minister wants the information I will give it to him.

MR. HICKMAN: You gave the name.

MR. SIMMONS: I did not give the name, Mr. Chairman. I said I talked to people who are involved in the subject of rural Canada at the national level - not the federal government level, at the national level - and they advised me that for their purposes they categorize a rural community as one of being under 4000 people, under 4000 people. And using that guideline, Mr. Chairman, I found, looking at the list up so far as I have it, and it is four years old, Mr. Chairman, I caution you it is four years old - do not blame me for that. I would rather analyse the list up till today if they would give it to me, I have asked for it for four years, my colleagues here have asked for it for four years and they will not give it to us. The Premier in the last twenty-four hours has said that telephone bills were paid out of public money therefore it is public knowledge. I wish he would apply the same brilliant conclusion to this business here and make it public knowledge, This is public money, very much public money. So I find in looking at this list, Mr. Chairman, despite the fact that it is supposed to be for developing rural Newfoundland more than half the money, Mr. Chairman, was spent in communities of over

MR. SIMMONS: 4000 people, Indeed just about \$100,000 of it during that period, \$92,000 of it, was spent in a rural community that I am sure all of you will know about, a rural community in this Province that all of you will know about, if you can believe it; \$92,000 in a rural community called St. John's. There is a struggling little isolated rural community for you, There is a place that needs some rural development right bad!

MR. HICKMAN: \$92,000 on the street (inaudible)

MR. SIMMONS: \$92,000, Mr. Chairman, But over half of it, Mr. Chairman, over half of it, Mr. Chairman, in communities of over 4000 people. Now, Mr. Chairman, I come to the interesting statistics, because this is the hon. crowd that tries to blush-and they find it more and more difficult to blush these days, Mr. Chairman. It takes a lot more to make them blush these days, a lot more - they try and blush when we talk about slush funds and when we talk about patronage and when we talk about favouring certain districts. My colleague here from Lewisporte (Mr. White) was subjected yesterday to a vicious attack by the Minister of Municipal Affairs for suggesting, as my colleague rightly did, that they are playing hanky-panky now with the capital grants. Well, I say to him it is not new, He is right in what he said but it is not new. It was going on in 1972, 1973, the beginning of 1974, I do not know whether it has gone on since with Rural Development Authority, I do not know because they will not give me the information but, Mr. Chairman, in the period of 1972 to 1974 of all the grants given out, Mr. Chairman, and we are talking about \$3,535,000, of all the grants given out, Mr. Chairman, \$451,000, less than half a million, Mr. Chairman, went to the districts then represented by Liberal members, less than half a million to districts represented by Liberal members; \$63,000 went to another district which was represented by an independent, or an NLP member at that particular time; and nearly \$3 million - \$2.89 million, \$2,893,000 - went to districts represented by PC members at that particular time. Now, Mr. Chairman, if you add all these figures up you will not get a total of \$3,535,000. We are still missing one figure. There was one other district during that period which was without any member - this is a lesson for all of us - this district was

April 20, 1978

Tape No. 1301 (NIGHT)

AH-3

MR. SIMMONS: without any member for most of the period. You remember that Mr. Cheesman, the then Minister of Fisheries, was elected in Hermitage and he resigned just a year almost to the day that he was elected.

MR. R. SIMMONS:

Then from March of 1973 until the Fall of 1974, for a year and a half there was no member in that particular district, the district of Permitage. But during that period, Mr. Chairman, the district set a record. It had more rural development grants and loans -

MR. F. WHITE:

I wonder what the figures are for Twillingage district.

MR. R. SIMMONS:

- more rural development loans and grants than any other district in the Province-Liberal, P.C. or N.L.P. It got \$127,000, most of it in August and September just before the election was called down there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (DR. COLLINS)

Order, please! The hon. member's time has run out.

MR. R. SIMMONS:

I have run out of time and I will get back to the subject later, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (DR. COLLINS)

Hon. minister.

MR. PECKFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond to some of the comments just made by the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons). I find it very passing strange that he spent just about all of his speech dealing with the past, which nobody is supposed to deal with anymore in this House, and the other things is in 1974 or 1973 whatever. The argument that, "we use only three names, Mr. Chairman, of that whole list of names you gave us" as if you can argue after using three names that that makes it all worthwhile, it is only when you use ten or fifteen names does it become wrong to do, the principle by which we have established the policy of not releasing the names, and the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) is living proof in his speech tonight of the very reason why we do not give out the names anymore. It is because when we do they pick and choose names to try to generalize the total and that is what it does. Because one name, if the hon. members on the other side are just going to use one of those names and keep using it, well then what does that do to that man or woman? What does that do to their husband or wife? What does that do to the family of the people concerned as if for some strange reason

MR. PECKFORD: because they happened to have a certain political affiliation it is therefore wrong for them to apply for a Rural Development Authority loan. I mean what is the point of it all? What is the implication, Mr. Chairman? What is the implication? Are they not allowed to apply? Are they not allowed to apply?

MR. SIMMONS: They never even applied (inaudible) pay-off.

MR. PECKFORD: There you go! Mr. Chairman, a point of order. The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) as he was leaving the House in reference to what I have been talking about and giving loans, he says it was a pay-off. Now if that is not out of order, Mr. Chairman, I would like to know what is.

MR. S. NEARY: He is an expert on that field.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

A point of order has been raised. Is

the hon. member speaking to a point of order?

MR. SIMMONS: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member.

MR. SIMMONS: I would like to speak to the point of order. Mr. Chairman, the term 'pay-off' was used in response to the minister's comments not as they apply to all the loans but as they apply to the three that he was talking about, the three that we had identified. These, I believe, Mr. Chairman, were in every sense of the term political pay-off's, Mr. Chairman, political pay-off's. A man on Bell Island, hardly rural Newfoundland, been defeated twice as a Tory candidate, getting a large loan, Mr. Chairman? That is a political pay-off. I doubt he even applied for the loan, Mr. Chairman, I doubt he even applied for it at all. Now let the minister get on to something more current and let him give us the information, Mr. Chairman, the information since 1974, and stop using the old red herring approach which he is pretty good at, Mr. Chairman, but address himself to the subject at hand. Give us the list for the past four years. That is all we are asking for, Mr. Chairman. That is a reasonable request, I would think.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please! Order, please!

In regard to the matter raised as a point of order, again this is an interpretation placed upon certain activities. I do not think this comes within the ambit of being disorderly insofar as the Committee's activities go.

Hon. minister.

MR. PECKFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I abide by your ruling.

I think it is awful when hon. members can stand in this House and indicate that two or three individuals, in 1974 or 1973, or whatever, who applied for financial assistance under an existing programme and that assistance

Mr. Peckford: was approved, that now the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) is saying that they perhaps did not even apply and that it was a political pay-off. And, you know, I think that is - I will let that stand, Mr. Chairman, and I will not address my remarks any further on it.

MR. WHITE: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order has come up.

MR. WHITE: The hon. minister knows quite well, having been in this House much longer than I have, that he knows the procedure and the House knows the procedure and there is a procedure whereby the hon. gentleman can appeal a ruling made by Mr. Speaker or by the Chairman, and he can proceed in that particular route if he wants to do so.

MR. PECKFORD: To that point of order, Mr. Chairman. I have already said that I will abide by your ruling, and whatever ruling you make I will abide by it. But then I reserve the right to continue to discuss and to debate the issues that are at hand which in no way challenged your ruling, Your Honour.

MR. WHITE: What a coward!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

I did not understand that the ruling was being challenged. I ruled that there was not a point of order before the Chair -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: - and therefore the hon. member can continue his remarks.

MR. PECKFORD: Exactly, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much. Thank you for your protection. All I was trying to say, Mr. Chairman, in relation to remarks made by the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) in which he was making charges, he was alleging that a number of people who had the courage to be of one political persuasion or another and who were getting into a number of business enterprises, applied under existing programmes, financial programmes that the Department of Rural Development has, and were approved and they went

Mr. Peckford: ahead into those enterprises; and I would imagine that there were loans and I imagine they have been paid back now. The whole point of programme is to give some incentive to people to start, and they are low interest loans rather than the same current bank interest rates to help stimulate, to create new jobs in the Province. You know, but I find it extremely passing strange that at the one hand the Opposition are saying, "Give us the list and give us the names and we will be responsible individuals; we will be responsible individuals in talking about those names, and we will not do it, because look what we did in 1974. See, Mr. Chairman, you can trust us. Look what we did in 1974. We only took three names and said that these people were getting the loans because they were members of the P.C. Party and they had to be paid off. And so therefore, Mr. Chairman, there is nothing wrong. There is nothing wrong, we are being extremely responsible. We are only saying that every time that you give out a group of loans quite a few of them happen to be to Tory or political friends and we are paying them off. That is all. And so on that basis there is no problem for you as the Minister of Rural Development or for you people over here as a government to go ahead and release these names because we are going to be responsible, we are only going to call them political pay-offs, that is all. And we are just going to pick out the names that we would like to pick out and try to see whether they were P.C. or Liberal, use the ones that are the juicy ones or seem to be the juicy ones so that then we can get another crack at the government. So we are extremely responsible, Mr. Chairman. And we would ask again for the Minister of Rural Development to give us that list."

Well, you know, Mr. Chairman, it begs an answer because they prove from their own mouths why it is not possible, why it is impossible for us as responsible individuals on this side of the House to release names, because they will use them as they see fit and try to taint the political pay-off business on it. So I am more convinced now than ever, I am more convinced now than ever, if I needed

Mr. Peckford: any more convincing, that the policy of not releasing these names is a very responsible policy, because otherwise we would have to put up with the spectacle of having individuals in this Province, citizens of this Province being called that this programme is only given to them for political pay-off reasons. So obviously, Mr. Chairman, what we have done, I think, is responsible. We have given the list indicating the categories of where the loans were given, the number of loans, the number of jobs created, the amount of money laid out, public money laid out for these programmes.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, I fail to understand how the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) can use a definition of 'rural' which originated in Central Canada and apply it to Newfoundland. I thought that we always said in this Province as Newfoundlanders, "The guys up along, the people up along they do not understand Newfoundland, and the things that apply and the definitions that apply in Upper Canada are not necessarily the kinds of standards that we will use in this Province because we are a tiny bit different, we are a tiny bit different for a whole bunch of reasons, historically, geographically - climatically, too - and for a whole bunch of other reasons, so therefore it does not apply." But when it is convenient, Mr. Chairman, when it is convenient then the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir does not mind using an Upper Canadian definition of 'rural' and then try to apply it to our situation when, by using that definition, he can try to make a few little Brownie points, Mr. Chairman,

Mr. Peckford: to indicate that this is not a Rural Development programme because we are lending money to a town that has a population of 4,000. Or, and we have to be very careful here, Mr. Chairman, there are many loans that have been given out to people who reside in St. John's even but whose enterprise is not in St. John's. There are many people, for example, in Springdale, the capital of Green Bay, with a population of 3,500, close to 4,000. Well now, I do not know what most Newfoundlanders would consider Springdale. I would say a lot of people in Newfoundland would consider Springdale to be a rural part of Newfoundland, but let us say it is not a rural part; let us say it is a very urban part, which it is not—but just let us say, for argument sake, most of the people in Springdale, for example, who qualified, because I happen to know fairly intimately the people who are involved in pulp wood contracting and sawmilling in Springdale, they are residents of Springdale, their business is in Springdale, but they do not cut trees in Springdale, Mr. Chairman. And the enterprise for which they got the loan in the first instance is in the forest. And in any case this whole definition of rural being 4,000 is just dreamt up to try to concoct an argument, to try to prove that this Rural Development programme only applies to urban centres. Well, that is just so much hogwash. It is not true. It is totally not true. And there is nothing wrong in any way, Mr. Chairman. The emphasis, the majority, by far the majority - 90 per cent, 95 per cent of the assistance that we give through our programmes in the Department of Rural Development actually go into ^{raw} Newfoundland. And if there is a man or a business enterprise in St. John's or in Corner Brook or Grand Falls or Gander, and he is going to create a number of jobs and we can help him by having a low interest rate on our loan programme and get him started, where he would have difficulty if he went to the bank, and he is going to create jobs, and it is manufacturing or resource, based in some way, or even in the tourist industry which is bringing in new dollars, what is wrong with loaning to that? What is wrong? What is wrong with loaning to that

Mr. Peckford: business just because they live in Grand Falls or Corner Brook? Nothing wrong with it, Mr. Chairman. And I defend that kind of a scheme, that kind of a system, as long as our emphasis continues to be in the rural parts of this Province. You do not exclude. The whole nature of rural development, built into the whole philosophy of rural development is the concept of flexibility, the concept of high risk to try to stimulate, to get incentives in; and when there are other enterprises come along that are in a larger centre, I see nothing wrong with assisting them if they are going to create a few jobs.

