



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND**

Volume 3

3rd. Session

Number 59

VERBATIM REPORT

TUESDAY, APRIL 30, 1974

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

I would like to welcome to the galleries today, from the Eugene Vaters Academy here in St. John's, fifty-nine grade V students, with their teachers, Mr. Stringer, Mrs. Sparkes and Mrs. Noel. On behalf of all the honourable members I certainly welcome you to these galleries today and trust that your visit here is most interesting.

NOTICE OF MOTIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Justice.

HON. T. A. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Constabulary (Pensions) Act."

On behalf of the honourable the Minister of Transportation and Communications, a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Highway Traffic Act."

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Minister of Finance.

HON. J.C. CROSBIE: I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave of the House to introduce a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Civil Service Act."

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Minister without Portfolio.

HON. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I have an act that the opposition have been waiting for for twenty-five years. I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act Respecting Tenders For Public Work."

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS TO WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Industrial Development.

HON. W. DOODY: These are the answers to questions that were asked by the member for White Bay South on April 18, questions 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19 and 20, all very interesting and very comprehensive but I will table them. I do not think he really wants to be bothered with the details.

ORAL QUESTIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bell Island:

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the Hon. the Premier. I would like to ask the Premier to elaborate on the public statements that have been made concerning the effect of the zooming increase on interest rates and on the escalating costs of developing the Lower Churchill. Is this going to have any bearing on the development this year or next year? What will be the effects of these increases in costs?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Premier:

HON. F. D. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I think probably the honourable Member for Bell Island is referring to an article in the "Evening Telegram" quoting the honourable Minister of DREE in Ottawa and also a comment published in the "Daily News" this morning by the Minister of Mines and Energy of this government.

The situation, Mr. Speaker, is that the interest rates as everybody knows are escalating for any type of borrowing in the bond market or in any other market. That will mean in essence that there will be some escalation in the Lower Churchill development but nothing like what was quoted in the paper which I think by the way was an erroneous quote on behalf of Mr. Jamieson. I think it is very fair to say that, and that is the way it should be put.

The fact is that these figures are being worked on daily. It is the government's intention, Mr. Speaker, to proceed with this project until it is proven absolutely not feasible. It is a long way from being in that condition. It is our intention to bring the power of the Lower Churchill River to the province because in the long term this province cannot live without it. It is our intention to bring it here to attract industry to the province and to provide reasonable electrical rates and stability to the people of the province.

The principle that we have adapted of bringing that power to the province has not changed. The misquotes, if you like, in the paper most certainly I know as far as the Minister of Mines and Energy is

concerned, are not relevant at this time. We hope within another week or two to have a much more definite position on the development of the Lower Churchill and what the time schedule will be.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the seriousness of these statements that have been made, would the Premier indicate to the House if he has held any discussions with Mr. Jamieson concerning these statements that he made?

MR. MOORES: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I spent four hours with Mr. Jamieson early on Sunday morning and also we have been in touch regarding follow-up meetings in Ottawa, regarding follow-up meetings with our own people. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, later on this afternoon we will be having a meeting regarding this very subject and it has been continuously pursued by the government.

MR. W. ROWE: If I may ask a supplementary on this. I do not know if my colleague picked it up or not. I believe the import of my colleague's question was had he met with Mr. Jamieson since these allegedly erroneous statements were made by Mr. Jamieson, \$500 million estimation.

MR. MOORES: Since the interview was given by Mr. Jamieson, the answer is yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Since it was published?

MR. MOORES: Not since it was published, since he made the statement.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary. We want to be very clear because the "Telegram" had - are we to understand that Mr. Jamieson was misquoted? That the escalation in cost, whatever it may be, that Mr. Jamieson did not say as he is quoted here; that it will cost at least \$500 million more than the current provincial estimate?

MR. MOORES: Only Mr. Jamieson can answer that absolutely, Mr. Speaker. I had a long talk with him about the interview that he had and Mr. Jamieson as I understand it and he can correct me if I be wrong here, said that there would be an increase over the \$500 million, not that it would be \$500 million more.

MR. ROBERTS: I thank the Premier but just to clear up the last loose end on it - I will put it as a question - Has the Premier spoken with

Mr. Jamieson on this point since yesterday when this thing became public?

MR. MOORES: I have not spoken with Mr. Jamieson since it came in the paper but I spoke with Mr. Jamieson after he gave the interview, Mr. Speaker. The fact is, as I have said, what is being printed here in the paper and by the way, for the record, Mr. Jamieson has no idea of what this will cost at the present bond rates because those figures have not been worked out by ourselves, by the consultants nor the federal government. This is an interpretation at this time and as I say it is still our intention and of course it is our intention to carry on as was announced previously.

MR. ROBERTS: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker, on the same subject. The Premier, I understood him to say that Mr. Jamieson had no idea of what it would cost and because the government, among others, had no idea of what it would cost. How then can the Premier tell us on what basis the feasibility studies are drawn?

MR. MOORES: Yes, Mr. Speaker. That is a ludicrous question because it makes a ludicrous assumption that we did not know what the assumed cost would be in the feasibility studies. The feasibility study was done at a certain rate of interest. The rate of interest now is one per cent to two per cent higher. One per cent to two per cent higher in the rate of interest does not mean a \$500 million increase on a \$500 million project. The actual cash flow of the project, the actual financing costing over various term bonds is now being worked out and this when it is available and once it has been determined is what we will be dealing with.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, would the Premier undertake to make public the feasibility studies so that the people of Newfoundland could have some idea? We do not want any confidential information but there is nothing confidential that I can see about these feasibility studies. Would he undertake to make them public so that the people of this province would have some idea of how these arithmetical calculations are being arrived at?

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, we have had these studies for quite some time. We have not held on to them closely, in any great confidential manner. As a matter of fact we have passed them on to these people who have been interested and that includes a great many people in industry and in other areas that could have some bearing on it.

At the present moment, to make them available publicly, (They are about "yea" thick) I do not really see the need for it. The fact that they are not confidential would mean I am sure that we would be only too glad to give one to the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, that would for the time being satisfy us.

MR. MOORES: They are not confidential.

MR. ROBERTS: If they are not confidential, I do not know what publicly but if they have been put around widely to industry and so forth, I was not aware of that. Certainly we would like to have a copy. Would the Premier undertake to make one available to us for use and so forth?

MR. MOORES: As I say, there are no confidential sections to it.

Mr. Speaker, gladly.

MR. NEARY: The report will not be censored.

MR. MOORES: There is not a thing for the honourable gentleman to leak this week.

MR. NEARY: I hear I was not very popular in cabinet last week.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why only last week?

MR. NEARY: I am talking to the honourable - look, I am talking to the real Premier, not the acting Premier.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. NEARY: I would like to ask the Premier a supplementary question concerning the development of the Lower Churchill. Would the Premier indicate to the House if there are any negotiations going on now, either by the government itself or by an agency of the government or by anybody representing the government with potential customers for power from the Lower Churchill?

MR. MOORES: The answer is yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Would the Premier indicate with whom these negotiations are being carried on and

by whom?

MR. MOORES: The answer is no. Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the Premier indicate then if the government are carrying on the negotiations themselves or is it the Power Commission or is it some agent appointed by the government?

MR. MOORES: All three, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, would the Premier indicate to the House who the agent of the government is? Is it BRINCO? Is it some other agent?

MR. MOORES: As a matter of fact there are two or three, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, would the Premier care to tell the House and the people of Newfoundland who they are?

MR. MOORES: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: My God! I am telling you! I see I have to get a leak somewhere over there to get the information. I am not going to get it out of the Premier. Would the Premier indicate then, in his opinion and the opinion of the government, how much of this power will be sent up to Quebec or how much does the government intend to bring to the Island of Newfoundland? Will there be customers on the island for it?

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, it will depend, of course, what size the customers are on the island. It is our intention to bring as much as possible and hopefully all of the power to the island as quickly as possible.

MR WM. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Justice. Would the Minister of Justice care to give the House a report on any investigation that may have been conducted into the unfortunate death of some gentleman, I believe in the last day or two, in Her Majesty's Lockup in the City?

MR HICKMAN: I cannot report now.

MR ROWE: Does the honourable minister know anything about it or not?

MR HICKMAN: I just got back in town a few minutes ago. I was unaware of it but I will find out.

MR ROWE: Did he know that a man died in the jail down there?

This is incredible. Is the minister now aware that a man for no known reason - there may be a perfectly valid reason - died in the jail?

MR ROBERTS: There has to be a reason.

MR WM. ROWE: What I mean is no public reason, no foul play nor anything like that is suspected. Is the minister not even aware of this?

MR HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, may I repeat that I just got back to the city from Fortune.

MR ROWE: Fortune does not have any radios nor anything?

MR HICKMAN: Well if they did I certainly did not have them on. I have been driving all morning and I have not been made aware of it. If a death occurred in a cell there will be, as there always is, a magisterial enquiry.

MR NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the minister care to indicate to the House whether or not there will be a magisterial enquiry into a death recently on one of the coastal boats, the death of a gentleman being carried on the coastal boat to the hospital in Burgeo? Now that is practically in the minister's own district. It is all on the South Coast. He must surely know about that one.

MR HICKMAN: MR. Speaker, there will be a magisterial enquiry into any death as there always is into deaths that do not arise out of natural causes; and that depends to an extent upon the death certificate that is signed by the attending physician.

MR WM. ROWE: Or whether there is a physician.

MR HICKMAN: Or if there were not a physician there will be an enquiry.

When this House comes to my estimates he will note that the old practice, the very wasteful and not effective practice of having to have autopsies simply because there was not an attending physician hopefully will now be changed with the medical examiner system that we propose.

MR NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, would the minister assure the House, because I am afraid that this one may escape the attention of the minister's department, that there will be an enquiry into this death on the coastal boat?

MR HICKMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR NEARY: Would he assure the House.

MR HICKMAN: Yes.

MR NEARY: Good! Okay! Fine! Thank you!

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, before we move into committee I wish to make a motion under Standing Order 23: With that I know Your Honour is familiar:

I ask leave, Sir, under the provisions of Standing Order 23, to adjourn the House to discuss a matter of urgent public importance; namely the desirability and need for the Government of the Province to take such steps as are required to ensure that the control and the ownership of large areas of land located in the Shoal Harbour Valley in Trinity North and along the Indian Bay River in Bonavista North be not transferred in any way until such time as the government, with appropriate public consultation, has determined the best use for these track of land.

I have a written statement for Your Honour, as the rule requires.

MR SPEAKER: Order, please. Whilst this matter has aroused considerable interest throughout not only the areas concerned but throughout the province and caused considerable discussion here in the House yesterday, I do not feel that the matter is urgent enough to discontinue the ordinary business of the day; thus I have to rule it out .

MR ROBERTS: I wonder would the Minister Without Portfolio consider calling the estimates of Forestry and Agriculture, as the honourable gentleman, the Minister of Finance, has just suggested, so that we can discuss this matter.

MR WM. ROWE: Let us do it now. It is important now.

On motion that the House resolve itself into a committee of the whole on Supply, Mr. Speaker, left the Chair:

MR CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stagg.) Order, please.

We have presently consumed thirty-two hours and twenty-seven minutes of the allocated seventy-five hours. The clock is running.

Shall Heading 1601-01 carry?

MR ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee proceed to Head XII, Forestry and Agriculture.

MR CHAIRMAN: The motion is that the committee proceed to Head XII

MR MARSHALL: I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that that particular motion is in order. It is established in the rules and the Standing Orders of the rules that the government call the order of business. Whilst it is obvious that the motion is going to be voted down anyway, I do not think that we should as a matter of precedent allow dilatory motions such as that.