The Opposition talks about creating jobs. Well that is what we are doing, trying to create jobs. We created over 3,000 of them since the programme started and 400 last year in 1977. That is performance, Mr. Chairman. That is performance. That is what the Rural Development programme does. All our development associations, for example, have headquarters, very often in what the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) will call an urban setting. But they serve the whole region, the region in which they are located through our community projects and so on. We have funded through the development associations various experiments all around the Province, you know, which is rural development in essence. So, you know, there is only one or two rare occasions that anybody even applies from a St. John's or a Corner Brook, and when they do, if it is a good viable, feasible proposal and they are going to create a few jobs, the more power to them, and we will loan them the money and get the few jobs created. And I think most people in this Province would endorse that kind of an attitude and that kind of a programme to apply right across the Province with an emphasis on the more rural, scattered parts of the Province, and that is what we are trying to do.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if one wants to get back into the petty, small debate of talking about districts and where loans or grants are put out, we have been through this in Municipal Affairs

Mr. Peckford: on many occasions and have proven, beyond a shadow of a doubt, even though there are less seats on that side of the House than on this side, that there were more special grants, for example, into the councils that were in Liberal districts, and I can do the same thing here with the industrial incentive grants for last year and show that there were, percentage-wise, more industrial incentive grants into Liberal districts than there were in P.C. districts. There were more applications and that is the way it should be. That is the way it should be. That is fair and square. That is fair and square. If there are applications come in from any part of Newfoundland, I do not care what district they are from. I could not care less, I could not care less where they are from. If it is a good

MR. PECKFORD: proposal it will get approved. If it is a bad proposal it will get rejected. If it is a grey area it gets deferred and the benefit of the doubt is always given to the applicant, and we defer it. I have only been in the Department of Rural Development for three or four weeks now - three weeks, two weeks, or whatever - and I have deferred applications because it was a grey area that possibly could go ahead, and sent men out in the field again to re-examine the market for that product to be sure that if it was rejected it would be rejected after a full and complete investigation had been done. I have done it already for applications in districts represented on the other side of the House, for example. I have done it for the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. McNeil), I just sent him a letter on it today, and I will do it for any member on either side of the House, anytime, if they came to me; and even if they do not, I will do it if it is a grey area. Because our job is to create jobs not in PC districts but in the Province. As somebody said here the other day, I think it was the Leader of the Opposition, 'In this House when we become members, we become members for the Province and not just for the districts that we represent'.

MR. WHITE: You would never say that.

MR. PECKFORD: The industrial incentive grants, percentage-wise, there are more in Liberal districts than there are in PC districts. So where is the argument on the politics of it? Where is the argument? There is no argument. There is no argument on it.

MR. FLIGHT: Ask the Minister of Tourism (inaudible).

MR. HICKMAN: How come that Lewisporte gets so much more than Grand Bank when they are both rural districts?

MR. PECKFORD: So, Mr. Chairman, the arguments put forward by the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons), which were only three: that they would not use names, and yet they go ahead and use names; that the definition of rural development that he picked up from some place in Upper Canada, which is non-applicable, and he only uses different standards when

MR. PECKFORD: it is convenient to him, and the whole question of politics in it, I think I have succeeded on all three points to indicate to the hon. member he should re-think his speech before he gets up again to try to lay on the table, or lay before us, some arguments which, obviously, are shallow and specious.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Young) Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Ah, Mr. Chairman.-

MR. HICKMAN: A point of order.

MR. W.N. ROWE: - how disillusioning to see an hon. minister -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. HICKMAN: The Speaker has to come back, Would the hon. member yield?

MR. W.N. ROWE: Sure. I will be recognized again, Mr. Chairman, I assume?

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

On motion that the Committee rise report progress and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Chairman of Committees.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Young): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have directed me to report that they have considered the matters to them referred, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion, report received and adopted, Committee ordered to sit again presently.

MR. SPEAKER: I would usually wait until eleven o'clock, or when normally I would come back into the Chair, to rule on this matter, but it is one of such a nature that I think it should be settled and resolved and finalized as soon as possible.

I have spoken with both hon. members, the hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) and the hon. member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), and reviewed with them what transpired between a few minutes to six and a few minutes after six. It is obvious to me that there were serious differences of opinion, a very heated debate, and the possibility, as well, of serious misunderstanding.

MR. SPEAKER: I am authorized by both hon. members to state the following:

The hon. member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) retracts insulting language used towards the hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan).

The hon. member for Bellevue withdraws any imputation of motive towards the hon. gentleman of Bonavista South.

This is made with the concurrence and knowledge of both hon. gentlemen and, since they have both withdrawn, the matter is closed.

MR. HICKMAN: Committee of Supply.

On motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Committee of Supply

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. CHAIRMAN: XV - RURAL DEVELOPMENT

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Thank you, Sir.

I am sorry the minister is not in the House at the moment because I would not want him to think that what I am about to say I would not say in his presence. Sir, I have been in this House now for a long time and I have observed members as they have developed along and it is very disillusioning to see a man or an hon. member of promise, or apparent promise, get up and make, Sir, what can only be characterized as one of the most hypocritical speeches ever made in this hon. House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. ROWE: Yesterday, or within the last couple of days, we had the Premier of this Province stand and say that whenever public money is spent the public has a right to know what the public money is spent on. Everybody in Newfoundland can find out the salary of every single civil servant in this Province. Every member of the public can find out how much money is paid and for what purpose for every member in this House of Assembly. Any money spent, Mr. Chairman, out of the public purse is accountable through this House to the public and the public has a right to know and generally and usually they can find out.

The Department of DREE in Ottawa makes grants and loans to certain firms and certain individuals, and far from keeping the amount or the name of the person back, Mr. Chairman, you read in the paper every day that such-and-such a company has received a DREE grant -

MR. F. ROWE: It is sent to all members, too.

MR. W. ROWE: - in order to modernize it. Press releases are sent out because the federal government has nothing to hide and the person receiving the money has nothing to hide.

MR. SIMMONS: Name the company and the town every time.

MR. W. ROWE: The company, the town, the area, the province, all information is given out, Mr. Chairman. Yet this laudable principle,

Mr. W. Rowe: which apparently the Premier of the Province adheres to and espouses and gets up and makes speeches about in the House concerning telephone calls or telephone bills or anything else, this hon. minister, Mr. Chairman, is not prepared to go along with. He seems to think that if some person gets a loan of \$50,000 or a grant or a loan from this particular department that that person is immune or inviolate as far as public scrutiny is concerned. And I say, Sir, that if anybody wants to feed at the public trough the public should know -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. ROWE: - what is being fed and how much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. ROWE: The whole idea that somehow my hon. colleague here is going to make use of this information in a public way, and that there is something scandalous or bad or wrong or strange about that, Mr. Chairman; the imputation of, somehow, motives, unworthy motives, to my hon. friend here because he wants to know so he can determine for himself, as a representative of the people, how this money is being used or misused or abused as the case may be, the idea that somehow he is doing something wrong when he is trying to protect the public purse, that is a scurrilous type of impression to try to give abroad, Mr. Chairman. And I repeat that if anybody is getting a loan from this government or a grant or money from this government then the people of this Province has a right to know who that person is and how much he is getting, and for what purpose and where it is going. And if a person, Sir, does not like the idea of having that fact, that simple truth, that simple fact made public, then let that person go back home with his tail between his legs and not come looking for any more public money. And if there is nothing wrong with the reason for the money having been given out, then no person has any reason to fear any public abuse or any public criticism -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. ROWE: - because it will simply not stand up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. ROWE: And there is nobody in this House, Mr. Chairman, who wants to deny the use of government money for the creation of jobs and getting small industry in rural Newfoundland going. Nobody wants to do that. But I as a member certainly want to look at loans and grants which are being made and find out for myself, satisfy myself whether in fact this money was made for the purpose of creating jobs, this loan was made for the purpose of creating jobs or whether, as my hon. friend so amply said, it is for the purpose of a political pay-off. I deserve that information.

MR. FLIGHT: You are entitled to it.

MR. W. ROWE: And I am

MR. W. ROWE: entitled to that information and I should have it.

It is a shame and a scandal that I can go down to my district and someone can say, "I think go-and-go over there across the way got a loan to put up a flower shop. Do you know anything about that?" And I as a member of the House have to say I do not know if it is public money or private money; he might have gone to the bank or he might have gone in and had a little chat with the minister, I do not know. And the person says, "Can I get a loan to put up a greenhouse or can I get a loan to do that?" And I have to say I do not know, I do not know what bases people are getting loans and grants on, I have no idea whatsoever except from some vague guidelines which may be thrown out from time to time by this ministry; I do not know if you are entitled to money like that chap down the road who you suspect has government money, I do not know if you are or not because I have no precedent to go by, I have no examples to go by. I do not know. All I know is that this government will spend millions of public dollars, tax dollars of this Province, pass it out, I do not know if it is a risky loan, I do not know if a person gets a loan if it is a bad risk or a good risk or whether that is in fact a grant instead of a loan, I do not know the procedures which have been used against individuals to try and collect loans. I know nothing, Mr. Chairman, as a member of this House, and to have a minister, a young, developing, promising minister trying to make his name in the glamorous field of multinational oil companies, to have him stand up in this House and in a scurrilous, hypocritical fashion try to paint my colleagues here, or myself perhaps in a few minutes, as somehow low, ill-motivated, abusing the processes of this House to try to find out how that money is spent - the minister should resign, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. ROWE: Now I am prepared to accept that he has only recently been appointed to that department and he is following along the same low and political and in some way scurrilous practices of his predecessors in that department and that he really has not had an opportunity to come to grips, to come to his senses on this particular

MR. W. ROWE: expenditure. I admire the hon. gentleman. Perhaps, Sir, when he really comes to think about what he is doing, the principle he is violating, the concept which he is throwing to the four winds which we all should adhere to, when he comes to grips with that, thinks about it, mulls it over in his mind, he will say certainly it is only reasonable and sensible that members of this House, on both sides of the House, have this information as should be and is their right as members of this House and protectors of the public purse. Remember, Sir, that the only power of this House, the only power of this House, Sir, when it all boils down, the only power of this House is to grant supply unto His Majesty or unto Her Majesty, as the case may be; that is our power, to withhold supply from the government, Her Majesty as represented by the government. That is our power. And to think that we are here voting or not voting as the case may be in absence of crucial information is an insult flung in the teeth of every member in this Hon. House by that minister and by that government.

Now, Mr. Chairman, enough said on that particular subject. One or two other minor matters I would like to mention quickly because we have not had any opportunity really to get into the Budget debate or the Throne Speech debate and make the general points. One hates to waste time on estimates on general points; we should be more specific but we are forced into it because we have been building up, members of this House have been building up now for nine or ten months watching the abuses take place in this Province and you are forced to make general kinds of speeches on the estimates when you should not be doing it but we are forced to because we cannot resist it.

MR. SIMMONS: They have not got the guts to call the Budget debate.

MR. W. ROWE: I will just make one or two other small minor - not minor points, but one or two other points very briefly, Sir. First of all, let me say this: This is a government which takes great pride, simulated pride at least, in its rural development programme. Rural development is the hallmark. It is one of the things that put the Premier where he is today and this government where they are today: Let us get away from the big things and let us get into the small things, let us develop rural Newfoundland. And we look at the budget and we see a

Mr. W. Rowe: Department called Rural Development, and we see that the expenditure in that department, Mr. Chairman, is a little over \$5 million out of a budget of over \$1 billion, \$1 billion of Provincial money expended, a little over \$5 million of Provincial money expended. The Rural Development Department that this government is so proud of represents an expenditure of one-half of one per cent of the Province's budget, one-half of one per cent. About the same chance, Mr. Chairman, of being struck by lightning.

MR. PECKFORD: That is the whole point. You do not understand small, that is your problem.

MR. W. ROWE: I understand small, I am looking at something small now, Mr. Chairman. Small-minded, it is narrow in a speech that he just made to this hon. House insulting me as a member and everyone else in the House on both sides. That is small. And it is a case where small is small, not small is big, or less is more. One-half of one per cent spent by this hon. government on rural development, on the Rural Development Department.

I heard the Premier stand up one time in this hon. House and try to announce what he considered to be the major step forward for this government. It was the Throne Speech of, not this year but the year before this, last year, He stood up and he said, "We started this great Rural Development Association programme, and we started to fund the Rural Development Associations." That is what he said, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W. ROWE: That is what he said. And my hon. friend again, the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, corrected him on the spot. The Premier of this Province did not even know, did not know that Rural Development Associations, first of all, had been in existence long before anyone ever dreamed that that government was going to go into power, Mr. Chairman. And the government started to fund with public funds these Rural Development Associations in the year, if I am not mistaken, the year 1970, announced by myself at a Development Conference which we held at the Arts and Culture Centre. I am not sure if the hon. Minister of Justice was not in fact in the government in those days, I do not know, He might have crossed over by then.

MR. HICKMAN: No, I was in opposition.

MR. FLIGHT: If he was not kicked out.

MR. W. ROWE: If he had been in there we would not have been able to get the concept through Cabinet, Mr. Chairman. One of the reasons I was able to push it through is that there were a few people with progressive ideas and minds in the Cabinet in those days after himself and his friend, Mr. Crosbie, and the other hon. gentleman I will not mention because he is now retired from politics.

MR. FLIGHT: He was kicked out.

MR. HICKMAN: Speaking in terms of politics now, tell the House about the first cheque that was delivered to the (inaudible) Development Association -

MR. W. ROWE: By my hon. friend opposite, I would imagine.

MR. HICKMAN: No, no, no, no. He subsequently became a Liberal candidate.

MR. W. ROWE: I do not know all the little details.

MR. HICKMAN: And he was so -

SOME HON. MEMERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W. ROWE: We can talk about cheques, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HICKMAN: They were so insulted, they were so insulted that they walked out.

MR. W. ROWE: We can talk about cheques. My hon. friends here remind me that certain deliveries might have been made in brown paper bags or otherwise, Sir, -

MR. HICKMAN: Might have been, yes, might have been.

MR. W. ROWE: - on the first day that this House opened, this was back in 1972, but we will not get into that transference of money either in specie or by cheque.

MR. FLIGHT: The Bill Saunders cheque.

MR. W. ROWE: We will not get into that. But if we are going to get into the transference of cheques, we can have a rip roaring debate, Mr. Chairman. The point of the matter is that it was the much maligned former administration which is going to be replaced by a new former administration shortly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. ROWE: And we promised not to mention a word, let us make a solemn pledge, not a word about the new former administration. We are too busy, Sir, hopefully forging ahead.

The point is, Sir, the Premier of this Province had no idea, he thought he was the architect of this grand scheme of funding Rural Development Associations. And he had no more to do with it, Sir, and did not even know whether he had anything to do with it or not, but he had no more to do with that particular programme than a babe in arms, and that he was announcing as the great step forward of the government. We find now that the one thing they were trying to hold up as a shining examples of their progressive development now founders because they had nothing to do with it, nothing whatever to do with it.

Now, Sir, another point I would like to make in all seriousness to the minister is this, the Rural Development Associations are now getting-what?- \$15,000 per year by way of a grant annually? In 1970, when we commenced the funding of them, I believe it was \$10,000 at that time.

MR. PECKFORD: (Inaudible) for other additional programmes that are in place that all the development associations can apply for. So when you say that you must qualify it with that kind of thing in order to be completely valid on the point.

MR. W. ROWE: Yes, Well the \$10,000 was intended at the time, although there was no government control over it, the \$10,000 was intended for salary and office expenses, administration, and nothing else. I mean they could take part in ARDA, or DREE or -

MR. NEARY: Canada Works.

MR. W. ROWE: - or Canada Works or anything else that was on the go.

MR. FLIGHT: Who changed it all?

MR. PECKFORD: (Inaudible) programmes in place that we have now whereby they can increase (inaudible).

MR. W. ROWE: Yes, Well \$15,000, Sir, seven years later - I was looking at some figures there the other day - a dollar then in 1970 has eroded by just about three quarters, eight years later. And the same point which is made by my hon. friend, the member for Grand Falls with regard to Term 29 certainly applies, because of inflation and the eroding of the dollar, to these development associations. The \$15,000 presently received by them for salaries and for operating expenses is less, Sir, in fact, in purchasing power and value, and with the increase in salaries, the increase generally not only in the erosion of the dollar but the increase in the salaries and the expected salaries and the standard of living generally which has gone up even faster than the inflationary spiral, that Sir, has made that \$15,000 worth far less than the \$10,000 which the programme started out with in 1970 under the former administration. And I would commend to the minister the idea of perhaps increasing it to \$20,000 or \$25,000 or something along those lines. I have talked to a number of the hired, the executive director, the

MR. W. ROWE: hired person involved in the rural development associations, people who by and large are very interested in the concept of rural development, which is why they are there. Teachers, for example; a man who could be making \$18,000 making \$10,000 or \$12,000, because he is interested in rural development.

I think it is a shame to penalize people for their altruistic motives and their desire to get into rural development. And the minister could certainly take into account the idea of raising that and allowing a person who is in a field like that perhaps to get \$18,000 or \$20,000, something along those lines.

Now, Sir, it is very difficult to speak, Sir, when you have -

MR. HICKMAN: I am sorry. I am sorry. I am sorry.

MR. W. ROWE: - the lovely, beautiful form of the Minister of Justice interposed between yourself and your friends opposite. I get distracted by the svelt form of the Minister of Justice.

I would like to reiterate, Sir, some of the points made by the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) and others in this House in which they condemned utterly, as a concept - one minute left - the Action Group, the \$2 million that will be spent, will have been spent over a fourteen months period on what is essentially, Sir, I have said publicly and reiterate now, is essentially a slick propoganda programme brought into effect by this government in order to fund the PC Party's advertising agency, McConnell Agencies. \$2 million, Sir, and I think, Sir, that this \$2 million over the same period of time could have been much better spent perhaps in funding rural development associations or some programmes or pilot programmes or perhaps even if it was distributed for advertising purposes to the various line departments involved in rural

MR. W. ROWE: development, agriculture, fisheries, rural development itself, others who are involved in-resource development, I should say, rather than rural development, resource development, give them more money for advertising programmes to bring home to the people the programmes which are being offered and ways and means of getting through red tape, cutting through red tape. Maybe that would be a better use of that \$2 million. The use it is now being put to, Sir, I think is a poor use, a use which is not in keeping with the best interests of the people of the Province. My time has run out I believe, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman,

Mr. Morgan: few words on this very important department under the minister's heading. First of all, may I say that I was not surprised to listen to the last remarks. I note that there were very little remarks made about the department itself. I think it clearly indicates—and the speeches prior to the Opposition Leader's speech made by the Opposition members and spokesman—the major difference between that party over there and this party over here, now the administration of the day, because we stand for little business, small business enterprises, and we stand for rural development. The fact is today in our Province we have 14,000 small business enterprises registered. Out of these approximately 13,000 are employing twenty people or less. And these people are obtaining assistance, many of them, from the Rural Development Authority. Indeed it was not with any astonishment to me that the hon. gentleman, the now Leader of the Liberal Party seeking to become Premier of the Province, had little to say about rural development, and a policy to this administration today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. Morgan: Because, Mr. Chairman, I am going to going to go back a little bit, not back in history, I am going to go back a couple of years or so, but no longer than maybe six or seven years or so. I will not go back to 1957 when they commenced what they called the resettlement centralization programme, but I will come approximately ten years later, 1967, ten years after they commenced the resettlement programme in this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER Do not be too hard on them.

MR. MORGAN: The first comment made on this matter was made in July of 1967 by the then minister responsible for the Department of Community and Social Development of the government, Dr. Fred Rowe. He pointed out then that up to that time they had moved 12,000 people, relocated 12,000 people. They had eliminated in the Province of Newfoundland 183 communities.

AN HON. MEMBER: Vagabonds.

MR. MORGAN: He stood proud in this Assembly, and it was carried by the press, and I quote - which I can table for the hon. Chairman if requested to. It was carried the next day on July 28, 1967 in

Mr. MORGAN: The Evening Telegram, which we all know, quoting Dr. Rowe at that time, standing proud in the House of Assembly about the fact that he had eliminated 183 communities. Well, that is back in history—because I am not going to go back in history—because I thought at the time that that was policy from the older generation of the Liberals, and I looked at the time to just getting involved in politics with some hope for the new Young Turks of the Liberal Party who came on the scene shortly after. I am talking about, for example, the present Leader of the Opposition, the present official Liberal Leader in the Province, and a few other of his colleagues who came on the scene at the time.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Those Uqandans.

MR. MORGAN: And I said to myself, maybe this policy will recede the destruction of places like where I came from, Flat Islands, in Bonavista Bay, and many other viable communities around the Province—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: - that they would have some hope.

MR. W. CARTER: Order, now!

MR. MORGAN: But in 1969 a new young minister came on the scene in that same governing party, a new, bright young minister with new ideas about the freshness of the rural parts of our Province and the future of the rural parts of our Province. The first major policy that department, which he headed at the time, was not to give loans to small businesses, not to establish a group to assist people in getting information to help assist small businesses, no, Mr. Chairman. It was -

MR. H. COLLINS: Is this the same gentleman -

MR. MORGAN: - to press the federal government to change their regulations with regards to resettlement.

MR. H. COLLINS: Is this the same gentleman we are looking at over there?

MR. MORGAN: I quote on March 7 there was a statement, again in The Evening Telegram, which I have clippings here which can be filed in the House, reporting the House of Assembly, March 7, 1969. I am not going back in history, just 1969. It was only a few years before

Mr. Morgan: this party took over office. "Mr. Rowe", in this case, not Dr. Rowe, but, "Mr. Rowe", the new, bright young minister now on the scene with the bright ideas about rural development in our Province, said, hopes the federal government will agree to do away with the 80 per cent requirement which was the regulation in connection with resettling or eliminating, in my view, many of our communities around the rural parts of our Province.

MR. H. COLLINS: They are all gone.

MR. MORGAN: Following that year there was an outcry, a major outcry -the clinnings are here to prove it and

MR. MORGAN:

can be tabled here, the criticisms that came from all over the Province; came from the Anglican church, spoken out loud and clear in the Province, the head of the Anglican church in the Province, against resettlement, the damage it was doing to Newfoundlanders, destroying the moral fiber of Newfoundlanders in rural Newfoundland. Along came Professor Kato Wadell strongly criticizing the programme and policies of this bright, young minister with his new programmes. Along came Professor Clinton Herrot, another man strongly opposed, in opposition to the resettlement programme. Along came Dr. Noel Ervison and on we go. Some of the major complainers are among the members of this House today. My colleague the Minister of Fisheries, the MHA for Placentia East (Mr. Patterson), the present member in Bonavista North (Mr. Cross) and many others who are now in the House today made their views known publicly. The criticism came from the residents in the influential society of Newfoundland. But, Mr. Chairman, despite that, despite all that on January 17, 1969, and despite the criticism the following year, despite that at a time when we thought there was going to be hope that this kind of ancient policy in the past ten years was going to change, that there was going to be a hope for rural Newfoundlanders, that there was going to be a hope for some of those rural communities, that there was going to be hope for small business around Newfoundland, the bright young minister announces \$2.58 million.

MR. W. CARTER: What for?

MR. MORGAN: What for? For the resettlement, the centralization programme.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame! Shame!

MR. MORGAN: On May 2, 1969 the present Liberal Leader announces over \$2 million for the resettlement programme. Not only that, Mr. Chairman, that I think would probably be forgiven, - maybe he was under the control of a Liberal premier who had strong control over his Cabinet ministers. Maybe that was one reason and I could forgive him for that - but the same young minister went to the great Liberal conference over in Hot Springs, British Columbia and this was in -

April 20, 1978

Tape No. 1311 (Night)

AH-2

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

The Thinker's Conference.

MR. MORGAN:

The great Thinker's Conference in Hot Springs and he stood up and put forward a paper on new centralization.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He was all wet.

MR. MORGAN:

He used centralization to support the case for a prospective regional development programme. The policy for regional development was to centralize the smaller communities.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Rural Development, no! Resettlement, yes!

MR. MORGAN:

And it was quoted November 2nd. and I can table those quotes.

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

Table the document. That is a beauty.

MR. MORGAN:

The present Liberal leader said that it was his plans and his intention to relocate 20,000 people, to relocate 80,000 people. That is the programme. I do not want to go on and on with these little details; I want to point out clearly what the policy of the Liberal party was then with these young turks.

SOME HON. MEMBER:

Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN:

Then there was a great flurry and we saw people like Dr. Sametz pointing out in replies to my colleague here from Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) who was raising - I will not use the unparliamentary word, but he was raising it quite loud in Ottawa. It was quite loud. He was standing up for the communities that now exist today which fortunately exist somewhat through his efforts in saying, "No! I am not standing for this kind of elimination of these communities in our outports."

AN HON. MEMBER:

Start them all over again.

MR. MORGAN:

He said there was a black list and Dr. Sametz came back, and I

MR. J. MORGAN: quote him here somewhere, he said no, it was not a black list, it was an isolation index outlined to him in a policy programme by his minister and the minister was and now is the present Liberal leader. Let me quote -

AN HON. MEMBER: Table it, 'Jim'.

MR. J. MORGAN: 'The inshore fishery is now over populated and is therefore no longer a feasible economic base for the small settlements. We must eliminate - We must eliminate! That is their kind of policy.

AN HON. MEMBER: Table it.

MR. J. MORGAN: Now you might think I am emotional in my speech tonight but I lived through resettlement in Flat Islands, Bonavista Bay. I lived through it. I saw what was happening to the people who were forced to move, forced to move away from viable communities.

MR. FLIGHT: Will they go back?

MR. PECKFORD: They are gone back, boy.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: They will not go back after they visit Paris.

MR. J. MORGAN: So, Mr. Chairman, the point I am getting at is this, if I thought today as a politician that that man who was then in a position to make decisions, the man to make decisions regarding all parts of the Province, particularly rural parts of the Province and as minister in a Cabinet he had the authority to make decisions and these were the kind of decisions he made. The question in the back of my mind as a Newfoundlander today is this, if by some fluke the same hon. gentleman got authority again, what would he do to rural Newfoundland?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. J. MORGAN: And that question is lingering in the minds of people in Bonavista South district where, I recall, Father James Beresford came in with a delegation, twenty-five people came in led by Father James Beresford and they were told, "Go back to your communities because your communities are dormant" - the term used was 'dormant' - You have sleeping communities. Your only chance to survive and to get the services you require," Mr. Chairman, they were told this and this is all printed here in a clipping I can table -

MR. S. NEARY: Sit down, boy!

MR. J. MORGAN: They were told this: the only way you have to survive, to get any kind of an economic base, right from Charleston down the shore to King's Cove and on to Stock Cove - Knights Cove, nineteen communities were told on the south side of Bonavista Bay back in 1970, when the same hon. gentleman was the minister, were told, "I am sorry, gentleman. If you want the services that you require from government you will have to relocate from the south side of Bonavista Bay." And Father James Beresford took the very strong stand - I recall it was headline news in the Evening Telegram, the clipping is here, in 1970 - that they would have to blast them out of Bonavista South if he wanted to move them, blast them out! Thank God today that that stand was taken in a very firm way, and if it was not for that the Bonavista South as I know it today would not exist.

MR. DINN: That is where we are putting in the services.

MR. J. MORGAN: And these are the kind of things that bother people and it bothered people living in rural Newfoundland, and I am not at all surprised tonight that the hon. gentleman did not have much to say about rural development because what I think, for his own sake, as a man aspiring to become the Premier of this Province, should relieve the minds of many concerned Newfoundlanders living in those outports today that if he ever came into a position of power to make decisions in regards to the rural outports of our Province, these small outports, what would he do?

MR. DINN: Well, after the next election he will have to be resettled himself. We will resettle him to Paris.