MR ROBERTS: Your Honour, if I may speak to what I understand to be a point of order from the gentleman from St John's East: The committee, Sir, is the master of our own procedure. The government call orders but the committee obviously can change that if we so wish. The gentleman from St John's East says it will be voted down. Sir, I have no way to know what the members of the committee will do. Maybe he has some means of knowing; I do not know that.

I might point out as well, Sir, that it is always in order to move a motion that a certain order of the day be proceeded with. That would be an analogy which would be relevant here.

I submit the motion is in order. I submit further that it is debatable and I submit that it should be debated.

MR MARSHALL: It is neither a debatable motion, Mr. Chairman, nor is it in order.

MR ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, the honourable gentleman makes a statement, looks at Your Honour, makes a statement but cites no authority, does not even cite a precedent. I have cited, Sir, not a precedent, because I know of none, but I have cited what I consider to be a reasonably good authority for it. I submit, Sir, that this committee cannot make their own rulings but can determine the order in which we call the heads. If a majority of this committee should wish to proceed with Head XII, which is Forestry and Agriculture, this committee can pass on to Head XII. It is nonsense to say it is not in order to so move.

Are we now in the complete slavery of the gentleman from St John's East? He proposes, he disposes and the rest of us merely look on. Bad enough, Sir, he restricts the time, a gag rule. But now, By God! he even wants to say what we can and cannot discuss!

MR MARSHALL: I shall ignore the petulant remarks, Your Honour.

The proceedings of the House, as set forth in the Standing Orders - and there are still a lot of them that have not been amended, and still a lot of it is good. I refer to page 17 of the Standing Orders, which is grounded on Beauchesne and which says:

"All motions referring to the business of the House shall be introduced by the Leader of the House..." This is something that the honourable Leader of the Opposition will not like and put out his chest and say I am not the final authority. It was not I who said it; it was the late Mr. Speaker Sparkes. "He is the final authority as to the general progress of every government project, as to the time to be given to it, the different stages, as to any application of closure"- which we do not use - "or as to any other available method of bringing matters to a conclusion.

It is not a debatable motion. Somewhere in Beauchesne there is a list of what motions are debatable and which ones are not.

Let me see here: Page 106 lists the motions that are debatable motions from "a" to "m". This one is not included in it of course because it is really out of order. It says down at the end, "All other motions including adjournment motions shall be decided without debate or amendment." There is the authority then, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I submit to that the gentleman in fact has read the relevant note on page seventeen correctly, but it is the first time I have ever heard a person, a minister or a member, state, apparently seriously, that what he says prevails over the rules or what Mr. Speaker Sparkes, who may be the late Speaker but is not the late Mr. Sparkes, (certainly he is very much with us) says; that a note, a commentary takes precedence over the House.

I say that the committee, Sir - and this is the point - the committee can, if they so wish, by vote determine the order in which the estimates are called - by vote.

Similarly the House, Sir, no matter what the House Leader may say, if the House should pass a motion that an order be proceeded with, the order is proceeded with. The House leader then has one vote. He has the same vote as any other member. He is only an ordinary member

MR. ROWE, W.N. Page 198 -

MR. BARRY: Mr. Chairman, if I could draw Your Honour's attention to the equivalent section in Beauchesne which expands a bit on the procedure note contained in our Standing Orders, on page seventeen; in Beauchesne it is on page eighty-two of Beauchesne, Section 88, Subsection (2):

"All motions referring to the business of the House should be introduced by the Leader of the House." There is a quote then - "Let us now briefly indicate the influence directly exercised by the Leader of the House on the course of business. It is his task in the name of the Government and the party in office, to distribute over the session the programme of legislation announced in the King's speech and to advocate it in the House. He assumes the duty of proposing all such motions concerning the agenda of the House as are deemed advisable by the Government and is their spokesman in the debate thereon. With regard to every Government project, the Leader is the final authority as to its general progress, as to the time to be given to its different stages and as to any application of the closure or other available method of shortening debate and bringing matters to a conclusion."

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Minister without Portfolio.

MR. W. W. MARSHALL: I thank the honourable minister. There is another authority, it is right here in the Standing Orders 16(b): "Whenever government business has precedence", which is now, Mr. Chairman, "government orders may be called in such sequence as the government may think fit."

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman -

MR. MARSHALL: Just one moment, I am not -

MR. ROBERTS: Go ahead, I am sorry, if I keep ground to a halt.

MR. MARSHALL: We know that is the rule. I would suggest that a certain amount of time is now being consumed by the opposition on this serious point and we get on to the business of the province.

MR. W. N. ROWE: It is an important point, Mr. Chairman. I think we should have some discussion of it. There is no doubt about the fact that the government House Leader is entitled to catch Your Honour's eye and call the order of the business, in a general way, which he did. He called

Committee of Supply. Then the Speaker left the Chair. The motion was put in a formal manner, the Speaker left the Chair, the Chairman came into the Chair and then the House Leader called or it is assumed that he called the head that we are now discussing, the Minister's Salary of the Department of Rural Development. But that is not to say, Sir, that no member of the House cannot at any time rise in his place and make a motion, the motion being tantamount to the Orders of the Day be now called or that a certain matter be proceeded with. At any time, as I understand it, a member of this House can rise, it is not at any time, certainly at the appropriate time - I think the Leader of the Opposition did it at the appropriate time, can rise and make a motion that some other order of the day be proceeded with.

Obviously the government are in the hands of the majority of the House of Assembly or the majority of the Committee. Otherwise the House has no power whatsoever, Mr. Chairman. If a vote be lost at any time, proposed by the government or opposed by the government, if a motion is carried opposed by the government that is certainly then in that case a vote of no-confidence in the government. So I do not see where the House Leader can get his authority from the few scappy pieces of authority cited from Beauchesne, get the authority to say that the government have the power to say when, how, where, what and anything else concerning any business in the House.

The essential point is that the government are in the hands of the majority of this House, Mr. Chairman. Any member can make a motion and if the House decide by majority not proceed with the motion, the motion is defeated. But that is now tantamount to saying that the House Leader is the tyrant in the House or in the Committee.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, obviously the government are in the hands of the House but these are substantive motions. The House may defeat a motion or may half the motion with respect to substance but for the purpose of the effective operation of any house or any parliament this is the way it is. It is in Beauchesne. It is in our Standing Orders and it is what is the customary practice throughout all of our great British Parliamentary institutions. The unfortunate part and I do not

like to engage in the same type but a little bit of bitterness that comes back and forth is that I think certain members, not all of them but certain members of the Opposition seem to perpetually forget the fact that in 1971 they no longer formed the government of this province.

MR. CHAIRMAN (STAGG): Well, we are probably going to break new ground again today. However, in the absence of direction, particularly on this point, I am going to refer to Section 127 (1) of Beauchesne, on page 114. He said, "Formerly all motions were debatable, unless some rule or other or other parliamentary usage could be quoted to the contrary. But at present the rule is reversed. All motions are to be decided without debate or amendment, except those specifically recognized as debatable under Standing Order 32." And one such not debatable motion is, "Motions relating to the time of sitting and the business of the House." Consequently I am going to put the motion without debate.

The motion is that the Committee refer itself to Head 12- Forestry and Agriculture.

Those in favour of the motion, please say "Aye". Those against the motion "Nay".

I declare the "Nays" have it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Division.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On division, if that be in order in Committee.

Head 1601-01. Shall 1601-01 carry?

MR. R. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, before we vote on 1601-01, I would certainly like to hear the minister respond to some of the questions that have been raised. We on this side have raised a number of very legitimate questions. I have heard many speakers say, a surprisingly large number of speakers indeed from the government side speak on the subject but I have heard scarcely a word from the minister.

He did speak briefly on one occasion in the debate on this head. A surprisingly large number of other members on the government side have spoken. Of course, as a result one does not expect any more of the charges from the Minister without Portfolio about how the opposition are wasting

time on the estimates. Fully half of the time or more has now been taken up by government backbenchers who have been speaking on the subject. Well I do not object to their right to speak but I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that at least part of the time taken up by government members would be taken up by the minister responsible for the department.

I would now invite him to answer some of the questions. They are very pertinent questions which have been raised by my colleagues, the Leader of the Opposition, by the Member for White Bay South, by the Member for Bell Island, by the Member for Labrador North, by the Member for St. Barbe North and by me. All of us have raised very legitimate questions. If he did not hear them, if he were not listening, if he should like to have them repeated, we should be only too happy to do it. But the point that needs to be made, Mr. Chairman, is that a number of important questions have been introduced in this debate and have not been responded to by the minister up until this time.

I would hope before we vote on this item we would indeed hear something by way of explanation, something by way of answers to the many questions we have raised from the minister who after all, Mr. Chairman, is responsible for this department. We have been told in many long-winded ways, over the past few days, about how responsible he is. If indeed he be responsible, let him now stand and let him tell us the answers to the questions which have been raised. We have heard it from everybody but the horse's mouth. We are told he is responsible, we are told he is a good minister and yet nothing in this debate from the minister himself would indicate just how good or just how responsible or how knowledgeable a minister he is.

It seems for some reason that everybody else is anxious to speak for him or perhaps anxious that he not speak. This was not the case when we dealt with the estimates of the Department of Finance. We heard from the Minister of Finance repeatedly, almost too often, Mr. Chairman, there was no shyness on his part, no reticence, no hesitancy. He was on his feet most of the time during the debate on the estimates for his department. I must say that while in some respects he was probably on his feet too

often, I saw it as an encouraging sign. I interpreted it to mean that this would be the trend in this debate, that ministers would stand up and at least attempt to answer the questions, make some effort at it. In that respect the Minister of Finance is certainly to be commended. He certainly did not answer all of the questions but at least he made an effort which is more than we can say for the Minister of Rural Development right now.

He has had a number of opportunities, Mr. Chairman. In a minute I shall sit down and give him another opportunity. I would invite him on behalf of the members on this side of the committee who have spoken to get up and give us some explanation for the many questions that we have raised on this side of the committee.

I believe the minister owes it to the public of Newfoundland. I believe he owes it to the members of this committee and I would welcome the opportunity now of listening to him give us the answers to the many questions that we have raised in the last two or three days. I would sincerely hope that he would do that before we vote on this subhead.

HON. J. REID (MINISTER OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT): Mr. Chairman, there have been a lot of questions asked since sometime yesterday morning until last night, eleven o'clock, when we closed. At least I will try to come back with some of the answers at the present moment. Certainly if given an opportunity, a little later I will come back with the rest of the answers to the questions that the various members asked last night.

Right now I would certainly like to make comments on the member for St. Barbe North's statement last night. I think this is very important. This is certainly a part of rural development that probably I should go through with right now. I think that the questions raised by him last night were as important or probably more important than any other questions raised.

I would like to compliment the opposition on their constructive comments on the department's programmes, other than the authority loan programme, especially by Mr. Fred Rowe or the member from St. Barbe North. While I feel that there are certain points which should be clarified on the work we are doing with Regional Development Associations - Mr. Rowe expressed his concern in the following areas:

"The local field workers are being employed and grants are being made before associations have held seminars." Now, I think that that needs an explanation because we are studying up development associations all over Newfoundland and Labrador. We certainly want to have everyone involved in those development associations who wish to get involved. This has not been done since I became Minister of Rural Development.

To receive the \$12,000 administrative grant which increased

from \$10,000 to \$12,000 under our new ARDA Programme now being cost-shared by Ottawa, any association must: (a) Open its membership to all communities within its area; (b) Hold a training seminar; (c) Become an incorporated body; (d) Have a democratically elected executive. In other words, Mr. Chairman, that anyone - even though we are getting accused of almost anything these days as far as being political, any human being can join this association. We would like for everyone to take part in it.