MR. J. MORGAN: Because, Mr. Chairman, we are a party that helps small businesses, not a party of pie in the sky dreams. Let us look at some of the pie in the sky. I heard some comments, I think in this debate, that "Oh, they have no planning. They have no concept where they are going what they are doing. There is no planning, there is no development." How about some of those pie in the sky dreams of the previous administration when this young turk was then the Minister of Social Development, the bright, new young fellow on the scene and

April 20, 1978

Tape 1112 (Night)

MM - 3

MR. J. MORGAN: now going to be, - hoping to become -
of course, he is hoping based on his recent poll which he carries around
like a new toy with him showing his new poll, showing his new Goldfarb
poll like a little boy.

MR. DINN: He is using that as a platform now.

MR. J. MORGAN: Let us look at, Mr. Chairman, some of
those - before my time runs out, let us look at some of those pie in
the sky dreams.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, I recall listening to
and reading reports, reports were carried in the media at the time,

MR. MORGAN: about the chocolate factory,
do you recall a great chocolate factory?

AN HON. MEMBER: Adlers.

MR. MORGAN: Many of my colleagues recall
a great chocolate factory, where the chocolate got frozen
up and they had to get - it froze into great big cakes
and they had to get a bulldozer to bulldoze the big cakes
of chocolate out through the side of the building. Remember
that one? How about that great rubber factor, the rubber
factory where, for one, I think they manufactured boots for
a full six months and they were all for the left foot. That
was a fact, left footed boots.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: They were making the boots for
themselves.

MR. MORGAN: How about the hockey stick plant?
Someone passed the puck there, very obviously. How about the
great orange juice proposal, the orange juice proposal from
Panama? That was going to be a great enterprise but it all turned
sour.

MR. DINN: There were a lot of proposals
from Panama. They are still coming in.

MR. MORGAN: Oh, the great pie in the sky dreams and
the great plans!

MR. DINN: The member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary)
is still getting in proposals from Panama.

MR. MORGAN: Because, Mr. Chairman, the fact is
that rural development has always been a very sore point with the
Opposition, and in particular now with the new Liberal leader,
because rural development has been a very positive part of this
government's activity.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: - a very positive part and tonight I noticed, it will be carried in Hansard and I will pick up Hansard and read it tomorrow or the next day, it shows where the present man aspiring to become the Premier of the Province only tonight says - tonight! He says tonight - he talks about the scurrilous acts by the previous ministers in the Department of Rural Development by making loans to people out in rural Newfoundland, because his colleague, the previous speaker said they were making loans to party hacks, PC Party hacks, and then he stands in his seat and demands, "Give me a list. Give me a list." What for? So he can go on in the morning on open-line, on the hot line shows in the Province and say, "This man, he had to be a PC; he had to be a PC to get a loan from the PC Government. He had to be a PC. He had to be a PC Party hack. He had to be a friend of the government to get a loan."

How do you think a man out in Amherst Cove, Bonavista Bay would feel if he saw his name being pushed over the radio stations by an Opposition spokesman saying, "Oh that man had to be a PC to get a loan from the PC Government"?

MR. DINN: Reputations do not mean anything to them.

MR. MORGAN: That is what happened here, that is what happened approximately two years ago, I was in the House here, I saw it happen two years ago, They demanded and got some names. The next day, Mr. Chairman, these names were bandied back and forth through all the media and accusations about these innocent gentlemen who were out there, innocent gentlemen who came in innocently in a way to get some assistance to get something done in their respective communities and their names were bandied back and forth publicly. What for?

MR. FLIGHT: That happened five years ago.

MR. DINN: You cannot remember what happened five minutes ago let alone a couple of years ago, so I would not tell you.

MR. MORGAN: And tonight the same hon. gentleman, the same hon. gentleman tonight stands in the House and demands a list, demands a list of these loans approved.

MR. DINN: We will send it to Paris after the next election.

MR. MORGAN: Demands a list so he can go out tomorrow morning and toss them around to all the media, and toss them around the open-line shows and attack them by saying, "Oh, you are a party hack because you got a loan from the government."

MR. DINN: We will send them to Paris.

MR. MORGAN: That is the reason why it is not being passed out; that is a good reason why it is not being passed out.

MR. DINN: He has a fixation now. Now watch out! He has a fixation.

MR. MORGAN: Now, Mr. Chairman, in closing my remarks I will say very sincerely- if I can get my colleague to be quiet there - I will say, Mr. Chairman, I will say very sincerely that I am convinced today with the reports and the facts- it is not reports, it is facts; the facts speak for themselves - that if this party on this side which is now the government of the day, had not come in and formed the administration in '71, looking at what was happening with the resettlement programme in 1970, one year before and '71, talking about moving and relocating 80,000 people, talking about eliminating 183 communities around rural Newfoundland, talking about a concept that one day we would only have to service 300 communities - that is a quote - "to only have to service in our Province 300 communities,"

MR. MORGAN: that if we had not formed the government in 1971 and stopped that policy, that we would have seen the destruction of a way of life which today we are quite proud of in our Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Chairman, I do not think that the hon. gentleman from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) has recovered from this afternoon yet, because obviously he would have made more sense than he has been making.

Mr. Chairman, in one breath
we hear

Mr. Callan:

this government saying, "We cannot afford to provide the social services that the rural communities in this Province need ". And then with the other breath they are saying that nobody should ever been resettled, we should have had one hundred or two hundred communities more than we have today. But if this government, Mr. Chairman, cannot provide essential services to the communities that are presently existing in this Province, services like post offices, telephone systems, water and sewer systems, federal wharves, artesian wells, town halls, firefighting equipment, incinerators , sports fields and ball fields, schools, and the dozen and dozen of other things, if this government today cannot afford to provide these essential services, social services to the communities that we have now, then how would the government manage to cope if they had to maintain these services on the dozen and dozens of communities that nobody wanted to stay in, by the way nobody wanted to stay in?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CALLAN: This minister can get up and talk about somebody that he talked to in Bonavista Bay from Flat Island, and I can just as quickly tell this House that I was talking two weeks ago in Arnold's Cove to a gentleman who wanted to repair his house under Rural RAP, and I said, by the way, you know, "How much money did you get when you moved in off the Island?" "Oh," he said, "I moved in off the island years before the resettlement programme started." So, Mr. Chairman, it is utter nonsense. It is something that should be washed under the -

AN HON. MEMBER: It is a red herring.

MR. CALLAN: It is a red herring. That is all it is. It is a red herring.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say this, if this government, Mr. Chairman, were concerned about rural development, developing the rural areas of this Province and was concerned with rural development then why did we have the two big events that we had in 1974? In 1974,

Mr. Callan: Mr. Chairman, one of the big events that we had was this, we had redistribution where seats were added in the larger urban areas. If this government is so concerned about the rural areas of this Province then why is it that we have thirty-six and forty and forty-odd communities expected to be served by one MHA and we have in this city and other cities and towns around this Province a half a dozen MHAs to serve an area half the size, a quarter of the size? That is how you look after the needs of the rural parts of this Province, give them fairer representation, And this, of course, applies especially, Mr. Chairman, to the Labrador section of this Province where we have three seats and it is impossible to cover the areas. So that was one of the things that happened in 1974, Mr. Chairman, that proved that this government cared nothing at all about the rural areas of this Province, all they care about was adding enough seats in the P.C. strongholds in the urban centres so that they would be elected to power again no matter how strong the tide was for the Liberal Party to get back into power.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN: That is what happened.

And, Mr. Chairman, in 1974 we hear this government and the various ministers talking about how we want to develop the rural areas of this Province and how we should have more farmland under production. Mr. Chairman, it was in 1974 that hundreds and thousands of barrels of potatoes were dumped down into Central Newfoundland because there was no market for them. And at the same time about 30 per cent of the potatoes and vegetables that are consumed in this Province only 30 per cent is produced here, is grown here; the other 70 per cent is brought in from P.E.I. and the other provinces. So how does that tie in with developing the rural areas of this Province? How does that tie in?

Now, Mr. Chairman, we talk about sawmills and we talk about lumber. Mr. Chairman, according to the Budget speech less than 40 per cent now we do not know how much less; it could be 10 per cent less than 40 per cent, it could be 20, we do not know how much less -

Mr. Callan: but the Budget Speech says that less than 40 per cent of the lumber that is used in this Province is produced here, less than 40 per cent; more than 60 per cent of the lumber used in this Province, Mr. Chairman, is brought in from elsewhere, is imported into this Province, at the same time, Mr. Chairman, that we have millions of cords of wood rotting on the stump.

MR. DOODY: We can hear you well enough.

MR. CALLAN: You should be used to it. You are listening to the Minister of Rural Development bawling like that every day of the week.

MR. DINN: I did not even hear you.

MR. CALLAN: You cannot hear me?

MR. DOODY: I did not say I could not hear you.

MR. CALLAN: Now then, Mr. Chairman,

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Chairman, sixty odd per cent of the

MR. CALLAN: lumber that is used in this Province is brought in from other provinces, and from other countries, I suppose, and here we have millions of cords of wood rotting on the stump, as some people say. I think it is rotting on the roots actually because I do not think there is any stump there yet.

Now then, Mr. Chairman, if this government is concerned about the rural areas of this Province, what is needed to be done and done immediately, and should have been done last year or the year before, instead of wasting these millions of dollars on this useless spray of the spruce budworm, get in there, harvest that timber, harvest that timber, Mr. Chairman, and at the same time employ some of your carpenters and other labourers and other tradesmen in building up across this Province lumber banks so that the suppliers of lumber can go to these lumber banks that are located here in this Province, with our own timber, and buy from these lumber banks rather than having it brought in by the carload, and by the train-load from other provinces. Develop a system of lumber banks across this Province.

Mr. Chairman, I was reading an article recently, an article that was talking about the ten Premiers of this country, and Mr. Chairman, it was very interesting to note in this article that Premier Blakeney of Saskatchewan was described as the brainiest Premier. About Levesque it said that in any other country Levesque would be Prime Minister of this country.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I do believe the hon. member is having a little difficulty getting the attention of the House. Order, please!

The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Chairman, it is very interesting to note that this same article when it came to speak about the Premier of this Province mentioned three glaring things about the Premier. It said the Premier of Newfoundland is the tallest Premier. How very important that is to the economy and to the rural areas of this Province! - we have the tallest Premier. Our Premier has the most children, eight children. How important that is to the economy and to the rural areas of this Province! And thirdly it said our Premier is the youngest Premier, the youngest Premier. He does not look the youngest. Is that because he works so hard, I wonder? Mr. Chairman, let us look at the policy that this Premier had back in 1971, let us look at it.

Mr. Chairman, it says, and here is the Premier speaking in 1971, before he became Premier, he said, "Newfoundland is a sick, sick mess. It is frightening the Province is so near to bankruptcy. It is \$1 billion in debt with no way to pay it off." Here is the very same Premier, Mr. Chairman, who today, after six years, has brought this Province \$3 billion into debt. And he was scared that the Province was on the verge of bankruptcy in 1971!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Three billion?

MR. CALLAN: It is closing in on \$3 billion; it is closing in, it is closing in and closing in fast. If it is not closing in fast I do not see why not, because this government has confessed time after time after time that they cannot get the money out of Ottawa that they would like to get and that they used to get, so therefore if the government is not \$3 billion in debt and if it is not going into debt every day of the week, then where is the money coming from? Is it being created through the dollars in the Come By Chance refinery?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! The hon. member's remarks should be heard with at least some modicum of silence.

MR. CALLAN: Are the new dollars in this Province being created as a result of the way that the Linerboard mill is working at full capacity? Is this where the new dollars are coming from?

Mr. Chairman, let me refer again to this Premier who said in 1970, he promised a system of auction sales would be instituted where feasible if the PCs were elected to ensure fishermen receive the best prices for their fish, a promise he repeated at a campaign rally at Twillingate eleven months later and again two or three months ago, and one on which he has never delivered. This is the government and this is the leader of a government who has the answers to this problem and who knows how to develop the rural areas of this Province. Another goody

MR. CALLAN: yet to come to functions promised by Moores in Gander was the formation of a provincial Crown corporation to develop Labrador resources. What have we seen in six years? What have we seen? Now then, Mr. Chairman, and I am sure the Minister of Fisheries would love hearing this again, fish products- the Premier, the former Premier, the man who was leader then, fish products, he told the meeting, should be processed in Newfoundland instead of being shipped in bulk out of the Province, another excellent suggestion which now has the sound of a badly worn tape recording. Now, Mr. Chairman, here is the hon. member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) talking about the promises and the things that the former administration talked about doing and tried to do. But here I just read it -

AN HON MEMBER: Table it.

MR. CALLAN: Table it? Where is the Page? Send over two or three Pages or a book. Here are the people who are talking about the former administration and some of the promises that were made and some of the mistakes that were made. The Premier of this Province more than six years ago talked about all the fine ideas that he had to put into effect when he became Premier, and here six years later we still have nothing, nothing to show . One minute, I am told.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in this one minute I would like to throw out a challenge to this administration. It is quite obvious to every Newfoundlander in this Province, who is not too blinded by PC beliefs and so on, it is obvious to every Newfoundlander in this Province that this Province is lost, there is no future, and this government does not know how to cope with the problems that we have. And they have confessed, as I said just a few minutes ago, time after time after time after time that they cannot negotiate with Ottawa. Well, Mr. Chairman, here is my challenge: After the federal election when it comes, hopefully in June, if the Liberal Government is re-elected in Ottawa, would this government have the guts to resign? Because obviously there would be no point in hanging on. If they cannot negotiate with the Liberal Government in Ottawa then that is our only hope, and so they might as well resign. And the P.C. Government, Mr. Chairman, might not be taking a big chance, let us face it: Five of the provinces have P.C. Governments including this one. Ontario has a P.C. government,

MR. CALLAN: and New Brunswick where the hunter safety tests were brought from that I did seven or eight years ago and skipped over Nova Scotia, which has a much better Hunter Safety Programme, skipped over that because it was Liberal and went to New Brunswick because it is PC. The same reason that they skipped over Nova Scotia when they said that we will not spray, we will go to New Brunswick because they are PC and they are spraying.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. GOUDIE: In the twenty minutes or so allotted for remarks under this heading, I would like to address myself to the Department of Rural Development as it relates to Labrador and the potential for development in that part of the Province as a result of some of the efforts which already exist and hopefully some of the efforts which will exist in the not too distant future under this particular department.

First of all I would like to make reference to - some hon. gentlemen made reference to totals under this department which were a little in excess of \$5 million, but that does not of course include the refunding or other funds which come from Ottawa which I understand total \$16 million under this department, \$9 million of which is channeled directly into Labrador which represents something like 56.25 per cent of the total budget of this particular department. I think that - I was going to use the word admirable but perhaps practical might be a better way to describe the attitude and the efforts of this department in relation to that other part of our Province.

I am not quite sure where to begin here but I would perhaps make reference, not in a critical manner, the remarks made by a number of hon. gentlemen over the last few hours and that is in relation to resettlement.

MR. GOUDIE: One community in Labrador which was resettled is the community of Hebron. Most of the people from that community moved into Nain, or into a certain section of Nain.

MR. ROUSSEAU: When was that?

MR. GOUDIE: I cannot remember the year now.

AN HON. MEMBER: The late 1960s.

MR. GOUDIE: Yes.

MR. NEARY: Davis Inlet was resettled too.

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, Hebron was.

MR. GOUDIE: Davis Inlet itself is not a new community.

MR. NEARY: No, but when the Base set up -

MR. GOUDIE: The location which they use right now is a new location.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is it?

MR. GOUDIE: Yes. In any event, Mr. Chairman, I wanted to make reference to Hebron. At a recent meeting of the combined councils of Labrador North a number of resolutions were adopted, one of them calling for the establishment of a new community in Northern Labrador. It is not spelled out in that resolution that the area they are talking about is Hebron or Okak or any other particular area, but my own opinion is that the area they are referring to would be Hebron.

AN HON. MEMBER: Moving back?

MR. GOUDIE: Moving back for a couple of reasons. It was basically, completely an Inuit community, a community of hard workers, of men and women and children who lived with the land - not necessarily just off it, but lived with it. They adapted themselves over the centuries past to accommodate the requirements of the land on the human inhabitants. They want to get back for social reasons, but I think there is also another overriding concern and that is the char fishery of Northern Labrador. I do not know if hon. members realize or not, but according to federal fisheries biologists salmon do not enter any river North of Davis Inlet, so the predominant fish catch from the rivers North of Davis Inlet obviously is Arctic char. It is a very marketable commodity, I might add, coming out of the fish plants at Makkovik and Nain. Nainip kautsavinga, I think, is the name of the plant.

MR. NEARY: They are trying to get rid of it.

MR. GOUDIE: No, they are not trying to get rid of it.

MR. NEARY: Yes, they are trying to get rid of it.

MR. GOUDIE: They are not trying to get rid of it.

The hon. member does not know what he is talking about and I am going to illustrate that now in just a couple of minutes -

MR. NEARY: I do not know what (inaudible).

MR. GOUDIE: - if the hon. member will remain silent and allow me to speak.

MR. NEARY: It was under my administration that the plant in Nain (inaudible).

AN HON. MEMBER: Be quiet and sit down.

MR. GOUDIE: May I have silence please, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Dr. Collins) Order, please! The hon. member requests silence for his remarks.

The hon. member.

MR. GOUDIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I was saying that one of the main reasons that residents of some parts of Northern Labrador want to get back to Hebron is to take advantage of the char fishery, because the char are not a migratory fish comparable to the salmon. They stay within the general confines of the river in which they were born, so over-fishing is taking place in a number of areas in Northern Labrador. But now we talk about "taking away the fish plants" I think is what the hon. member suggested a minute ago.

MR. NEARY: No, giving them away.

MR. GOUDIE: Give them away to whom?

MR. NEARY: Fishery Products. They will probably end up with them.

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Chairman, I had the privilege to sit in on a meeting two days ago in the Cabinet room in this building with the Labrador Resources Advisory Council, a group that I am going to have a few comments on in just a moment, and the Resource Policy Committee of Cabinet, and that particular problem was discussed. The comment was made that the fish plants are going to be taken away. The comment was made by some people sitting on that council, the Labrador Resources Advisory Council, and they were

MR. GOUDIE: justified in making that comment because they had no other opinion based on comments of the past on which they could go, But it was my understanding when the meeting was finished that there is now a lot of room for discussion through the Assistant Deputy Minister of Rural Development located at Goose Bay, his staff, the Labrador Resources Advisory Council, the combined councils and any other interested group. And I would state, Mr. Chairman, there are quite a number of interested groups in Labrador in this particular problem, and I would hope, and I believe, that the hon. the Minister of Rural Development is sympathetic enough to the cause, to their problems that the fishermen on the coast of Labrador have that he will consider with rationale any move that that department makes in relation to the fish plants.

One of the problems with the fish plants

now -

MR. FLIGHT: Look what they do with Gull Island (inaudible).

MR. GOUDIE: I am sorry?

MR. FLIGHT: What did they do with Gull Island when they
(inaudible) Happy Valley (inaudible).

MR. GOUDIE: Gull Island, Mr. Chairman, is not the topic of discussion at this point in time. It certainly does not come under the mandate or the requirements of the Department of Rural Development, so I will restrict my remarks to this. The hon. gentleman, when he resumes his own seat in the House, can have his opportunity to address his remarks to the subject.

AN HON. MEMBER: What a blow to the head!

MR. GOUDIE: That was not meant to be a blow of any kind, just a general observation.

In any event, Mr. Chairman, I will try and continue with my remarks for a few moments. I was suggesting that the fish plants at Makkovik and Nain are too small.

MR. NEARY: And Black Tickle.

MR. GOUDIE: Well I do not know the size of the fish plant at Black Tickle. I do not know if it is too small or not. But the other two that I am talking about right now are too - they are too small if you take into consideration the possibility of a varied fishery on the North Coast. Right now the Nain efforts are going into salmon, char, and the cod fishery.

MR. NEARY: And shrimp.

MR. GOUDIE: Shrimp are being dealt with now.

MR. NEARY: I will buy that.

MR. GOUDIE: Scallops are being investigated and a number of other varieties. So obviously some of the equipment at these plants is going to have to change if the fishery is to improve and expand. And I might point out Mr. Chairman, that I believe that there are certainly capable fishermen, not only on the North Coast but on any other part of the Coast of Labrador, who can prosecute that industry in a very industrious way, if you will, given the opportunity and the

MR. GOUDIE: facilities to do so.

MR. NEARY: I do not think the people want to leave Nain. I do not believe the hon. member is right there. They may want to go up in the Summer time and come back down again but they do not want to move out.

MR. GOUDIE: Well, the resolution is here. It is a public document as far as I know.

MR. NEARY: You would be surprised.

MR. GOUDIE: Now as I said in my remarks they did not refer to a specific community. What they were asking for is the establishment of another community. So I would assume that would mean, I think it follows logically that if you are going to establish another community then certain members of existing communities would have to locate there to establish that community.

MR. NEARY: Do the majority of people in Nain support that resolution?

MR. GOUDIE: The resolution came in from the combined councils of Northern Labrador - Nain, Davis Inlet, Hopedale, Makkovik, Postville and I believe Rigolet.

MR. NEARY: If a referendum were held in Nain, what does the hon. gentleman think the outcome would be?

MR. GOUDIE: I cannot even guess.

I just want to make a couple of other points and the hon. gentlemen can raise these questions at some other more appropriate time I think. As a matter of fact I would be more than willing to meet with the gentleman privately and explain my feelings on this whole thing.

MR. NEARY: I had a lot to do with that community.

MR. GOUDIE: I am sure the hon. gentleman did.

MR. NEARY: And Davis Inlet and Makkovik.

MR. GOUDIE: The Department of Rural Development, Mr. Chairman, as I pointed out initially, has a great role to play in Labrador; the establishment of handicraft industries, for instance. Now I do not wish to leave the impression that this department was solely responsible for the establishment of handicraft industries. Obviously that is inaccurate, because the handicrafts which are being produced in Labrador right now were not classified as handicrafts at one time; they were classified as essential instruments in the lifestyle of that part of the Province. The seal skin boots, and the duffle parkas, and the mitts and every other item, and the hooked rugs from the Straits of Bell Isle area, which are becoming famous all over Canada.

But I think it is important to point out that this department is certainly sympathetic to that sort of an effort. They are assisting in that sort of an effort. The handicraft -

MR. NEARY: The Government of Canada footed the bill for that.

MR. GOUDIE: Yes, I agree. I pointed out in the beginning that the funds under this department of \$16 million involves federal funds which comes through the federal-provincial committee. I am not trying to take away any credit from the federal government, or the hon. member's colleagues. I am just trying to make a few points about the importance of this department and the money in it, regardless of where the money comes from, to Labrador. That is all I am trying to do.

The handicraft shop, which is located in Happy Valley, last year - rather than try and give the exact figure because I cannot remember it, the money accruing from the sale of goods of that business was in the vicinity of \$1 million. All that money, or the most part of it, going into the hands of local people, not only in Happy Valley - Goose Bay but in other communities of Labrador as well.

MR. HICKMAN: Hopedale, was there not a lot of activity there?

MR. GOUDIE: There is another handicraft centre set up in Hopedale. I believe there are handicraft centres set up in every community. But that is now expanding, the handicraft centre at Happy Valley-Goose Bay, to get larger or get more room to bring in more supplies to fill demand for this sort of thing. Initially when the Handicraft Associations were set up they went on a very simple formula that I believe was developed in the community of Makkovik. The ladies in that community were able to obtain a loan initially of something like \$1,500.

MR. NEARY: Which community?

MR. GOUDIE: Makkovik on the North Coast.

MR. NEARY: Reverend Hettasch pioneered it up in Main.

MR. GOUDIE: Okay. Well, I am under the wrong impression, I am trying to give an example here. If the hon. gentleman would be patient I am trying to give an example of how this works or worked in the past. The group of ladies involved acquired a loan of something like \$1,500 which they put into what they call a revolving fund, From that \$1,500 they bought certain amounts of material, The ladies or men in the community who wanted to produce handicrafts came into the store, asked for enough supplies to make a parka or a pair of mitts or whatever the item was, took it home at no cost to them, produced the item, brought it back in, were paid for their labour, the shop marked it up by 20 per cent to cover their operating costs and sold it; and from that sort of a small beginning, whether it was in Makkovik or Main, if that is what the hon. gentleman contends, the principle of the thing is that it is a lucrative business, not -

MR. NEARY: You started it.

MR. GOUDIE: I am sorry?

MR. NEARY: You started it.

MR. GOUDIE: No. The hon. gentleman is being - I assume he is being partisan.

MR. NEARY: No.

MR. GOUDIE: I am not interested in being partisan right now. All I am trying to do is point out the importance of the relationship between this department to Labrador. And the importance, Mr. Chairman, of such groups as the Labrador Resources Advisory Council. As I mentioned, the Executive of the Council met on Tuesday of this week with the Resource Policy Committee of government to present their second annual report, and their feelings on a number of issues related to the fishery on the coast and other problems. And on page 3 of The Evening Telegram, I think it was yesterday, I heard some remarks from some hon. members of the House, "What is going on? We are putting money into this group and they are criticizing us, and they are holding up federal ministers as examples of good co-operation."

It is my contention, Mr. Chairman, that rather than being critical of that sort of an annual report or that sort of a situation I think we should be happy with it -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GOUDIE: -because it reflects a healthy attitude. Now this department, the Department of Rural Development, did not provide the funds to the Labrador Resources Advisory Council; it was under Executive Council, I think, estimates. The point is that funds were provided, the group is operating, and my own personal opinion is that we have discussed on a number of occasions in the hon. House since 1975 the practicality or otherwise of regional government for Labrador. I have talked a little bit about it and some other hon. members have talked about it. But I believe that we have the core group now for that sort of a concept. The Resources Advisory Council is made up of representatives from every community of Labrador, from all of the organizations who deal with social and economic problems. They are beginning to have an effective input. I believe it is accurate to say that the Resources Advisory Council had a direct input into existing offshore oil and gas regulations which have been published, which is an invaluable service as far as I can see to this or any other government.

MR. NEARY: The native land claims.

MR. GOUDIE: The native land claims are issues that are going to have to be dealt with, both the Inuit and the Indian. I do not believe- you know, I was going to say the Resources Advisory Council is not connected with that, but that is a completely false statement, of course, they are. They sympathize with the issue as do I.

MR. NEARY: What was that? I could not get that

MR. GOUDIE: I said they sympathize with the rights or the claims to rights of native people, I do not think I am misquoting them in that, as do I.

MR. NEARY: What does that mean to the hon. gentleman?

MR. GOUDIE: That I sympathize. That is all it means.

MR. NEARY: Sympathize in what?

MR. GOUDIE: Okay, I will try it again. The Inuit and the Indian peoples of Labrador are stating they have rights to certain parcels of land and resources and otherwise of Labrador. I am agreeing with that.

MR. NEARY:

Right.

MR. GOUDIE:

Is that clear now? Okay.

MR. NEARY:

Do not be touchy.

MR. GOUDIE:

I am not touchy. I am just trying to explain things to the hon. gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary).

MR. NEARY:

I thought the hon. gentleman was talking about (inaudible).

MR. HICKMAN:

I suggest we should be proud that we have a man in this House who knows something about Labrador. Let him speak without interruption.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

He should be over here on this side of the House, not where the hon. gentleman is.