"Have a democratically elected executive": Since I have been Minister of Rural Development, no association has received a grant without first meeting with their requirements. Second, "that some associations have work but no executive." This is what was stated last night. This is not possible because all grants are made payable to development associations. The local worker is a paid employee who works under direction of the executive.

Three, another statement made by Mr. Rowe, that sometimes communities in the area are not members of the association. Now, I do not want to leave the impression -

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

Before the honourable minister gets further into his speech I must direct him that he should refer to the honourable member for St. Barbe North, not by his name but refer to him as the honourable member for St. Barbe North.

MR. REID: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to leave the impression that I am trying to knock the member from St. Barbe North because what he said last night was very constructive stuff and I am very, very pleased today to do my best to try to explain what is actually happening in those development associations.

Three, all communities within the boundaries of the association are eligible to become members. However, if it should happen that a community for reasons of its own decides not to become a member, they are always eligible to join. In other words, if all the communities in the areas where we are setting up development associations, if they do not feel like joining, a little later on they

are always welcome to join those development associations. If a development association refuse membership to a community within its area, it breaks the terms under which it was incorporated and the department may withhold a grant to that association until the conditions for the grant are met. In fact, not one community in the area would return establishment of the organization.

The member from St. Barbe North also said that some associations represent smaller geographic areas than others. This is quite true. This is correct. The boundaries are set up to include communities that have much in common such as regional schools, resources, road connection and trade patterns, etc.

He also asked how the department assists the associations in dealing with their problems. My department is designed to lend support to problems in development associations. Our whole approach is to work with the associations at the regional level to develop a planning approach for economic and social development of the area. I wish to emphasize that the local people will make their own decisions and evaluations in the direction of their planning. We do not go in and tell them. We are depending on the local people to develop and come forward with these ideas and by all means, if we think they are feasible we will do our utmost to make sure that it is going to be a success. Our main input is to provide any necessary expertise that is lacking in the area, such as engineering studies, business management, techniques and other services not available at the local level.

In the Extension Division: In addition the Department through its Extension Division has placed twenty specialists in the field to work with development associations directly. We also have an individual on staff who provides training relating to the function of Regional Development Associations. My department also provides an information service which makes available to the public information on all programmes of government and other agencies.

Also a newly signed ADRA-DREE Programme, Regional Projects

Funding, is available to development associations for economic type projects which were a part of the overall development planned for the region. One of the main purposes of this programme is to give encouragement to associations to strengthen their planning and decisions and make them on the local level.

Home industries: In the Home Industries Division we are providing assistance in craft development, business management services and new project development. For example, a few technologists have been employed by the department to encourage the commercial production of jams, jellies and other fruit items. Special attention will be paid to assisting operators of small rural industries to introduce improved business methods.

Then the member from Hermitage - I would like to say a couple of words here. Mr. Simmons who was very concerned -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. REID: I am sorry. I cannot help it. I just do it.

The member from Hermitage is concerned about government becoming too involved with development associations. The whole concept of the department approach to assisting development associations

revolves around the association improving its decision-making capabilities. The grant is to encourage the associations to obtain a high degree of independence from government. In fact the individuals involved in these associations will not tolerate too much government interference.

Mr. Chairman, when I hear the opposition ask questions about our loan programme, I get the feeling that they are saying, "People in rural areas are not capable of handling their own loans." I am sure that a lot of people throughout Newfoundland, by the way some of our people jumped up on their feet, know that certain little industries can always be very permanent here in Newfoundland. These people jumped up on their feet and tried to condemn it. Some of our own local things will always prosper providing we have the right people to run these little businesses.

My department believes that rural Newfoundlanders are as capable as anybody in handling their responsibility of repaying borrowed money, whether it is from the banks or from the government. My department is determined to continue to provide employment opportunities to the people of this province. We feel that we have done a good job so far. We are determined to do an even better job in the future.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I just want to point out for the benefit of the committee, Sir, that the Minister without Portfolio, the Member for St. John's East, raised a point of order, when I was referring to notes there a week or so ago. I would like to point out to the committee that the minister who just took his seat, Sir, was reading from a prepared script. I should hope that the rules will apply, Sir, to both sides of this committee in the future.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: There is no difference, Sir. There was a prepared script and the author of it did not even have the courtesy to put in the Member for Hermitage or the Member for White Bay North, he put in their last names, which is not in accordance with the rules of the House, Sir. I do not mind that but I just want the rules to apply to both sides of the committee, Sir.

MR. REID: Mr. Chairman, I think I should be blamed for that. I spent mostly all last night preparing this because I figured today at least they would ask me for a few answers. I could not prepare all the answers but I certainly will. There was no prepared statement by anyone outside of myself.

I am one of the junior ministers here and for using their names and that, I am very, very sorry.

MR. F. B. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the minister for his very comprehensive, clear and straightforward answers to the questions that I did ask yesterday respecting the Rural Development Association. I would just like to remind the honourable minister that the expectations of these associations are extremely high indeed. They are going to need a great deal of guidance in the months and years to come and I hope they will be a success.

However, Sir, I am disturbed about one thing and that is that the minister did answer the questions I asked in the committee over a five or ten minute period. Upon my return to this committee, Sir, I had heard three of my colleagues ask some very important, extremely important questions of the Hon. Minister for Rural Development. I have to indicate my disappointment over the fact that the minister did not answer the questions raised by the Member for Hermitage, the Member for Bell Island and the Member for White Bay North and White Bay South. I was hoping that the minister would answer some of these very grave and important questions that were raised. I hope that before this afternoon is out, during the committee's proceedings probably when some of my colleagues can raise these questions, the minister will attempt to answer them.

I personally feel - I say this, Sir, because I am somewhat fearful of my political career, I have been complimented now by the Hon. Premier, the Hon. Member for St. John's South and now the Hon. Minister of Rural Development, and compliments coming from the other side of the committee, Sir, might be the kiss of death for a member on this side of the committee.

I would urge the minister to answer these very important questions raised by my colleagues last Friday and again yesterday afternoon and last night. But I would wish to thank the minister for answering the questions that I raised.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I just want to raise this matter again. My colleague wanted to leave and that is why I had to dispose of this in a hurry.

The Minister without Portfolio said that there is a difference. Would the minister explain what the difference is of that minister reading from a script and my referring to notes when we are speaking in this honourable House. What is the difference? Is the difference because that member sits on that side of the House and I sit over here? Is that the difference? Would the minister please explain to me what is the difference?

MR. MARSHALL: Would the honourable member yield the floor?

MR. NEARY: Sure.

MR. MARSHALL: If the Hon. Member for Bell Island, Mr. Chairman, should want to go on, he can go on for an hour and one-half or two or three hours explaining the difference and explaining the rules but we are almost half through the estimates. We have one department through. This government is interested both in the government and in the opposition because there is no opposition. I suggest that we get on. The difference is quite frankly this:

The Hon. Member for Bell Island was reading from notes, he was reading from them verbatim and was reading from them slavishly, completely and absolutely slavishly. He was reading them in such a manner that it would almost appear that he was not paying attention, so one would get the impression that it was written by a ghost writer. I do not know whether it was or whether it was not.

In any event, Mr. Chairman, it is perfectly competent for members to refresh their minds when they are speaking in this House, to glance at notes. I am sure that this is really all that the Hon. Minister of Rural Development, who is a very erudite

speaker and a very clear and concise speaker, was doing. That is the difference. The difference is, Mr. Chairman, that the Hon. Member for Bell Island was slavishly reading cards that had been prepared either by him or for him, because they were typed. They were typed.

MR. CROSBIE: (Inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL: They were greenograms, so the Minister of Finance was saying.

The Hon. Minister of Rural Development was merely refreshing his mind. There is a distinction.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, they were prepared -

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Dunphy): The point raised by the Member for Bell Island appears to be rather frivolous. The Member for Trinity South, the Hon. Minister of Rural Development, was not, in the opinion of the Chair, reading from a prepared script. I do not think there is anything in the rules that says that one cannot refer to notes, prepared notes or otherwise. The point is out of order.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of Your Honour, I did not raise a point of order, Sir. I just rose to draw to the attention of the committee - there was no point of order, no point of privilege, no point of anything, not even a pint of water. I could not care less, Mr. Chairman, if the honourable minister, whose salary we are discussing here, Sir -

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Dunphy): Order please!

We are drawing to debating an entirely unrelated issue. We are on Rural Development. I think we should get on with it.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I could not care less if the minister come in with a prepared statement or not. I am not that snooty and dirty. I am not like the Minister without Portfolio. I can get up in this honourable House and make a speech any time I want to, without a note. Sir, I sympathize with the minister. He

prepared his statement last night. He tried to answer some of the points that were raised by my colleague the Member for St. Barbe North.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Dunphy): Order please!

The Member for Bell Island is not being relevant.

He has gone off in another direction entirely. We are on Rural Development and I think we should get on back to Rural Development.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the minister refused to answer the pertinent questions that were put to him by members of the opposition. Sir, this brings into focus the whole matter of wheeling and dealing by ministers who are also directors and shareholders and principals of various companies in this province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Wheeling and dealing?

MR. NEARY: Wheeling and dealing, of course. What else would one call it?

Mr. Chairman, we were told by members on that side of the House on numerous occasions that the former Premier of this province was a dictator. That he went and he told members on the government benches at that time when they should speak and when they should not speak. Well, Sir, for the last two days the Hon. Premier has gone down to that honourable minister and counselled him, told him to keep quite, sit down. The Minister of Finance said, "Sit down, Jim, you are not in conflict of interest."

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Ah, the Minister of Finance did say it, it was reported in the "Daily Newspaper", Sir. The minister did not deny it. The minister stood up and he asked me when conflict of interest legislation was proclaimed and the Minister of Finance said, "Oh, some time in January, I think it was." The minister said, "Well how could I be in conflict of interest, if the conflict of interest legislation were only proclaimed in January?" The Minister of Finance laughed and said, "Sit down Jim, you are not in conflict of interest anyway."

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Well I heard him. The newspaper people up in the press gallery heard him because it was reported -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: That is right, they do. They certainly do.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the Premier has deliberately, Sir, I say deliberately told the Minister of Rural Development not to answer any of these questions that we put to him about this work that was done by the water line committee in Lead Cove, Sibleys Cove and Trinity Bay.

MR. REID: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Chairman, we did not have a satisfactory explanation, Sir. We did not.

MR. REID: Well I will call the people in and give him an explanation.

MR. NEARY: No, he does not have to call the people in. Do what I suggested. Have the Auditor General -

AN HON. MEMBER: Do not be so foolish.

MR. NFARY: Call in the Auditor General. There is the man who is impartial. Do not call in his buddies. Do not try and use his political influence on that crowd over there the same as he did down at the Public utilities Commission when he wrote the letter objecting to the bus service over there because they were going in competition to the honourable minister -

MR. REID: Do not be so foolish.

MR. NFARY: That is not being foolish, Sir. He is not God Almighty, you know.

MR. REID: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Chairman, these questions that are most important. Sir, have been avoided. It went right over his head or the Premier told him not to answer the questions. Now who is being the dictator? Why does not the minister stand up in man fashion and give us the answer? It is the minister's honour and integrity that is at stake. Mr. Chairman, it is not good enough for the Premier to stand up in this House and say, "I will take the responsibility if there be any corruption in any of the government departments, including the minister's department."

That is not good enough, Sir. It is not good enough. We want a little more than that. We want the Auditor General called in. The Auditor General who is a servant of this House, a watchdog of the treasury called in, do a thorough investigation.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NFARY: Whose name is not written down? Written down where? It is on these - James G. Reid and Sons.