MR. GOUDIE:

Mr. Chairman, all I am trying to do is make my remarks to the hon. House and right at this point in time I do not care particularly from where I make it. But I have to make it from this seat here and that is what I am attempting to do.

MR. NEARY:

Come on over, boy.

MR. GOUDIE:

There are two particular concerns that I have in relation to this department. One is in relation to the federal-provincial committee, and I hope the minister will address himself to this, and that is the designation of native communities in Labrador. And there is one particular community which poses a problem right now and that is the community of Northwest River. It is not a problem in the sense that it is not designated: It is a problem in the sense that it is only half designated. The south side of the river, the Indian community, is a designated native community, but the other side, which also has a native population - it is not an Indian population but it is a population native to Labrador.

MR. NEARY:

I could not agree more with the hon. gentleman.

MR. GOUDIE: It is not designated and as a result there are problems with schooling. Indian children from the Penamin MacKenzie School in Northwest River - it is not the case now but it was the case where some of them, if they wanted to complete their high school, travelled to either St. John's or to Wabush. Thankfully that is not a problem any more. But when you think in terms -

MR. NEARY: Because we built a school down there too, and a dormitory.

MR. GOUDIE: Yes, okay. When you think in terms of administering a town by a town council, and there are at least two representatives from the South side sitting on the town council, the town council is supposed to be responsible for the operation and provision of services to all of the community, but yet it is a divided community according to the federal-provincial committee. That is a problem that has to be rectified, I think.

MR. NEARY: What is the answer to that problem?

MR. GOUDIE: There is no other community in Labrador -

MR. NEARY: Designated community.

MR. GOUDIE: - or designated community, yes, that is cut in half like that.

MR. NEARY: What is the solution?

MR. GOUDIE: Designate the whole community is the solution as far as I am concerned.

The other problem, perhaps the minister -

MR. NEARY: The Grenfell people may not agree with that.

MR. GOUDIE: I think the Grenfell people would.

The other point I wanted to make, Mr. Chairman, and I hope the minister may address himself to, is the problem of accountability in terms of spending the money

MR. GOUDIE: by native groups. I understand, I am not clear on this, but I understand that steps are now being taken to provide for accountability. I think it is wrong for this government, for the federal government or any other government, to provide millions of dollars of funds to any group, native or otherwise, in this Province and not have that group responsible in terms of accounting for how that money is spent.

So I hope the minister will find the time to address himself to that problem and I thank the hon. Committee for putting up with my remarks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to make a few remarks with respect to this particular debate since it is of some concern to me, and I might add for the benefit of the gentleman from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) it is a matter of some importance to me at present, Mr. Chairman, and it is not a matter of being old history.

Rural development in this Province has been going on for quite some time and, Mr. Chairman, if you want to look at how the people in rural Newfoundland look upon members on this side I think all hon. gentlemen opposite would have to do is look at our seats and where our seats are established in this Province.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: Mr. Chairman, obviously there must be a kind spot in the hearts of Newfoundlanders everywhere for the Liberal Party for the way they have continued and quickly come back to the Liberal Party after six or seven years of Conservative mismanagement.

Mr. Chairman, I was interested when the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) was speaking tonight and he

MR. WHITE: talked about and quoted the Hon. the Premier about six years ago as talking about the economy of Newfoundland. And the gentleman from Bellevue quoted the Premier as saying the economy of Newfoundland in those days, back six years ago, was "sick, sick, sick." And those are a direct quote from the man who was Premier of this Province and who has led this Province for the last six years.

Mr. Chairman, a quick check revealed that back six years ago, when the Premier made those remarks, the unemployment

MR. F. WHITE: rate in Newfoundland was 9 per cent, Mr. Chairman, and if when the unemployment rate in Newfoundland was 9 per cent, Mr. Chairman, the economy of this Province was "sick, sick, sick," it has not got much better since. That is all I can say, Mr. Chairman, it has not got much better since. Now today the unemployment rate in this Province, Mr. Chairman, despite this government's so-called rural development policies, the unemployment rate today in six short years has doubled in this Province. And I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the economy in Newfoundland is close to death. It is not a matter of being sick, Mr. Chairman, it is close to death. And the economy for the last five or six has been under the direction, the scattered direction, I might add, of this government.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) talked about the Liberals not being interested in small businesses and quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, I wrecked my brains to find out and to think about a small business that the hon. gentleman, the Minister of Tourism, is concerned about. And quite frankly the only one that comes to mind is Sealand Helicopters. That is the only small business that comes to mind.

MR. S. NEARY: What about the Ocean Breeze lounge?

MR. F. WHITE: Yes, well that is another matter that I do not want to discuss at present, Mr. Chairman. It seems to me that that hon. gentleman who got tonight and attacked everybody, practically everybody who has anything to do with the rural Newfoundland, a gentleman like Senator Rowe, Mr. Chairman, a gentleman like Senator Rowe who represented in this House for many, many years the most rural parts of Newfoundland, and the hon. gentleman gets up tonight and attempts, Mr. Chairman, attempts to throw doubt and suspicion on his long career in this Province and in this House of Assembly.

MR. S. NEARY: Not even here to defend himself.

MR. F. WHITE: Not even here to defend himself. I think, Mr. Chairman, the last man who got up in this House - probably I should not. I was going to say what happened to the last man who got up in this House and attacked a parent of a member. I think all hon. gentleman know. It is interesting to note as well, Mr. Chairman, that yesterday -

MR. J. MORGAN:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

A point of order has come up.

MR. MORGAN:

The hon. gentleman is now attempting to indicate or insinuate that I attacked an hon. gentleman. All I did in the House tonight was quote a source, which I am willing to table in the House, of quotations made and taken from statements made by the then minister responsible for resettlement in the Province who happened to be then Dr. Fred Rowe. There was no attack on the individual.

MR. F. WHITE:

To that point of order, Mr. Chairman, The hon. gentleman tonight went through all kinds of effort to determine and to state and to try and prove -

MR. S. NEARY:

It was slander and libel.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

MR. F. WHITE:

- that the resettlement programme in Newfoundland did untold damage and he linked the untold damage to Senator Rowe, who was at one time a minister in this House. Now, Mr. Chairman, if that is not a deliberate attempt to downgrade a gentleman's career I do not know what is.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please! Order, please!

I feel it is not a point of order but more or less an explanation of remarks made by the hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. F. WHITE:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for those words of advice. Now, Mr. Chairman, in this House tonight is the hon. gentleman for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) who recently left the Cabinet of the hon. the Premier. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman for Grand Falls has only been out of the Rural Development Department for a few short weeks and I do not think that he should be let off the hook as easy tonight as he is being let off the hook by members in this House. Now, I do not know if the fact that Rural Development was coming up one of those days and the gentleman would have to answer for his deeds, if that is the reason the hon. gentleman is not in the Cabinet today. I suspect there are more reasons than just the Grand Falls hospital. If promises has anything to do with it, Mr. Chairman, if promises has anything to do with it the hon. gentleman for Grand Falls is equally, and more so in some respects, guilty than the hon. the Premier with respect to playing around, Mr. Chairman, with the morals of God-fearing

MR. F. WHITE: Newfoundlanders. Mr. Chairman, this secrecy policy of this government that we are facing here tonight was developed by this gentleman, the gentleman for Grand Falls.

MR. S. NEARY: Cloak and dagger policy.

MR. F. WHITE: He is the gentleman, Mr. Chairman, who started this hiding policy, the gentleman who started hiding the lists of rural development grants, and I would like for the hon. gentleman to stand up in this House tonight and tell us what rural development grants were given out, Mr. Chairman, particularly in Twillingate district. Why does the hon. gentleman not stand up and tell us who got rural development grants in Twillingate district during the by-election and leading up to it? Why does he not tell us how many were promised that were forgotten the day after the by-election in Twillingate district? Why does the hon. gentleman not start accounting for some of his deeds? I have heard nothing in this House, Mr. Chairman, from that hon. gentleman since I have been here other than criticism- criticism of the Opposition, criticism

MR. WHITE: of Ottawa, criticism of everybody.
And he resigns and he blames that on the Premier. When is this hon.
gentleman going to start taking some responsibility for his deeds,
Mr. Chairman?

MR. NEARY: Misdeeds!

MR. WHITE: With respect to those lists, Mr. Chairman,
the only logical conclusion that I can come to is that the government
does not want to disclose the rural development list, the loans list,
because they have something to hide.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. WHITE: Now I come to that conclusion, Mr. Chairman,
because members will notice that the government is not very slow in showing
on television and in television commercials some of the good projects that
have gone ahead in this Province with respect to rural development and
other programmes. The T.V. ads are there, millions of dollars are being
spent to promote the good aspects of rural development, and yet,
Mr. Chairman, we in this House, the members of this House, are not given
the opportunity to find out what Rural Development loans and grants have
been given out in this Province. All we get is a list.

And, Mr. Chairman, another point that I would
like to make.

MR. NEARY: Some of the people they are using in these
ads are hopping mad because they are being used without their permission.

MR. FLIGHT: That is right.

MR. WHITE: That is right.

MR. FLIGHT: They are being used.

MR. NEARY: They are being exploited for political purposes.

MR. WHITE: I would like to know from the Minister of
Rural Development, for example, what quail breeding is about - I really
would, Mr. Chairman. I am interested in all kinds of projects in rural
Newfoundland.

MR. NEARY: What about the rag packages?

MR. WHITE: I would like to know who came up with the
quail breeding suggestion, what it means to this Province, and how many

MR. WHITE: jobs it means, Mr. Chairman. I would like to know about those things. I would like to know about the taxidermy industry -

MR. NEARY: And who is getting stuffed.

MR. WHITE: - and the taxidermist who has been relocated on a prime piece of property on the Trans-Canada Highway at the intersection of the Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir road. I thought it was a new modern tourist chalet or something of that nature that was being erected there, Mr. Chairman. I would like to know about that. And I would like for members opposite to tell us all about that \$8,000, where it went and why it went there. Why do not all those lists of names come out? Let us look at them and debate them, because anybody in receipt, Mr. Chairman, of public money in this Province surely does not mind his name being scrutinized here in this House.

The entire record of this administration, Mr. Chairman, is one of dismal failure, and even when they tried to do something that is fine and dandy, Mr. Chairman, something that we welcome and something we promoted and we tried to get going, even when they do something like that they do it in the wrong fashion. Take the seal hunt for example, Mr. Chairman. A very worthwhile thing in rural Newfoundland is the annual seal hunt and all members are proud of it and so on, but take the government's attempt to sell the seal hunt around this world. It was not built around a seal, Mr. Chairman. Those ads and the news conferences and so on were not built around a seal, they were built around the hon. the Premier and not the seal hunt in this Province. And that is one thing we should remember here in this House.

MR. NEARY: And now he has got a scrapbook.

MR. WHITE: The entire campaign contains more money, Mr. Chairman, than all the loans going to be made available this year for rural development in Newfoundland.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: That is the government's policy, Mr. Chairman. That is the government's policy. That is the way they do things here in this House.

PREMIER MOORES: I understand Ray Elliott (inaudible) or something. I can understand why.

MR. WHITE: Yes, right.

MR. NEARY: The hon. Premier now has a little scrapbook he carries around with him.

MR. WHITE: I would like also, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan), if he does speak in this debate -

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible) alright too.

MR. WHITE: - Mr. Chairman, if the hon. gentleman does speak in the debate I would like for him to tell us -

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Young) Order, please!

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) the money he got to put a factory on his ship.

PREMIER MOORES: (Inaudible) Which is it?

MR. NEARY: No, I am merely asking a question -- Did the hon. gentleman pay back the money?

MR. WHITE: Where was the hon. the Premier all night?

MR. NEARY: Did the hon. gentleman pay back the money?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER MOORES: (Inaudible) Captain Morrissey Johnson.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please!

I did recognize the hon. the member for Lewisporte (Mr. White) and I feel there are many more joining in the debate and I ask you to refrain from joining in. I would ask the hon. the member for Lewisporte to continue.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Chairman, as I was going to say, the hon. gentleman from Grand Falls, when he does get up to defend his estimates, because I notice that the Minister of Mines and Energy has no heart for it tonight, and I think the hon. gentleman from Grand Falls should be called upon to at least try to defend some of this spending that is going on here. Why does he not tell us about the eel experiment on the Exploits River? - why that went ahead, Mr. Chairman, on the Exploits River; tell us all about

April 20, 1973

Tape 1322 (Night)

EC - 4

MR. WHITE: how it got started and tell us about
its conclusion. The other day I was listening to a group of fisheries
people who were in Europe promoting the fishery in Newfoundland, and
one of the specific projects mentioned on the national C.B.C. News that
evening that I was listening to was the smoked eel that is prepared in
my district and was put on display in several countries in Europe. And
when the person involved in this particular venture came back to
Newfoundland I said, 'What is the problem? Why can you not really
develop this particular project and get it going in Europe?'

Mr. F. White: And she said, "Because the raw material is just not available and I had to tell the Europeans that I did not have the quantity that they were looking for." And I said, "Why?" I said, "What about the Exploits Valley eel experiment?" And she said, "It was an absolutely ridiculous place to start an eel industry." The best place to start an eel industry is the small rural areas of Lewisporte district, Stoneville, Horwood, Birchy Bay where the silver eel, Mr. Chairman, are in plenty there in the Fall of the year and all we need is a little bit of help and that project will boom, Mr. Chairman, because I know it will boom. So I hope the hon. gentleman tells us about that.

MR. NEARY: No all the slippery eels are on that side of the House.

MR. WHITE: So, Mr. Chairman, I would like for the hon. gentleman to try and defend some of this, and I do make an appeal, -

AN HON. MEMBER: Do you have the facts?