MR. REID: Inaudible.

MR. NFARY: Well I am only trying to steer the minister in the right direction. There is no conflict of interest? The minister should not have anything to be scared of, nothing to be afraid of. Well why not call in the Auditor General? Why not? Or get up and give us an explanation in this honourable House. The House is entitled to an explanation, Mr. Chairman. We are entitled to it, this committee.

MR. REID: I will get up. Does he want me to speak -

MR. NFARY: Sure, go ahead. I will yield the floor.

MR. REID: Mr. Chairman, if I have to go through every single thing that my company, where they worked and what they have done for so many years: The Leader of the Opposition last night he raised about how he saw a piece of equipment working out here with Seaboard. Because government money was used to build that building, even though Seaboard Construction had that contract, my piece of equipment was not allowed to work there. I worked with Viking, I worked with Crosbie's on government jobs. These are the kinds of jobs my equipment is working on. They are hired by the Crosbie's or the Viking Companies. I have been hired out in Come By Chance. When the famous Joey was around, I was out there, I was hired. Was it a conflict of interest then, if I had been in government? No way, shape or form. How many people were in government then that got a contract without even bidding?

I am not getting any money, handouts to my company direct from this government or any other government. My equipment is wide open for anyone to hire. If someone inform me tomorrow or my manager and want to rent a piece of equipment to anyone from Port aux Basques to St. John's, I should certainly be allowed to do it. I worked this year on my equipment down in Baie Verte. They phoned for it. They asked me. We had the right equipment. We had good operators and the best equipment. They hired it. I am not suppose to work because that was a cancelled job, I am not allowed to go down there. I have to park it now because I am sitting here in the House of Assembly. I worked over in Carbonear. We are working in Bay Roberts right now. What influence can I have over the water and sewage crowd over in Bay Roberts, Carbonear, Heart's Content, Whitbourne and in any other place? They do not come under my department. The council can hire whom they like. If my men and my equipment are doing the job, what in the hell is wrong with them getting a job?

Not only that I have had - One thing about it I have had as high as 158 to 159 Newfoundlanders working with me, local people working with me, not foreigners, and they are doing a good job. We have been recognized all over Newfoundland. One thing I must say while I am on my feet,

it has been the best advertising, it has not cost me a cent for what you people are saying over there, in grants. In fact I am thinking about now buying several more pieces of equipment because I cannot supply the demand.

Now I have been accused, I have been told and have been accused of governing my equipment this last two years because I came into Rural Development. Now I do not think there is anybody that naive down in my department that would allow that much money for me to be there. I do not think there is any department here, I do not think there is any minister here that would like for me to take advantage because I am here in government. I have news for some of you people, the less equipment ever Jim Reid brought this last ten years. Is this last two years. I can assure them right now that my business today is suffering because I am here in this chair.

When I ran as a member, I never intended to go into politics, I never had it in mind. Several people asked me to go into politics. I have not been that sorry since but I know I have had to put up with a lot of bull but in the meantime I ran there in Trinity South hoping that we would have a change, hoping that we would certainly make a difference down there because we were never recognize down there. This letter came so easy, this letter came from the bottom of Trinity Bay and it says, "We never had anyone work for us like you did." Then I never expected to come in here, into this cabinet. I did not ask for it. I am going to assure them that when I came in here it was quite a challenge. When I walked into the Community of Social Development Department, if I had known at that day what I had to face down there, Jim Reid would have never been a minister in this House right now, I can assure you that. I faced something down there. I faced, but I will guarantee you we took the bull by the horns.

My deputy minister and my staff - the deputy minister probably was the only new one who went in there. The rest were already staff down there. The morale was lousy, I do not mind quoting that. The morale was lousy. Today we have one of the best departments down there because one reason is that we are working together, we are working. I can travel

from Port aux Basques, anywhere across this island and meet with our field members, our directors or anyone and I have been welcome. I recognize anyone who is working with us down there. I will assure you I have a tremendous lot of respect for them and I will assure you that we will certainly get results out of that department.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member for White Bay South.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I yielded the floor to the minister to answer a few questions, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: No, I do not. But, you know -

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member now has the floor.

MR. NEARY: Okay then, go ahead.

MR. CHAIRMAN: His honourable colleague should yield the floor to him.

MR. ROWE, W. F.: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to prolong this any further.

MR. REID: Mr. Chairman, I did not speak from notes then.

MR. W. ROWE: That was obvious. It is obvious, Mr. Chairman, the minister did not speak from notes. That was painfully obvious.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to prolong this any further, this debate on the minister's salary, as to whether he is entitled to it or not. I would like to ask the minister one simple question. Will he undertake to table in this House during this session that might last for two or three weeks, so he has plenty of time to dig up the information, will he undertake to table in this House or one of his colleagues, the Minister of Finance, Treasury Board, the amount of public money which has gone from the treasury of Newfoundland to his company, James J. Reid and Sons Limited or whatever the name of it is, since the minister became a minister of the government? A simple request and I -

MR. REID: I will surely get it.

MR. W. ROWE: Well, we have to let the records show in case, Mr. Chairman, it was not picked up in Hansard, that the minister has undertaken within this session to table in this House all public money -

MR. REID: All money that I have had direct from the government here.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Directly and indirectly.

MR. REID: Well, it is all indirectly, for God sake! Where does it all come from if it does not come from government?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: It comes from the public treasury.

MR. REID: That is right, not direct to me though.

MR. W. ROWE: All money which was paid directly by the government I asked, Mr. Chairman. If there are other sources which the minister, which are indirect but which might have come basically from the government, the minister can use his own discretion on that and table that information as well. It will probably save him some trouble in the long run because if the sort of thing should come up as was produced in the House by a number of members here, where although the job itself was an indirect job by a water committee of a couple of communities in Newfoundland yet the money was paid out directly. If it be that kind of a situation, naturally I know the minister will use his discretion.

I as a member of the House would like to see that kind of information tabled. I believe there is a requirement somewhere that any money paid by the government to any member of the legal profession who happens to be a member of this House that that information has to be tabled. I do not know the citation. I know that maybe it is done as a result of a question asked by a member to the Minister of Justice; what monies have been paid, but it is done almost as a matter of course I believe. Perhaps the same thing should apply to companies in which any member of the House or any minister certainly - a member of the House is not too important, I do not think, in that regard but any minister who has controlling interests or substantially influential interests in a company in Newfoundland, if that company receive money from the government, I think it is a matter course that that information should be tabled in the House so members of the public and members of the House can see it, can look at it, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Stagg): The honourable the Minister of Finance.

MR. J.C. CROSBIE: I have not said very much in this debate, Mr. Chairman, because I just had a whole week of answering non sequiturs, irrelevant arguments, points of obfuscation and points of propaganda and the like. So the last day or two I have not been speaking in this debate but it is all piece of a pattern, Mr. Chairman.

I have never heard such an abuse of a concept of conflict of interest as comes from the honourable gentlemen opposite who when they were in power were not the least bit concerned or at least gave no public indication of being the least bit concerned with conflict of interest and who have only become interested in the concept in the last year or so. Now they are completely twisting it so they can seek presumably to see what kind of a smear job they do on various members of the government.

That is a fact and I would like to before I am finished have them give us what their policy would be, Mr. Chairman, on conflict of interest. Now before the present administration took over as the

government of this Province there was no law, absolutely no law concerning conflict of interest whatsoever. There were not even any rules laid down. There were no rules, no rule of practice, there was no law. The law was changed, an act was brought in here in 1972 after the matter was studied by Professor Sinclair at New Brunswick, a lot of work done on it, brought in in 1973 I think it was.

That legislation provides for disclosure of any interests a member of the government or a member of the House has or certain civil servants have in any companies or even if it is not in a company that may be doing business with the government and that therefore might cause a conflict between a person's private interest and his public duty as a member of the House or a member of the government they have to disclose such interests.

Mr. Chairman, if in the course of your public duties, one of your private interests becomes involved so that your decision can either benefit your private interest or not then the legislation requires that you take no part in that position. That is what the legislation states. Or if you are a member of the House that you disclose to the House what your private interest is; if you are going to vote on a bill where you have some private interests, that is what it requires.

The legislation does not require any member of this House to give up any private interests a member has but he has to disclose what they are. It is disclosure.

Now, we will just look at the invoices from the water committee or whatever it is in Sibley's Cove. There is no conflict of interest. The Minister of Rural Development has a company. It is disclosed in his conflict of interest statement, presumably, James G. Reid Limited, which for years has been in the excavating and renting of equipment business about this Province and it still is. He has somebody running it while he is here in the House and now in the cabinet. It still is in business and the water committee of Sibley's Cove, Lead Cove or whatever it is had a job to be done. Somebody called and asked the

people at the firm to rent them equipment to dig the water line or whatever. They are getting a grant from the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing for the -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Rural Development.

MR. CROSBIE: The Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing, this is where this is all administered, to pay for this job. Now, they could have asked James G. Reid Limited for equipment. They could have asked, I suppose, Complete Rent Alls or Viking Construction, I do not know who else rents equipment.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Crosbie.

MR. CROSBIE: They asked, I just said Viking Construction, it does not matter, any one of a number of firms.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Stagg): Order, please!

MR. CROSBIE: It is all quite irrelevant.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member for Bell Island knows the rules in regard to interruption, that he speaks only when he has the floor.

MR. CROSBIE: So, Mr. Chairman, this water committee hired equipment from James G. Reid Limited and paid for it. Either they got the grant from the government and paid for it or the government paid it direct as part of the job. Now where is the conflict of interest? If the Minister of Rural Development, Mr. Reid, had to approve that grant to those persons -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Which he did.

MR. CROSBIE: If he had - so far as I know he did not. If he had to approve that loan to those persons and already knowing they are going to use his equipment to do the job, then he would be in the position of conflict of interest. If he approved a loan to them not knowing who they are going to get to do the job, it is no conflict of interest. All he is doing is his job, approving the loan, presumed that they needed a water line in Sibley's Cove.

So, no conflict of interest even if he approved the loan, which he had not done and did not have to do, it was not in his jurisdiction, if he

had done that and later on they go out and hire James G. Reid, there still, no there was not any conflict of interest, none whatsoever. If he approved a loan knowing that they are going to use the money to pay James G. Reid, then there would be a conflict of interest. He should say, "No, you will have to get another minister or the Premier will have to appoint an acting minister to decide this," if it were in his department which it is not.

So the Minister of Rural Development is not connected with this matter at all.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: That is what the legislation calls for. So there is no conflict of interest but what there is, Mr. Chairman, is an attempt to smear the Minister of Rural Development by making it appear as though there is a conflict of interest. If there be any conflict of interest the act here provides for a prosecution. Any citizen can lay a complaint of James G. Reid, guilty of breach of the Conflict of Interest Act, if there be any conflict of interest, the minister who involved himself in that decision had a personal interest, but there is not going to be any complaint made because he is not guilty of any conflict of interest.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the law of this Province is disclosure and then not participating in the decision. That is the law of this Province. There could be a law that could provide that no member of this House or of the government or of the cabinet should be allowed to have any private business interests at all. That is another position that you could take. You could have that law, that no member of a cabinet or even of the whole House be permitted to have any private business interests. That is another position that you could take. It has not been taken in this Province and it would be an extreme position to take because you would certainly prevent a lot of people going into politics who have something to contribute and should be there.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it does not matter whether persons give up their interests to the honourable crowd opposite or not because I gave up all of my interests. Every interest I had, every business interest I had I gave up

and sold.