MR. WHITE: Yes. And I do make an appeal, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister of Rural Development, the present minister, to come clean with the Opposition, Mr. Chairman. We have nothing to hide over here and we hope that the government has nothing to hide. We think all public money should be placed on the Table for scrutiny by members and I would say to the hon. member and the hon. minister that he would be well advised to place the list, to let us know who got rural development grants, and I would be particularly interested in Twillingate, Mr. Chairman, which I am sure the hon. gentleman for Grand Falls realizes by now contains more than smoked salmon. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN (MR. YOUNG): The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. CROSS: Mr. Chairman, certainly for -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CROSS: May I be heard in silence, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN (MR. YOUNG): Order, please. I recognize the hon. member for Bonavista North, and I cannot hear him from the Table.

MR. CROSS: I realize that there are quite a number of speakers who would like to speak to this debate tonight, but certainly I have a few remarks that I would like to make. Before I start I would like to say that I am not going to attack personalities, but for a few minutes I am going to reminisce on the former resettlement policy in Newfoundland. And I am going to go back to the Budget of 1969 for a few minutes to read a few excerpts and then I am going to try and relate what the resettlement meant to me because I did live in communities that did certainly suffer great harm as a result of the resettlement policy, not only communities, but people.

MR. CALLAN: Not in Bonavista North.

MR. CROSS: Yes.

MR. CALLAN: No way!

MR. CROSS: Yes, in Bonavista North.

Looking through the Budget of 1969-I am going to read a few excerpts from it- I will quote in my speaking, "We might as well face the fact without reluctance or fear, Mr. Speaker; there has got to be a very great reduction in the number of settlements in the Province, and there has got to be a great movement of relocation of population, and there has got to be a great development of centralization of population into a drastically reduced number of places."

Then a little further on in the Budget Speech of that year there is a part of another paragraph that I want to read. It says, "The very fact of that movement"-thinking of resettlement of course - "The fact of new house construction, the fact of extension and expansion in the larger cities of population and all of the incidentals appertaining to such movement would have themselves create a great stir in the economy of the Province." So apparently back in 1969 we were going to build the economy of Newfoundland on resettlement, kill some to improve others.

Certainly a little further on in this Budget debate, and I read again, it says;

MR. CROSS:

"Mr. Speaker, if I may summarize this aspect of my remarks I would say that in all probability in the next ten to twenty years the whole of the population of our Province will be found to be living voluntarily in a total of a very few if any more than 200 different cities, towns and settlements."

"It is entirely likely that 500,000 of our population will be found in no more than three dozen different places." So certainly looking at that, the rural Newfoundland, as we know it today, as we knew it in the past, I do not think it would be with us. But certainly in the North end, true, the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) when he spoke just now said some people moved into Gambo from various areas in the community. That is true. And I am not going to say anything to belittle the community of Gambo and the people who moved into Gambo from the other parts of Bonavista North were good people and I am sure they are making a great contribution in the community of Gambo.

But in the North end of my district, from 1966 onward, and just for a minute I will go back to Greenspond again, but in 1966, '67, '68, '69 these four years I was a teacher in that community and it was during these years that the community began to die. The people began to move out. But it was pathetic and certainly would almost break your heart to see how people felt about leaving that old, historic community and at this point in time in our history it would enlighten your heart to see the people moving back.

We are saying, and it has been said from the other side of the House, that the people who moved away from the island communities, or the small communities, would they go back now?

MR. NEARY:

No. •

MR. CROSS: I would say yes for the simple reason -

MR. FLIGHT: Do not be talking so ignorant.

MR. CROSS: - for the simple reason that three pupils whom I taught, hard working and industrious young men, who did get their education, and who got through in a little school, made their mark, passed in honours, goes on to trade school. One young man foresook a salary of \$25,000, this is the gospel truth, and decided he was going to go back where he wanted to live. Is there anything wrong with being allowed to live where you want to live? Going back to go into the fishery, three in fact buying a longliner between them, going back,foresaking good jobs and is going to make - and I say to some of the experienced people, experienced fishermen in Bonavista North, those young men,dedicated to what they are doing, will be prime fishermen and the man who beats them in hauling the fish from the water will have to get up early.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CROSS: Certainly there was an attitude in the lower ends and the thing is it is the policy, it is the resettlement policy, there was a policy possibly but I cannot say that there was a plan. I cannot say there was a plan for resettlement because while I taught in Greenspond my home was in Badger's Quay. I am not ashamed of having taught in Greenspond. I am not ashamed of my record as a teacher in Greenspond. It will stand with anyone's. But there was a policy with no plan, because there were people moving away from Greenspond to move into Badger's Quay, to move into Wesleyville, to go to Gambo and other communities, to Glovertown from Bonavista North, true, They moved

MR. CROSS: out and away, but the communities that they were moving into the people were moving out. From Greenspond to Badger's Quay, from Badger's Quay to St. John's, Gamba and so on, and so the story goes. So there was no plan there.

Six years ago in Greenspond there were houses barred up, the bar was on the door. The ones that were not torn down are occupied again now and last year there were four new homes constructed, the community living again. But in the North end of the district the bar was on a good many doors in 1966 up to 1970 but now all of those homes are occupied again and how many dozen built? So I am saying we have begun to live again. This is the point I want to make; we have begun to live again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CROSS: I believe it. There is an air of optimism in the district, and certainly it is the new dollar that counts in this respect. If you leave a job where you are not producing anything to go and produce a new dollar, like the three young lads from my district, they will be making a greater contribution. As a result the dollars will be there. There have been small loans, there have been small grants for blueberry cleaning in the centre of the district.

The smoke house: The hon. member for Placentia spoke this afternoon of the hundreds of smoke houses in New Brunswick. The old bait depot in the community of Greenspond was turned into a smoke house. Last year - only three little jobs - but last year that smoke house turned a profit. There was a fish plant one time in that community but, and this is the truth, shortly after the people began to move away - "We cannot leave the fish plant there they might think it will open again." So what did they do? "Sell the fish plant for a dollar and have it

MR. CROSS: torn down. There will be no more fish processed in Greenspond."

There was an ice making machine there. Thank God! there is going to be another machine put back there this year. So there is a bit of optimism on the go. Small loans are coming forth. We are developing. There have been more new dollars produced in the district of Bonavista North in the last six years than were produced in the last sixteen. Now, you might want to take me on on that one, but I think and I feel I am pretty close to knowing what I am talking about. I do not think that Newfoundland will survive on a policy that is going to bring about a great economic boom as a result of resettling 90 per cent of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER(Young): The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CANNING: Mr. Chairman, I am in the happy position, as I have said already in this session, to represent an area where there is a fair amount of development going on, where there is an awful lot of employment compared to other areas of Newfoundland. I do not have too much to ask for, not too much extra to ask for; all I have to do is beg that what we have will be kept going.

Mr. Chairman, in all my length of time here - I hate to be repeating it but it is a long time, the longest time that ever any member has stood in the House and claimed to be the representative of the same district. I know the area of which I speak where I was born and brought up and have represented for this length of time. Mr. Chairman, of all the people who have come in and out of this House, all the people I have heard speak in the House, all the members, I have heard more ignorant statements about resettlement in the last few sessions of

MR. CANNING: this House than all the
statements I have heard in the last twenty-six years and
I do not understand it.

 Mr. Chairman, why I do not
understand is this;

MR. CANNING: The one who just sat down said he had been a teacher. This has been thrown across by men who have taught in the schools, who have taught our children. They were good teachers, I suppose, for many subjects but I tell you one thing that they did not teach them, if they went on like they are going on now, they never kept their children informed of current events. They could not have told them in the schools what was happening when people left islands and isolated settlements. They could not have told them why those people came, why they had to leave. They could not have encouraged education when they get up now and say it is a great thing for them to go back.

Mr. Chairman, when I went into that district - that district had fifty-three settlements, and they gradually left it. The people got money enough to go or some area to go to and that district was cut fifty per cent, in half, as far as settlements were concerned, before anybody mentioned resettlement, before ever the hon. Leader of the Opposition ever came into this House. They were left there when he was in school. And he was here while this was going on. But I will tell the House one thing now, and I will back it as far as I am concerned, the hon. Leader of the Opposition had no more to do with anybody who left isolated settlements on the Southwest Coast, in Fortune Bay or Placentia Bay, than he had to do with the election of the last Pope, and he had nothing to do with that. He had nothing to do with it, nothing to do with it.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. CALLAN: The Premier laughs, look.

MR. CANNING: I am going to tell the hon. member for Placentia East (Mr. Patterson), I have to tell him because he knows what I am going to tell him is true, but he has gotten up a few times and said something about the resettlement. He did not say very much except he was not for it and we were awful

MR. CANNING: fellows over here for having caused that.

When this big move got on in Placentia Bay why they got away was any responsible father or mother living on an island in Placentia Bay would want to get off it, if he had his children there. If he wanted his children to get medical attention, to get their teeth looked after, their health looked after he would get off it if he could get off it and come to the health centre. If he wanted them to take part in sports, if they wanted to get to an arena, if they wanted to see a television set, because they left before we had any electricity out there, and further than that I will tell as I go along. They left after they got electricity and after they got everything else practically, not the essentials. And I will tell you one thing there is - I went through that district, I know it better than anybody knows it, I know the history of it better than anybody knows it and it is not written, so it will probably die with me. I knew every settlement and every parent in that district in the twenty-three years I was there. And I will tell this House something tonight, there is not one mother, not one single mother who left the cliffs of Paradise or the bleak end of Marasheen or the bleak end of Harbour Buffitt, or anything else, not one single one of them would tell you today that they did not want to get off it, and they are glad they got off. And I will tell you something else, I would challenge the House to do this. It is not very far to Arnold's Cove, it is not very far, that fine settlement of Arnold's Cove where some of the finest people in Newfoundland moved into, and I will give you Arnold's Cove, I bet any member of this House can get in his car tomorrow morning and go out and see the children from - not the children now because some were children when they came in, very young, some were not in school - you ask anybody between eighteen and thirty in Arnold's Cove does he want to go back to Tack's Beach or does he want to go

MR. CANNING: back to the head of Long Island, ask the children. I saw them on television when they were interviewed in Arnold's Cove, and some members here probably saw when the interviewer went from one to the other, the children said, "No, we are glad we left." And then they named why they were there, because they had better schools, they had electricity, and they named it one after the other. No notion of going back there.

But I will tell you one thing and I will place my politics on this, any man who moves back into Paradise, or into Merasheen, or into Isle Valen or into Clattice Harbour, or into Davis Cove, and all the other places there, any man of twenty or thirty years of age with children, I would say he has no regard for his children, he has no regard for his wife to take them out. Because first of all you are not going to have a town there, you are not going to have central schools out there unless you put one on the middle island, and if we have not got money enough now to run the buses ten miles, by God we will have a job to take them out of Isle Valen, ten miles across the water and bring them to a central high in Merasheen. And I will tell you something else, we could not keep clergymen on those islands. They would not come. We could not keep nurses. And in all the time I was out there there was one Newfoundland nurse served in Placentia Bay, one native Newfoundlander that is what we got on Merasheen Island or got in Bay Harbour or got in Petit Forte, or got in Tax Beach, one. if anybody wants to check it. And I will tell you she is one of the finest nurses, she is still living at - I do not know her age now, she is over seventy years of age. She was an RN at eighteen years of age, came off that island and got in here and she spent here lifetime there. A woman I suppose who did more for the health of the people than any other living Newfoundlander today. She is in the hon. member for Bellevue's (Mr. Callan) district

MR. CANNING: now, she is living in Arnold's Cove. Go out and have a talk to her. See even if she wants to go back. But she is a dedicated nurse who spent her lifetime there and did as much for the sick people I suppose - as much anyway, if not more, than anybody living today.

We had a hospital ship in there, I do not know how many years, a good many years. All I know is there was not one Newfoundland doctor went on that hospital ship, not one.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about Dr. Duff?

MR. CANNING: He was not in Placentia Bay if he was a Newfoundlander. He might have been up the Coast. Perhaps there were when she went out there first up there. And they moved so fast that - well, I used to get embarrassed because I would go down aboard and every time I would go aboard I did not know the doctor. One time I got mixed up because they had one Dr. Murphy first and then there was another Dr. Murphy came. So I went down and I asked could I see Dr. Murphy and somebody said, "He is down there." I said, "No, no," I said, "I was aboard this one a couple of weeks ago." "Oh," he said, "well he only came a week ago so he is another Murphy." I did not know him.

We could not get the teachers to stay there. And teachers telling you to relocate! I would bet you any money that if the hon. Minister of Rural Development, if he were teaching yet, and Merasheen was still there

MR. P. CANNING: he would not go there. And if he went there, by God he would not be much of a man to take his children out there, take them away from higher schools and better advantages and hospitals. He would not think much about his wife if he went out there: he is only young yet and she might be going to have children.

AN HON. MEMBER: You never know, do you?

MR. P. CANNING: No, you do not know. All right, joke about it! They can joke about it. This is sense. This is facts. This is history. Let us tell those children.

And another one - this is the beaut of all this is now and this is true. The people who clung on, sometimes he was a merchant over in the corner of the harbour with a little shop. He hung on, he condemned Joe Smallwood for taking the people away, but, Mr. Chairman, he had a family - had had a family - but they were not there. They did not stay there. He had enough money to get them away, get them to school and they went off. He was there by himself. Anybody knows the firms of Placentia Bay. I do not know if anybody here knows much about them and I will name them.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Warehams.