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: There is a sworn statement and that is on the record with the Auditor General. Not only is there a sworn statement, I am saying, and I am not known to be a liar, that I sold any private business interests I had and that I have no shares with any company, except those listed down there, that does business with the government. So I gave up.

I chose when I went into public life to give up interests I had in Crosbie and Company and NECCO and this, that and the other and I have. I no longer have them. My wife does not have them. The children do not have them. That is the position. But did that stop a campaign of slander and calumny against me for the last few years? Mr. Chairman, it did not. It did not. The honourable gentleman from Bell Island's comment just then, "Do you expect us to believe that?" is a further exemplification of it. He is now saying he does not believe a sworn statement or my statement in this House.

MR. NEARY: I do not believe anything that the honourable gentleman says.

MR. CROSBIE: Now, Mr. Chairman, I want this retracted and I want it retracted now, the statement that he does not believe any statement that I make. That is unparliamentary. I do not really care about his opinion but it is unparliamentary and should not be left on the record here.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, that is not an unparliamentary statement. Sir, it is not a comment and therefore I have no intention of withdrawing it, Sir. It is not unparliamentary. Would the minister give us a citation. Show us where it is unparliamentary.

MR. CROSBIE: I do not need to give a citation.

MR. NEARY: Oh yes, Mr. Chairman, the minister does have to.

MR. MARSHALL: The citation is here, Mr. Chairman, I mean he is not allowed to question the honour of one, This is page 131 of Beauchesne,

one is not allowed to tell a member that he is going about the country telling palpable lies, and one is not allowed to question the honour of a person, one is not allowed to say a person is a liar and to say that obviously one does not believe a word - or anything that an honourable member says is in effect quite plainly saying that the person who is making these statements is telling the untruth, in other words is telling lies, impugning his honour.

MR. WM. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, on the question, I mean I heard nothing whereby the honourable member for Bell Island impugned the honour of the Minister of Finance. He did not call him a liar; he said he did not believe it. Now that might be a defect of the member for Bell Island. For all I know, the minister may be telling the absolute unqualified truth. Now there may be a problem with the member for Bell Island, he does not believe him. Now I believe ninety-nine point nine per cent of what the minister says; the member for Bell Island believes nothing that he says. Now I mean, surely that is a subjective judgement impugning nobody's honour. It may be a problem with the member for Bell Island, it may be my problem if I believe everything he says. He is not calling the minister a liar and he is not impugning his honour and I would say that the point of order raised, Sir, is specious.

MR. CROSBIE: Page 131 of Beauchesne gives the following examples of unparliamentary phrases, one of them is, "No member will be permitted to say of another that he could expect no candour from him." Even that mild an expression, "he could expect no candour from him" has been held to be unparliamentary. The statement, that the honourable gentleman does not believe a word that I say, if that be not the unparliamentary then we may as well throw away Beauchesne and not operate by any rules at all in this House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The citations brought by honourable members to my left are the citations which I intend to follow in this matter. While the exact statement by the honourable member does not appear, statements of

similar import do. For instance, it is not parliamentary to question the honour of another person or to tell a member that he went about the country telling probable lies and things of this nature.

I believe the honourable member's statement comes into that category, an unparliamentary statement. I call upon him to perhaps rephrase, preferably withdraw.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I believe my statement to be true. The honourable gentleman was talking about his shares in various companies and so forth and what he did with these shares.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! Order please! I am not asking the honourable member to explain his statement, I am asking the honourable member to perhaps rephrase, preferably withdraw and not to make a speech on the subject.

MR. NEARY: What is it I have to rephrase and withdraw? Sir, that I do not believe the honourable gentleman? If Your Honour says -

AN FON. MEMBER: Do not believe anything he says.

MR. NEARY: That is my prerogative, Sir; I just do not believe the honourable gentleman. So what? I do not believe him. But what else can I say, Sir? How can I rephrase that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member may not believe him, however that statement is not going to appear on the records of this House unchallenged. Now his statement has been challenged, I am calling upon the honourable member to rephrase probably, withdraw preferably. For the third time I have brought it to his attention. Now the honourable member is called upon to do his duty.

MR. NEARY: Your Honour is forcing me to tell a lie. Okay I do believe the honourable gentleman. Now I am lying to the House. Sir, that is a lie. Your Honour is forcing me not only to commit a mortal sin but to break one of the rules of this House because I am lying to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is obviously going to make a few more points before he does what he ultimately will do. However, that -

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, I will not. I am telling you that right now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is, his withdrawal or his rephrasing or whatever is not acceptable.

MR. NEARY: If Your Honour force me to withdraw then I am lying to the House and I do not intend to lie to the House, because I do not believe the honourable gentleman, Sir, I do not believe him. If I do otherwise I will be lying to the committee and I have no intention of - Your Honour is not going to force me to tell a lie to this House. It is against my christian principles and against my religion and I am not going to lie. Sir, I will not lie for Crosbie or Your Honour or anybody else in this honourable House. I do not believe the gentleman and that is it and I am not going to lie.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have made a ruling and I have called upon the honourable member to withdraw his statement he has made. Am I to assume that the honourable member will not withdraw his statement?

AN HON. MEMBER: What is the statement?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The statement is, as I have recollected, that he does not believe any statement made by the Minister of Finance.

MR. NEARY: That is not what I said, Your Honour, I said when the honourable minister was talking about his companies I said; the honourable gentleman pointed his finger at me and put a question to me and I said I find it hard to believe, I do not believe it. That is what I said, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! Order please! Now the honourable member has carried this on as far as this Chair is about to take it. Now the honourable member will either withdraw or I will have to follow the course that is a course that should not have to be followed. The honourable member does not have to compromise himself in any way really. If the honourable member has uttered a phrase that is unparliamentary, whether he believes it or not -

MR. NEARY: Would Your Honour read the citation for us?

MR ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR CHAIRMAN: The ruling is that the expression by the honourable

member for Bell Island, that he does not believe these statements made by the Minister of Finance, are unparliamentary. That is the ruling. That is unparliamentary. The honourable member is called upon to withdraw.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, that is not unparliamentary, Sir. It is not. Your Honour has not proven to this committee that it is unparliamentary.

AN HON. MEMBER: Are you questioning the Chair?

MR. NEARY: I am questioning the Chair. Of course I am. This whole thing is partisan politics of the worst sort and there is no Crosbie going to make me lie in this honourable House, I do not care where -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! Order please! I am now come to the point, for the first time in my tenure as Chairman of Committees, I am come to the point where I have commiserated with the honourable gentleman for as long as I possibly can. I now call upon the honourable gentleman by name, Mr. Neary, you are called upon to apologize to the House or to this committee. If you have any apology to offer now is your time to do so.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, Your Honour has to report to the Speaker of the House. Your Honour cannot make that kind of a ruling in committee. Learn the rules of the House.

MR. WM. ROWE: On a point of order, Sir, this is an outrageous use of power as far as I know. As I understand the rules, the Chairman has to report to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now I am calling upon the honourable member, his last opportunity to withdraw or be named, withdraw the statement made, as unparliamentary.

MR. NEARY: Could Your Honour give me the words please, so that I can see what it is I have to withdraw?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, the statement made by the honourable member for Bell Island was that he did not believe any statement that the member for St. John's West, the Minister of Finance, made. That is what he stated and that is what should be withdrawn if we are to have

any parliamentary practice in this committee at all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the honourable member prepared to withdraw?

MR. NEARY: I mean, look, Your Honour, if you are going to force me to do it, I will do it. Your Honour is forcing me to do it. I will lie, I will lie to the House and I will do it if Your Honour is forcing me to do it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the honourable member making an unequivocal withdrawal?

MR. NEARY: Your Honour, what do you want me to do, get on my knees?

MR. CHAIRMAN: All the honourable member has to do is say, "I withdraw the statement."

MR. NEARY: But Your Honour I will retract the statement and I will lie to the House and I will say that I believe the honourable minister. I retract, withdraw. What do you want me to do, stand on my head?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is acceptable.

MR. NEARY: It is acceptable. Now it

is acceptable. Now, I am in a position where I have to go out and get down on my knees -

MR. CHAIRMAN (MR. STAGG): The position that the honourable member may be in now is -

MR. NEARY: ... and ask forgiveness for lying to the House because that is what I did. Your Honour forced me to lie to the House.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, now that the rules have been enforced, all I can say, as to whether the honourable gentleman opposite believes me or not, I could not care less because I have no regard for his opinion whatsoever.

To get back to the point I was making, Mr. Chairman and this is another illustration of it, that it matters not -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, a point of order on the statement just made by the minister. Sir, he says he has no regard for my opinion. He is questioning my character. He is questioning my honour and my motive. I ask Your Honour to give a ruling and ask the minister to withdraw. Sit down while I am raising a point of order. Sit down.

MR. CROSBIE: There is no point of order.

MR. NEARY: Sit down while I am raising a point of order.

MR. CROSBIE: This is not a point of order.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman - Sit down!

MR. CROSBIE: I am not sitting down.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I am standing on a point of order.

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

I think in view of the intemperate behavior of the committee that I will recess the committee for five minutes.

MR. NEARY: Sir, before Your Honour recessed the committee, the Minister of Finance made a statement that I consider to be unparliamentary, Sir. I would like for Your Honour to deal with it. I raised it before Your Honour recessed and went out to his office. I would like for Your Honour to rule on that point of order now, Sir.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, before you rule on it, I would like to know what the statement was. I said that I have no regard for the opinion of the Member for Bell Island. If any authority can be cited to show that that is unparliamentary, then I certainly would be glad to withdraw it.

MR. NEARY: It is impugning the honour of an honourable member of this House, Sir.

MR. CROSBIE: Impugning the honour?

MR. NEARY: It is just the same as I said that I do not believe anything the honourable minister says. One is just as bad as the other, Sir. I ask Your Honour to give a ruling on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stagg): The Chair rules that the expression used by the Hon. Minister of Finance is parliamentary.

MR. NEARY: Two different sets of rules.

MR. CROSBIE: Of course, Mr. Chairman, it is parliamentary.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stagg): If the Hon. Minister of Finance would permit? The procedure with regard to disciplining honourable members has been reviewed in the interim as well. The Hon. Member for Bell Island is pursuing a tack that he has over the past couple of days, which is interference at his whim. Any time he wants to interfere or get his statements into the record, he does so. It is unparliamentary. It has been brought to his attention on many occasions. I suggest to the honourable member that he refrain from these comments. He has an opportunity as everyone else does.

MR. NEARY: I would like to appeal Your Honour's ruling.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stagg): That is not a ruling, it is -

MR. NEARY: On that point of order: Your Honour ruled on it so now I am appealing your ruling, Sir.

On motion that the committee rise to report an appeal of Mr. Chairman's ruling, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stagg): Mr. Speaker, while in Committee of the Whole, the Hon. Member for Bell Island rose on a point of order. He alleged that certain remarks by the Minister of Finance were unparliamentary. I ruled that the remarks were parliamentary. The Member for Bell Island appealed my ruling.

MR. ROBERTS: Would the Deputy Chairman now state what the words were because that is the point, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I do not think that that is particularly important to this. I do not have to rule whether it was parliamentary or unparliamentary. The motion is that the ruling made by the Chairman of Committee be sustained. Those in favour "aye," Those against "nay." In my opinion the "aye's" have it.

On motion that the House go into Committee of Supply, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY:

MR. CROSBIE: If I may continue with my few remarks. As I was saying I have no regard whatsoever for the opinions of the Hon. Member for Bell Island. I am glad to hear that that is quite parliamentary because I felt quite sure that it was.

To get back to the point of conflict of interest, Mr. Chairman: As I was pointing out, there is no law in this province today that requires a member of this House or the government to divest himself of any private interests he has. The law is outlined in the Conflict of Interest Act. Even if a member should get rid of any private business interest he does have, it makes absolutely no difference to members of the opposition opposite because as we have already seen by the statements of the Member for Bell Island, he is not prepared to believe that the interests have been gotten rid of in the first place and encourages people to think that this is so.

Mr. Chairman, whether one gets rid of all the interests that one has or one does not (that is not required by the law) will make no difference to what appears to be a calculated campaign of using the expression conflict of interest to attack members of the government with, in cases where there is no such conflict of interest and in cases where the conflict of interest has not been breached.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there have been many instances in the past of conflict of interest. The law of this province before 1973 was such that in a case where a member of the government, the head of the government was involved in a company, Investment Developers Limited that leased several liquor stores from the government of the province, and there was no conflict of interest law at all applied to that situation whatsoever. There is just one instance of conflict of interest in the past. With the new legislation and in any such instance as that, where the interest was not disclosed, it would clearly be illegal.

MR. W. N. FOWE: Point of order. I believe Your Honour drew the Member for Bell Island to order because he was engaging in a philosophical discussion of conflict of interest and the implication is there too. Now I would ask Your Honour to make the same ruling with respect to the Hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stagg): I think the point is a good point.

The point under discussion is the Department of Rural Development, 1601-01. Certain allegations of conflict of interest have been made against the Minister of Rural Development, however, and they have become now enshrined in the annals of the House. I think in the interests of fair play and also relevancy probably the Hon. Minister of Finance should at least be given permission to explain to the committee just what conflict of interest is so that the committee can be better informed as to whether or not the honourable minister is involved in conflict of interest.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, is that the wish of the opposition in this committee that for many hours of the last few hours on the Department of Rural Development have involved themselves into statements or allegations about conflict of interest? If we are not to be permitted to discuss that, then it is a most peculiar thing.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what is being done here?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, point of order. Is the minister appealing Your Honour's ruling? According to the rules of this House, Mr. Chairman, one cannot criticize Your Honour's ruling unless one is prepared to appeal it like I did a few moments ago, Sir. I ask the minister if he is appealing Your Honour's ruling.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stagg): The honourable member did not listen to my ruling, obviously. I have ruled that the honourable minister could explain what conflict of interest was since the point had been brought before the committee, so that the committee could be better informed as to whether or not there was a conflict of interest.

MR. NEARY: Your Honour, the minister challenged Your Honour's ruling. He went on to say well - without going through the formality of an appeal.

MR. CROSBIE: May I continue?

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Member for Bell Island does not want honourable members on this side to be permitted to discuss conflict of interest. They just want to make insinuations about the Minister of Rural Development -

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

MR. CROSBIE: Then prevent any one on this side -

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

MR. CROSBIE: Then prevent any one on this side from speaking on it.

MR. NEARY: Sit down when I raising a point of order.

MR. CROSBIE: Another point of order.

MR. NEARY: Sit down, Scrooge! Sit down!

Mr. Chairman, I would like to raise a point of order.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, do you wish me to sit down? Otherwise, I have no intention of sitting.

MR. NEARY: Point of order, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stagg): Both honourable members have resumed their places. I do not know if the member is going to raise the same point of order as he raised before and, of course, it is not the Chair's duty to anticipate what the honourable member is going to do. However, I have already ruled that the Minister of Finance could continue on his explanation of conflict of interest. Certainly for the benefit of the committee, I think it is relevant. The honourable member may now state his point of order.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the minister explaining what conflict of interest means in his terms but Your Honour we want the same right on this side of the committee. Would Your Honour see to it that we will be allowed to comment on what the minister says or are we just going to have the comments from that side of the committee?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, that is not a point of order.

MR. NEARY: It is a point of order.

MR. CROSBIE: It is a question to the Chair.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I will continue on with my few remarks. I was amazed -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, may I have a ruling?

MR. CROSBIE: There is no point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY: The honourable gentleman does not own the House, he may own the province.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stagg): The member's question - I must say the honourable member's

temperament this afternoon is not one which tends toward the orderly flow of debate in this committee.

MR. NEARY: I am not going to be bullied around, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (MR. STAGG): The honourable member may not want to be bullied but he certainly gives every appearance of attempting to bully the Chair on a number of occasions.

Now, the point raised by the honourable member is hypothetical and the Chair is not required to adjudicate on hypothetical questions.

The honourable the Minister of Finance.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, the honourable gentleman for Bell Island does not want to hear this question discussed now. The honourable gentleman from Bell Island feels that he can stand in the committee and make the kinds of statements he does and then attempt to prevent them from being debated or defended.

Now, I was amazed, Mr. Chairman, in the course of the debate last night to hear honourable gentlemen opposite say - I believe it was - yes, the member for White Bay South - that suspicious circumstances had been disclosed. While he did not believe the Minister for Rural Development was guilty of anything, suspicions had been raised and these demanded an explanation. He hoped that the minister will come out as lily-white and innocent.

Well, to my mind, Mr. Chairman, this is a new perversion. This is certainly a perversion of the system of justice we have in this province where one is assumed to be innocent until one is found to be guilty, that now statements can be made by the opposition in this committee - and these are presumed to be correct and the person they are made about is presumed to be guilty unless he prove that he is innocent. This is indeed something new.

Suppose that these invoices from the Water Committee of Lead Cove and Sibleys Cove require an explanation. The Minister of Rural Development has already given the explanation. It is an explanation that seems to be sensible to anybody in the House. No member opposite has gotten up and said that the Minister of Rural

Development arranged a loan for the Water Committee of Sibleys Cove and directed them an order so that his equipment would be hired by that committee. There has not been any statement or suggestion of that. What the suspicious circumstances are, if they are suspicious, have been explained.

A similar thing happened in a debate in this House just a few weeks ago, Mr. Chairman. Despite what explanations were given, despite the documents that were filed, that did no good. That was not found to be convincing. The suspicious circumstances there - no member of the opposite side ever said that these suspicious circumstances had been explained. No. The whole matter was conducted on completely partisan lines. Every member of the opposition said that the charges, as far as they were concerned, were proven; it did not matter what documents were filed in the House and so on.

So, this is all part of the course. There is no way the Minister of Rural Development can bring forward any more facts or circumstances to this committee that will find members of the opposition opposite now saying that he is lily-white and innocent. That is quite obvious. So, this is all of a piece.

The minister is not guilty of any conflict of interest. There has been nothing put before the committee to show that he is guilty of any conflict of interest. There have been no very suspicious circumstances put before the committee. Yet, for the last two days, since Friday evening, just a few minutes before the adjournment this matter was brought up, not even earlier in the debate and the debate had been going on for hours then.

So, apparently, Mr. Chairman, this is the kind of thing that we are going to go through, not just in the Department of Rural Development but through this whole session until honourable gentlemen opposite get some indication from the public as to whether they are making any headway or not. Well, I do not think they are going to make any headway in this kind of tack. The minister has been asked to explain these invoices. He has explained them. There are no circumstances of conflict of interest.

Perhaps honourable gentlemen opposite when they get into power are going to provide new legislation and perhaps they would tell us about that. Is it their pledge that when they get into power at some time in the future that they are going to bring in legislation that will prevent any member of this House from having any private interests whatsoever if he become a member of the House or a member of the government? Is this what they are aiming for? It certainly was not the case in the last administration. It is not the law of this province now. It is not the law in the Government of Canada. It is not the law that I know of in any province at the moment. Perhaps this is what we are going to come to but it is certainly not what the public want today.

So, Mr. Chairman, I feel that the minister has explained satisfactorily these circumstances. The vote should now be carried and the committee should move on and discuss the vote and the estimates of his department which are what the public is interested in.

MR. NEARY: There is a fat chance, Sir, of letting this vote carry after what we just heard from the Minister of Finance. The minister, Sir, is making up the rules as he goes. The minister actually is telling us there is no law governing conflict of interest. They make up their own rules.

The minister made a couple of statements, Sir, that need to be corrected. The Minister of Rural Development was actually doing business with his own company. That is against -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: No, he is not.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Chairman, the checks were going from the minister's department. The Minister of Finance said that it was the Department of Municipal Affairs that was issuing the checks. That is not so, Sir. My information, Sir - let me go through it again because obviously the Minister of Finance must have been asleep the other night when I outlined the procedure.

The Water Line Committee over in Lead Cove and Sibleys Cove came to the minister's department and said, "We need so much money."

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: No.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Sir.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: No.

MR. NEARY: The water vote was under the minister's department.

Can the minister deny that? Was not the water vote under the minister's own department at the time?

MP. REID: No.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Chairman, the minister -

MR. REID: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: When?

MR. REID: That was a year before. In fact it was lying over there for almost two years.

MR. NEARY: The minister became minister of that department in December, 1972. These invoices are 1973.

MR. REID: Yes, but how long was I there as minister? I was in Municipal Affairs when that came through. That is when it was. I was not even in it.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Chairman, these are the matters that we want to get cleared up. That is why I am suggesting -

MR. REID: Well, I cleared them up last night only the honourable member could not understand it.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. REID: I read out the dates.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. REID: I gave them every date.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, my understanding, Sir, of this whole situation is that the minister's company was issued checks straight from the minister's own department to his own company. Sir, what I would like for the minister to do then, if the minister is saying, "No, this is not so", go down in his department, check to see if there are any checks there that were issued, bring copies into the committee if they were. Will the minister do that? Will the minister undertake to just defer passing his estimates?

MR. REID: What was the date on the invoice?

MR. NEARY: April 30, May 15, these invoices here. This one is May 31. There are all kinds of invoices floating around. My colleague has two over there. The Leader of the Opposition has one. They are floating around everywhere.

MR. REID: Municipal Affairs had that all taken over then.

MR. NEARY: 1971. 1973.

MR. REID: That was only when they went short of money and Municipal Affairs had it taken over. Now, is that clear enough? If I bring it up in black and white, the honourable member will not believe it.

MR. NEARY: Yes, I will. Bring it up.

MR. REID: No way. I had it here yesterday.

MR. NEARY: Bring it up. No, the minister did not have it there yesterday and that is what is causing -

MR. REID: The honourable member even stated how I went and got these people to write those letters which I never did. They brought them to me and brought them fifty miles too.

MR. NEARY: Voluntarily? They volunteered to bring the letters to the minister?

MR. REID: Guaranteed. In fact, the phone calls were waiting for me when I got home.

MR. NEARY: I have no doubt about that.

MR. REID: That is right because I got them out of a wonderful jam. Is the honourable member satisfied?

MR. NEARY: No, I am not satisfied. I want it thoroughly investigated because, Mr. Chairman, it brings into focus the whole matter of wheeling and dealing by ministers with their various companies. The Minister of Finance can get up and pound his breast all he like and say, "Oh, we are pure. All we have to do is disclose our interests." That is not conflict of interest, Sir. That is a farce. No wonder I find it very difficult to swallow anything that that minister says, Sir. In other words, what the minister is saying is that I can take the shares in my company, put them in trust, sell them to my brother and when I get out of politics I can go out and pick them up again.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: The honourable member is only in money business.

MR. NEARY: That is just a farce, Sir. There is nothing to it. It is only a gimmick.

MR. REID: Does he want me to go back over it again?

MR. NEARY: Well, I would be very pleased if the minister would go back over it again.

MR. REID: If I had it here, I would certainly love to go right back over it.

MR. NEARY: All right, let us hear it. I yielded the floor before, Sir, and then I got up and all I got was a lot of abuse from the other side. I have no intention of yielding now.