MR. CANNING: The Warehams? Fine people, fine merchants as they go, you know, I mean they lived well. When the fishermen did not live well, they lived fine. They had plenty to eat and plenty to wear when the fishermen were starving. That is a historical fact of Newfoundland. The hon. Premier knows that, knows there was fish trucked out of my bay over into the plant they were in when it was about a quarter of a cent - or was it a half cent he was giving them then?

MR. S. NEARY: No, a bottle of Coke for overtime.

MR. P. CANNING: Yes, these are facts.

PREMIER MOORES: Not true!

MR. CANNING: It is a fact. He paid three-quarters of a cent for a pound of fresh fish.

PREMIER MOORES: That is not true!

MR. S. NEARY: No, straight facts.

MR. P. CANNING: When did he give three cents? When did he give three cents in Harbour Grace?

PREMIER MOORES: When did you catch one last?

MR. P. CANNING: I caught one -

MR. S. NEARY: He wrung more salt water out of socks than the hon. Premier sailed over.

MR. P. CANNING: I caught one not too long ago. I was thirty-one years of age, I had come back from overseas and gone back to university and I went fishing. That is how I got it. I went back to the school with my hands too sore to write, and I expect I did more work between fourteen and thirty than the Premier did in his life.

AN HON. MEMBER: That could be.

MR. P. CANNING: He did not have to work. He was the son of a merchant prince.

PREMIER MOORES: I was the son of a what?

MR. P. CANNING: A merchant prince, the merchant princes of Newfoundland, that is just what they were. They were the only ones well off in those places. I do not know how well off where he was brought up. I know that people were not very well off because they never got enough for their fish.

And what is his history with the fish plant?

His father had it before him. A fine man they tell me - I did not know him. Great man! What happened to the fish plant when he took it over? Where did it go? I will tell you where it went. It went down and down and down and the Provincial Government bought it off him and made a millionaire out of him.

PREMIER MOORES: No, they did not.

MR. P. CANNING: And then he went out and he stabbed the fellow who gave the million and half - whatever he got for it - in the back with it.

MR. S. NEARY: Cannot take it!

MR. P. CANNING: Mr. Chairman, it is sickening, it is sickening and it is pathetic. I never thought it would happen. You know, I had the feeling when I came in here with teachers and lawyers and doctors -

April 20, 1978

Tape 1327 (Night)

DW - 3

MR. S. NEARY: Listen to this, listen to the truth.

MR. P. CANNING: - teachers, lawyers and doctors. We only have one over here, a lawyer now, have we?

MR. S. NEARY: Yes.

MR. P. CANNING: All right. That is all right. We need one against three or four. He is able to handle the three or four anytime especially where he is judged from Beauchesne. He can beat him on that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CANNING: Mr. Chairman, I have never heard as much ignorance coming out of anybody anywhere. Anywhere I hear people talking, any lectures I have heard any panel I have sat on, people I have talked to, the most ignorance - sometimes I just sit hear and wonder what I am hearing. When I hear the hon. Minister of Rural Development, when I hear him getting up and he is yelling and he is breaking all the rules of the House, I say to myself, my God! I am going to tell him my experience with him. When I went back in to my district,

MR. CANNING: he had been Minister of Municipal Affairs and I knew him, I knew him growing up. I guess he went through high school in the main town of my district, and I will just tell you the story about him because I do not understand him any more. When I look over I do not think it is the same boy. He went to school in Marystown with pretty good teachers. I am sure he would not deny that. And while he was there, the family was moved to Toronto. His father went away for an extra course. I do not know what grade he was in but all I know was this that when he -

MR. PECKFORD: You are wrong. You are wrong. I went to Lewisporte, Mr. Canning. Better get your facts straight.

MR. CANNING: I think you went to Marystown. You went to Toronto with your father as a schoolboy, went to school up there. Is that not right? Is it right or is it not? If it is not I will tell you something else, some of his family went there, some of the boys went there, and I am almost certain he did.

MR. MORGAN: Some of your cousins, boy.

MR. CANNING: And when he went to the school - just listen to this now about the Newfoundlander going to school from an outpost, a rural area. He went up to school and he was in class and some official of the school came in the classroom, He had been taught when anybody came in, the clergyman came in or the inspector came in, children stood in their places, stood up as an act of respect to whoever came in, Like you do in your own home. If anybody has any manners, someone comes to the door you stand up. So it is pretty good. But when this official, whoever it was, had gone out, the teacher came to him and said, "Why did you stand up?" Either he told him or one of his brothers, "Well, in the school I came from we were taught to stand up when someone like this came in as a matter of respect." Mr. Chairman, that teacher stood up before the class and told them why he stood up, because he looked odd - but they were not. They were good, civilized, partly educated - getting their education - Newfoundlanders who came from Newfoundland, had those manners, and had that respect for anyone who came in the house and they stood

MR. CANNING: up. Mr. Chairman, I was told that by one of his parents, so I do not think he can deny it. If it was not him it was one of his three or four brothers, however many he has.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. F. ROWE: Give it to them.

MR. CANNING: I do not know what they are laughing at over there, if they are laughing at him because the boy was taken up as an example in Toronto. Perhaps they would rather tell a joke where a mistake was made or something to be laughed at, and it would be a good Newfie joke. But I am telling where we could send them up in Toronto in one of the better schools they went to, where they were shown as an example. But my good God, I hope the teachers who taught them will not come in here and hear them in here because I have never heard anything like him in my life, the ridiculous statements he makes. And the former administration you did it all, and we are doing everything. Heavens, he is an intelligent man. You know, does he not know they are not doing anything or has something - you know, has something gone wrong up here with what he thinks with? I mean does he think that Newfoundland is going ahead today?

Mr. Chairman, I hope I have enough minutes to finish this, because I went off on a tangent there. When I went back to the district, Mr. Chairman, he was -

MR. FLIGHT: The truth hurts. You can see it in his face.

MR. CANNING: - when I went back there when I was elected, when I came in here, when I moved out one of his friends - something like him they tell me, I do not know - but they say that there were three or four oil rigs on the Grand Banks and they were drilling and drilling and my predecessor was talking and talking in here, challenged the Supreme Courts and challenging everybody, and by and by he disappeared. And then he stayed here. He is there now. As far as I know there are one or two - how many off the Labrador, two or three of them, one or two or something down there drilling? They

MR. CANNING: are gone. They are not there. So I would say between the two of them they talked away the oil rigs.

AN HON. MEMBER: Scared them off.

MR. CANNING: They are gone. They are not there. They scared them off.

Now, Mr. Chairman, when I went back to the district, as a good member, which I always did, I visit each place and I went into the different councils, met with the different councils and sat down with them. Mr. Chairman, what I found there, if I had time to tell it - I will not. All I know is this, that when I would mention the hon. minister's name - you know, did not the minister do this? Did you see the minister? Did you write the minister and what not? - they did not want to hear of him, they did not want to see him. And I could not get them to see the minister and he would not come in because he made a very good job of putting the town council in Marystown in poverty, down to where it almost - where they were going to sell the town hall this year to come out of the hole. And he had a lot to do with it, that hon. minister, I can assure you that -

MR. FLIGHT: That is what happened to the Lloyds River.

MR. CANNING: - by authorizing loans to the banks that they could not afford to meet, by their wonderful stadium policy they had. It drove them on the rocks. And what I found

MR. CANNING: in the towns was every place deteriorating the roads are pushed over on the small town councils to go to the banks for loans for them. It never happened before. It never happened.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. CANNING: I was going to pay the hon. minister a compliment; he has nothing to do with it. I hope he had nothing to do with -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! The hon. member has one more minute.

MR. CANNING: One more minute. I have to go back to him because, you know, I have spared the hon. gentleman, Mr. Chairman, I have spared him. I get along great with him. And my councils were getting along fairly well with him, but I will tell you one thing that if he can clear that mess in Burin up, clear that up first - that is if he can do it, it is not your fault. It is his fault, the other one.

Look, Mr. Chairman, we are fairly lucky up there, I would say. First of all I have got a good member in Ottawa, and he is a darn good member for Newfoundland, for all Newfoundland and I do not think he gives us any more but he is pretty good. But it was the first time that I found that the hon. Don Jamieson got money for a town council and there were so many irregularities, I am going to call them - if I say the scandals perhaps I will be called to order, There were five contractors went into Burin, coming up for elections, five of them running into another, trying to get one ditch down through a mile or a mile and a half of land, and they end up - And when I came in I went to the minister time and time again, to the present minister, after he took over, saying, "Is this cleared up yet? How much is it overspent?" First it was \$80,000, and I do not blame the minister, again, I think he has it hard to get all those invoices, wherever they are.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I am sorry to interrupt but I am afraid the hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. CANNING: Anyway, Mr. Chairman, I thank you very much and all I say is that that is not cleared up yet.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Grand Falls.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Give me about five hours and I will get off my chest what I have got on my chest after listening this afternoon and tonight to the remarks across the way. It actually scares me a little bit. I feel today that the people in Uganda would feel more comfortable under the present regime than they would under what I see across the way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: And I say to the Premier, I say to my colleagues, that if we do not recognize it, it is about time we have recognized that we have got a monumental responsibility, after what I have seen across the way today, led by the Leader of the Opposition, led by the member for Lewisporte (Mr. F. White), taking off and being coached by the Leader of the Opposition - and I have not got time to take off on him. I will get a chance. I will send out his remarks - the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), and now the hon. gentleman, I cannot remark about him, I think it would be unfair, the whole group of them. Mr. Chairman, I am actually after listening and I have been here now for three weeks, I came in two weeks late, looking for an alternative government. I think the Premier and other colleagues will feel half comfortable that there is an alternative government because governments sometimes feel the stress and the strain. I have only got two minutes, I just want to make one remark, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman who just spoke, the member this afternoon, talked about the resettlement programme, talked about what happened. Would people go back? Let us forget about going back, let us forget about the communities that were resettled.

In 1972, on March 10th, when this government was about to take office, the hon. member who is the Leader of the Opposition, had in his pocket, had in his desk a list of - this was the list that he was going to update -

MR. MORGAN: Table them. Make them known to the public.

April 20, 1978

Tape No. 1329

NM - 3

MR. LUNDRIGAN: - after his Thinkers Conference, Amherst Cove -
forget who was resettled - Beaumont, Bell Island, Bridgeport, Brighton -

MR. W. ROWE: Bell Island?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Change Islands.

AN HON. MEMBER: Bell Island, yes, Bell Island.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Deadman's Bay, Deep Bay, Fogo Island, Duntara,
Fox Harbour, Glovers Harbour, Greens Cove, Greenspond, Grey River,
Hawkes Bay, Island Harbour, MacCallum, New Melbourne, Pleasantview,
Port Anson, Port Hope Simpson, St. Brendan's,

Mr. Lundrigan: St. Jones Within, St. Shotts, Spillars Cove, Stock Cove, Terra Nova, Tickle Cove, Tizzard's Harbour, Twillingate, Winter Brook, Bonavista South. That was 130 communities -

MR. MORGAN: You were going to wipe them out!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: These were the communities, forget the ones that -

MR. NEARY: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (DR. COLLINS): Order, please!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: - were resettled, the 500 communities that were resettled.

MR. CHAIRMAN (DR. COLLINS): Order, please! A point of order has come up.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: They cannot take it!

MR. DINN: The truth will out!

MR. CHAIRMAN (DR. COLLINS): A point of order.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (DR. COLLINS): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - I think there was a ruling made, Sir, in the hon. House, I think it was today - it has been made several times - that anybody who quotes from a document has to table the document.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: I presume, Sir, the hon. gentleman is going to table that document?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, on that point of order.

MR. NEARY: I want a ruling from the Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (DR. COLLINS): Order, please'.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, am I entitled to speak to a point of order?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN (DR. COLLINS): The hon. member is speaking to the point of order.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Am I entitled to speak to a point of order? Your Honour, I will table them starting right now, Amherst Cove Lower,

Mr. Lundrigan: Amherst Cove Upper, Angel's Cove, Placentia Bay, Bartlett Harbour, Beaumont South, Bellburn -

MR. CHAIRMAN (DR. COLLINS): Order, please!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: - Benton, Big Brook, Birchy Cove, Black Duck, -

MR. CHAIRMAN (DR. COLLINS): Order, please!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Boat Harbour.

MR. CHAIRMAN (DR. COLLINS): Order, please! I understand that the documents will be tabled by the hon. member. I would point out that the time is nearly 11:00 o'clock.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is 11:00 o'clock.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is moved that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CHAIRMAN (DR. COLLINS): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred and have made some progress and ask leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chairman of the Committee reports that they have considered the matters to them referred, have made progress and asked leave to sit again.

On motion report received and adopted, Committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that the remaining orders of the day do stand deferred, and that this House on its rising adjourn until tomorrow, Friday at 10:00 o'clock and that this House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: Before putting the motion presented by the hon. Government House Leader there is a matter -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! - pending from 6:00 o'clock and that was a point of order brought up, and the substance of the point of order was that the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) had made a allegation of illegality toward another hon. member of the House. I have the transcript. I will read the few lines which occasioned this point of order, I will read them first and then make the ruling after. "We also know, Sir, that the Minister of Industrial Development makes extensive use of government aircraft not only within the Province but outside of the Province. As I made reference to recently, in one case violated the Criminal Code of Canada by transporting aboard the government aircraft an illegal weapon."

I have spoken with the hon. member for LaPoile and he tells me that the allegation of illegality, of an illegal action is made not toward the hon. minister or not toward any member of the House, but toward somebody who is not a member of the House. So I think that disposes of the matter.

It has been moved that this House adjourn until tomorrow, Friday, at 10:00 A.M. Those in favour "Aye", Contrary "Nay".

SOME HON. MEMBERS: "Aye".

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion the "Ayes" have it. This House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, at 10:00 A.M.