MR. REID: The honourable member got no abuse from me.

MR. NEARY: This whole matter, Sir, has not been settled to the satisfaction of the committee, despite what the Minister of Finance says; "Disclosure is the only thing you have to do under our Conflict of Interest Legislation." One has to do more than that, Sir. If the Minister of Finance were really interested in his colleague, the Minister of Rural Development, he would certainly go along with an impartial

enquiry. Why not? Does the minister have anything to hide? Nothing to hide, well why not go along with the Auditor General going in and taking a look at that situation?

MR. REID: It would look so foolish it is not even funny.

MR. NEARY: I am prepared to look foolish. I am quite prepared to look foolish.

MR. REID: The honourable member normally does. He normally does. I - what I had yesterday. I will read it back tomorrow to the honourable gentleman.

MR. NEARY: Boy, look! Forget the Minister of Finance dragging in his red herring.

MR. REID: The Minister of Finance has no influence over me right now in what we are doing.

MR. NEARY: Oh! But he has. He has. He went down the other day and told the honourable gentleman to keep quiet.

MR. REID: No way. The Minister of Finance has not spoken to me for weeks.

MR. NEARY: Well, maybe the minister is getting too much equipment hired on and running in competition to the minister's own companies.

MR. REID: No, I help those companies.

MR. CROSBIE: On a point of order. The Minister of Finance does not have any companies and he has no companies that have any equipment. So how could the honourable gentleman make a statement like that. I ask him to withdraw that.

MR. NEARY: It is a matter of opinion, boy. Sit down and do not be so foolish. The honourable gentleman is getting worse, boy. He is getting worse. The honourable gentleman might be taking over this Province but he has not taken over the House yet. We still have certain rights in this honourable House.

MR. CROSBIE: Why does he not worry about the Crosbies in his own party and not worry about the ones over here.

MR. NEARY: Do not worry, I will keep my eye on the Crosbies. They

have a foot in both parties now.

MR. CROSBIE: The honourable gentleman is not doing much of a job.

MR. NEARY: Is that so?

MR. CROSBIE: The honourable gentleman is worried about the leadership now.

MR. NEARY: I am not worried about any leadership.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes he is.

MR. NEARY: The minister is more worried about the leadership than I am.

Sir, this whole matter has not be cleared up to the satisfaction of the committee. I would like for the minister to be man enough to get up and agree to having an impartial enquiry made into this. If he has nothing to hide he will do it. Why not? The minister can get up and tell us how hard he worked and what a fine job his company is doing, how hard he has worked down in that department and the minister told us the morale of the department was at an all-time low. Who was the minister's predecessor? Who was the minister's predecessor? His colleague, the member for Grand Falls. No wonder the morale was so low.

MR. REID: Oh, yes! But he walked into an awful stew, did he not? He walked into an awful stew.

MR. NEARY: Sit down, I have the floor. Sit down, I have the floor.

MR. REID: I know, it is too bad he does.

MR. NEARY: The minister said the morale of the department was -

MR. REID: The morale of the department was not caused by the previous minister -

MR. NEARY: The member for Grand Falls was there a year before that minister went in. No wonder the morale down there was so low.

MR. REID: It almost broke his heart to see the stew that -

MR. NEARY: No wonder the member for Grand Falls had to be flicked out.

MR. J. CARTER: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The honourable member for Bell Island is deliberately baiting the honourable the minister and then not giving him a chance to reply to his accusations. This is

a meeting of the committee and the rules are fairly flexible. It permits for any honourable gentleman to make a statement, for the minister whose department is being discussed to reply and then for the honourable gentleman who is speaking originally to make a further statement. There is no need to carry on like that.

MR. NEARY: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. It is just -

MR. CHAIRMAN (Stagg): Well, the point raised by the honourable member is certainly one that the Chair takes note of. It calls for fair play in committee. The honourable member directs remarks at the honourable minister which on the face of it would require a response at that time.

However the rules of the House do not extend themselves to this type of response. Until the rules of the House are amended, so that honourable members can carry on an argument in the fashion that is customary in a domestic House, then I will have to enforce the rule that only the person who has the floor has the right to speak.

However, the person who does have the floor certainly has the responsibility to speak in a manner that does not evoke heated responses from the other side.

MR. NEARY: I can speak in any manner I want to in this honourable House providing it is in keeping with the rules of the House and it is not -

MR. W. ROWE: On a point of order. Mr. Chairman, I must say, Sir, I have been in the House for some years. I just did not understand Your Honour's ruling. Was Your Honour lecturing the member for Bell Island? Was he ruling that he is not allowed to say anything that hurts the minister's feelings? Was he saying that is quite all right for a minister to interrupt a member heatedly or vociferously because he does not like what the member is saying? Is that what Your Honour is saying? I mean I just do not understand Your Honour's ruling and I would like to have a clarification of it.

MR. CARTER: To that point of order, Mr. Chairman, to that very point of order, Mr. Chairman. The honourable member for Bell Island evokes a

response from the honourable the minister and then does not permit him - having baited him, does not permit him to reply. I say that this is improper and unfair and unheard of.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please! We have already, this afternoon had the ruling of the Chairman appealed. The member for White Bay South is now asking the Chair to explain this ruling by using a point of order. Either the member wishes to appeal the ruling or he does not. The Chair has made all of the explanations in this matter that it is going to.

MR. W. ROWE: I want the ruling clarified, Sir. I am a member of this House and I expect to speak from one occasion to another in the House. Now, did the Chairman rule that you are not allowed to say in committee anything that might irritate a minister and cause a minister to get upset and heated? Is that what the Chairman ruled? Because if so, Sir, I will have to guide myself in accordance to that ruling, you understand, Mr. Chairman. The member for Bell Island is not permitted now, under Your Honour's ruling (before I appeal or not appeal, I would like to know what I am appealing) the member for Bell Island is not allowed to say anything that might upset the minister and cause him to say, "That is not true," or whatever else the case might be, even in spite of the fact that the minister has been asked by every member of this committee to get up and say something about what has been said about his department and has refused consistently. Now is that what Your Honour is ruling?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I think it is fair at this time to give a certain amount of leeway to the honourable member for White Bay South who up to this point I always thought was one of the more perceptive members and certainly could have understood what I had said. I will for the sake of - I am trying to preserve order in the committee which is certainly not an easy task this afternoon. As far as the rules as they presently stand are constituted, remarks such as interjections by the Minister of Rural Development are out of order. I then suggested that

if honourable members wish to avoid being interrupted they would have to tailor their speeches accordingly.

However, the point simply is that no honourable member has the right to speak in this committee unless he has the floor. This is so well enshrined now that I hesitate to get up and say it because I feel that I am being needlessly repetitious. However that is enough of it.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, now Your Honour's ruling is correct. It makes sense.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is the same ruling.

MR. NEARY: No, it is not the same ruling, Your Honour, because the minister brought a new point into the debate, Sir. He mentioned the fact that the morale of his department was very low -

MR. REID: It was very low.

MR. NEARY: He said it was at an all-time low, Mr. Chairman. The minister said, Sir, the minister said, and I do not mind being interrupted, Mr. Chairman, I do not mind it at all. I can handle the honourable minister. I can handle anybody on that honourable side.

MR. REID: How does he mean handle them?

MR. NEARY: I can take them all together if they want to get into it, Sir. I am not worried about them one bit.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: The Minister of Rural Development, Sir, made a statement a few moments ago that the morale of his department was at an all-time low when he became minister.

MR. REID: When I went into Community and Social Development, yes. I will go along with the honourable gentleman.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Chairman, the point that I made was -

MR. REID: I will go along with the honourable gentleman there.

MR. NEARY: Right, right, now -

MR. REID: Community and social -

MR. NEARY: Now we are in complete agreement. Sir, do you know who the Minister of Community and Social Development was before that minister took over?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Who was it? Would anybody care to hazard a guess of who was minister of that department?

MR. REID: Does the honourable gentleman want me to answer that?

MR. NEARY: No, I will answer it.

MR. REID: Sit down, I will answer it.

MR. NEARY: One never asks a question in this honourable House unless one knows the answer.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: The honourable member over there from Grand Falls who got flicked out of the cabinet, Sir.

MR. A. J. SENIOR: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to some of the rulings you have made this afternoon and you have made rulings to the effect that everybody has a chance to speak in this committee to defend themselves. There have been certain statements made against me, Sir, and I would like to have the opportunity to defend myself at some time in the future.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, Sir. Is that just foolishness? Did you ever hear the like in your life? Does Your Honour want to make a ruling on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Stagg): The honourable member may direct himself to the point of order. I believe that the honourable member for Grand Falls certainly at some point during the proceedings will have the opportunity to have his say in this debate. It certainly will be in order for the honourable member to have his say.

MR. SENIOR: To further that point of order. The point I want to make is this, that I am not going to sit in this committee and have accusations made against me, either because I was former minister in this government or as a MHA or personally, without having the opportunity to react to it.

Now whether I have to sit in this committee and listen to a member from the other side get up and speak for an hour before I have a chance to defend myself or whether I can interrupt him, I do not know. Maybe that is contrary to the rules but I am not going to sit here and listen to that kind of accusation without having some opportunity to react to it.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Chairman, of course the Member from Grand Falls will have his opportunity to speak the same as anybody else in this honourable House. That is his right and he should get up and defend himself. Remember, Mr. Chairman, it was not I who made the charges against the honourable member, it was his colleague, the Minister of Rural Development.

MR. REID: I did no such thing.

MR. NEARY: The Minister of Rural Development, Sir, if I may be permitted -

MR. REID: Point of order: I made no accusation against the previous minister.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Chairman, let me rephrase what I said. Let me rephrase what I said, Mr. Chairman. The minister introduced in this debate the point about the morale of his department when he became minister. That was purely voluntary. We did not prod the minister. The minister volunteered that information that the morale of that department was at an all-time low. The minister confirmed this by nodding, yes.

MR. REID: "It was very low," I said.

MR. NEARY: Very low.

Well, Sir, the gentleman who was the minister's predecessor was none other than his colleague, the Member for Grand Falls.

MR. REID: That is right but he was bringing it back on its feet.

MR. NEARY: Well he was only there -

MR. REID: He was just bringing it back on its feet after the other previous -

MR. NEARY: The Member for Grand Falls was in that department, minister of that department for almost a year or a little over a year, I believe almost a year.

MR. REID: How long?

MR. NEARY: Eleven months, almost a year. I was quite right. The minister was there almost a year, Sir. Maybe we will find out now, -

AN HON. MEMBER: Wars have been fought and lost in that length of time.

MR. NEARY: That is right, Sir. My colleague reminds me that wars have been fought and lost in that length of time.

Sir, the minister was then thrown out and his colleague, his successor, inherited a department apparently that was in a shambles.

AN HON. MEMBER: Now we know why.

MR. NEARY: Now we know why, Mr. Chairman. Now we are finding out the real truth, the reason why the Member for Grand Falls was flicked out of the cabinet.

MR. REID: No, he started to get it back on its feet.

MR. NEARY: That is why he was thrown out of the cabinet, he was starting to get it back on its feet.

MR. REID: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: That was his reward. It is a wonder he did not get one of the Silver Anniversary medals for putting it back on its feet and then getting thrown out of the cabinet.

MR. REID: It is a wonder the honourable member did not have a nervous breakdown under the conditions that were down there.

MR. NEARY: Well if the minister does not keep quiet he is likely to have a nervous breakdown.

MR. REID: The honourable member will never cause me to have one, I will assure him of that right now.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, if I fling out the bait and they open up their mouths over there and swallow it, I cannot help that, Sir. I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that the Member for Grand Falls will challenge that statement made by his colleague. I did not make any accusations against the Member for Grand Falls.

MR. REID: I certainly did not.

MR. NEARY: No charges, nothing. As a matter of fact, I have nothing but respect for the Hon. Member for Grand Falls. I did not raise the matter. It was raised by his colleague, not by me. The member can get up and slander me all he likes, he can libel me all he likes but I did not say -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I did not say anything about the Member for Grand Falls. He is a nice fellow, he is a decent chap.

MR. REID: That is today.

MR. NEARY: It was the honourable gentleman's colleague.

MR. W. N. ROWE: The Premier should have kept him in the cabinet.

MR. NEARY: Of course, he should have kept him in. He is an honourable, decent gentleman, an honourable man. He should have been kept in the cabinet. The member was getting the department back on its feet.

AN HON. MEMBER: Backing up.

MR. NEARY: I am not backing up. I am not scared of anything on that honourable side of the House, nothing! The honourable gentlemen saw that this afternoon.

MR. REID: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Let alone the Member for Grand Falls. I am not even seared of "Bully Boy" over there.

MR. MORGAN: A point of order, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, do we have to listen to this kind of repetitious trash which is not relevant to the debate at all. We are debating the estimates of the Rural Development Department, 1601-01. We are not discussing whether the Hon. Member for Bell Island is afraid or in fear of any member on this government side. We are discussing Rural Development. Let us stay relevant to the debate and stop getting on with this kind of trash in this committee.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Point of order, Sir. I would submit that the Hon. Member for Bell Island has been relevant all along and that he was momentarily diverted there by some words spoken from the other side. I would advise the Member for Bonavista South not to come into this committee testy and angry because he was defeated last night in his take over bid of the Human Rights' Association. Just because he was defeated in his try, he should not come into this committee and take it out on us, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stagg): Order please, the Hon. Member for Bell Island and any other honourable member knows that the rule of relevancy is one that is rigidly enforced. Certainly in this debate it has been rather difficult to enforce it as rigidly as the Chair would like to have had it. I do think the honourable member may be wandering somewhat far afield. I suggest that the honourable member be relevant to Head 1601-01.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I want to give the Member for Grand Falls an opportunity to speak in this debate so I am not going to prolong the debate any longer. The honourable member may want to tell us that he inherited the situation, I do not know. Certainly, he should correct what his colleague said down there. It is very damaging to the honourable member who may have ambitions of going back into the cabinet some day. He has to get back in the Premier's good graces.

Sir, this matter of the invoices and the conflict of interest has not been cleared up. As a matter of fact -

MR. REID: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: I want the minister to bring in the documentation that we asked for the first day that this committee met. We asked to have the invoices. First of all we want the correspondence between -

MR. REID: The honourable gentleman has the invoices.

MR. NEARY: No, I only have some, Mr. Chairman. We only have five, Sir. There are twenty-five invoices like this floating around.

MR. REID: Oh, there are more than that. There are one hundred more than that.

MR. NEARY: That is right. There are hundreds.

MR. REID: Hundreds more than that.

MR. NEARY: Well, Sir, there you go, there is an admission. The minister is now admitting to the suggestions that we are making.

MR. REID: There are hundreds more than that.

MR. NEARY: So the minister should bring in first of all -

MR. REID: My Lord! Do I have to bring them all in?

MR. NEARY: Yes, boy, bring them all in.

MR. REID: I will have more trash than the honourable gentleman has on his table.

MR. NEARY: Ah, bring them in, I do not care. I do not mind.

MR. REID: I do not think that that is necessary.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I move Your Honour that we defer the minister's estimates until he brings in all the documentation concerning this matter between the waterline committee and the minister's department. I move that we defer the estimates.

MR. REID: Keep on, Sir, the honourable gentleman is going to embarrass me.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stagg): Is the honourable gentleman putting that motion?

MR. NEARY: To defer the minister's estimates until we get the documentation that the committee requires in connection with this matter between James Reid and Sons and the Waterline Committee in Lead Cove, Sibleys Cove, Trinity Bay.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stagg): The committee has heard the motion. I do not know if I can rephrase it in its original form. I believe the motion is that the estimates of the Department of Rural Development be deferred. Those in favour "aye." Contrary "nay." In my opinion the "nay's" have it.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stagg): Shall Head 1601-01, carry? Carried.

MR. SENIOR: Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to prolong the debate. As a matter of fact I do not have any desire to get involved in the

debate at all. It is just that my name was brought into it on a couple of occasions. I do not want to enter the debate because I might have to discuss the Member for Bell Island and I would not want to lower myself to that level.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I was -

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stagg): Order please!

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I was waiting with bated breath to the choice words of the Member for Grand Falls which he promised us. He really let us down that time. Perhaps there will be another occasion.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I also listened as I did earlier again to the minister this afternoon in both his performances, his scripted performance and then the unscripted performance which came later. I think anybody listening will agree that certainly there was more information in the second statement he made than in the first. I would only hope, Mr. Chairman, that the Premier and the Minister of Finance and the other ministers who have been down there to him, out in the corridors in the last few nights and days coaching him, I would only wish they would lay off the coaching and let the man stand up and say what he really believes. Let the man stand up and tell the truth. This is what the members on this side have been asking for a number of days, the truth about a number of matters, a number of questions that we have raised, not a prepared statement where he sits up during the nights writing and then reads it to the committee the next day, against the rules of the House, not that kind of a thing, a carefully chosen set of words that says very little of anything. He did, as I admit, as my colleague the Member for St. Barbe South, himself to two or three questions that he had raised, questions relating to rural development associations. We are certainly grateful for the answers to those questions.

Mr. Chairman, let the record show that not one word has been said today by the minister in response to the questions that have been raised in respect to the matter in Lead Cove, Sibleys Cove; not one word has been said in response. Not one word by the minister in response to the matters affecting the disbursement of RDA loans, not one, single, solitary word, not a comment from the minister on our suggestions as to how the RDA could be revamped, how there could be some guidelines to guard against the kinds of happenings about which we have expressed some fears in the last day or so in speaking in this debate. This is most disappointing. All we hear from the minister is another attempt, like we have had several in the past few days from the

Premier, from the Minister of Finance, from the Minister of Mines and Energy, from the Minister of Education and now from the Minister of Rural Development, blatant attempts to put in our mouths words that were never there. I hear the minister in the latest attempt imply that we have said, or not imply charge that we have said that we do not believe the people of rural Newfoundland are capable. Now what utter complete rubbish, Mr. Chairman, what complete nonsense. Of course he did not hear that at any time. He did not hear that at any time. We did not say it, Mr. Chairman. The Minister of Mines and Energy knows we did not say it. He had difficulty remembering anything we said yesterday, he was still recovering from the shock of Saturday night when he had that crowd of thirty-five people at his annual meeting in Placentia West.

We did not say this, Mr. Chairman, at any time.

MR. BARRY: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: If the member for Placentia West will allow me to continue without interruption I shall do so.

Mr. Chairman, at no time did I or any other of my colleagues on this side of the House imply or suggest or state that we believe the people of rural Newfoundland are not capable. Indeed that is the reverse of that. It is the whole thesis underlying what we are saying, that they are so capable that they deserve a fair break and they are not getting it under this rural development programme, this so called rural development programme which at best is some kind of a LIP project because they have been led down the garden path, Mr. Chairman, that is why they are not getting the break. They have been taken as some kind of goats or some kind of sheep to be led.

MR. BARRY: They are stupid, are they?

MR. SIMMONS: No, they are not stupid but the administration presumes they are stupid.

MR. BARRY: And what is the member saying, that they are being led?

MR. CHAIRMAN: If honourable members are not going to conduct themselves in a manner befitting this committee they will have to take continual

interruptions. Now the honourable member for Hermitage has the floor and has the right to be heard in silence.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, all we are asking from the Minister of Rural Development is that he stand up and address himself to the issues that we have raised. All we are asking from the other members of the administration is that they shut up and let the minister get up and speak for himself and let them stop coaching and stop telling him to sit down and not to say this and not to say that. Let him get up and be the man he is. Let him get up and openly bare his soul before the committee and tell it like it is. He has not done that, Mr. Chairman. He has given a pansy, prepared statement that he sat up all night trying to write and God knows it was not a most successful effort. Having heard that, Mr. Chairman, we heard him begin to get into the issue of truth and I wish he would pursue it a little more. He did address himself to a couple of matters but he has not, Mr. Chairman, and I repeat, address himself to the crux of the issues that we have raised in this committee. I would invite him once again to do so before we move on to the next head in these estimates.

Why does he try to confuse the issue by hanging on the opposition the charge that we have implied the people of Newfoundland are not capable? We think they are very capable. We think they are much too capable, much too capable to fall for this ruse that we are hearing about, this so-called rural development programme. We feel it is our responsibility to bring to the attention of rural Newfoundland the real truth about this rural development programme. We are trying to bring that truth to the people of rural Newfoundland. We are having difficulty because we are not getting any answers and we have asked some pretty legitimate questions and there have been no answers.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we cannot help it. Mr. Chairman, I can tell you one member who pays attention to me and that is the member for Harbour Main. He hangs on every word I say, every last word, when he is not interrupting me, Mr. Chairman.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Wish away. Wish away. Mr. Chairman, we cannot help it if the member for Bell Island -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. WM. ROWE: Mr. Civil Rights.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Civil Rights again, Mr. Chairman, always at best second best, always at best second best. Does it not flatter you, Mr. Chairman, the way they obey your orders about keeping quiet on that side?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: What was that again?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: No, Mr. Chairman, I do not know what he is referring to. I asked the minister today, as a matter of fact the Minister of Recreation. I went over and chatted with him during the session and he is coming back. I went over and asked for a second park on behalf of the people of Harbour Breton. Yes, I am looking for another park. Is that what he asked me?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: No, Mr. Chairman, I have one park myself. I bought it with honest dollars, thirty-eight acres of it, honest dollars, completely my own. The record will show that I bought it off Crosbie, Mr. Chairman, honest, good, honest dollars and I own it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Oh yes, a number, Mr. Chairman, there is one a mile down the road, another five or six miles down the road, another twenty miles -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: See what I mean, Mr. Chairman. It is intimidation - now they are going to zero in on me now. A few acres of land out there with my house and a place I try to live in peace on weekends, and now they want to take that away from me.

MR. WM. ROWE: Shocking.

MR. SIMMONS: This, Mr. Chairman, was the minister who was not going to get involved in personal attacks. This was the fellow who was - I wish he would avoid the personal attacks and get up and indeed avoid to any extent that he does attack his own colleague. Imagine getting up and attacking the fellow who ran the department before he got there, particularly when that fellow is not my colleague from White Bay South but his own colleague, the member for Grand Falls. "The shambles," he says, "The morale is at an all-time low."

AN HON. MEMBER: Before he got there.

MR. SIMMONS: Oh yes, qualify it now. I would say he deserved to be flicked out of the Cabinet if after eleven months he could not do anything to clean her up. Perhaps the Premier had more wisdom than we gave him credit for, and that is possible. That is very possible.

MR. BARRY: Does he not agree that it was a mess before the member for Grand Falls -

MR. SIMMONS: I agree that if the guy could not do something to administer the department in eleven months he should have been kicked out. I agree to that. I certainly agree to that, Mr. Chairman. I also agree that the Minister of Rural Development ought to get up now and tell us the answers to some of the questions we have raised. We have had enough of dissertations on conflict of interest and one man's opinion, one man's opinion, the Minister of Finance's opinion as to what conflict of interest consisted, in his particular version. He is a man who beat this around, beat it to death for years when he was in opposition, used it as a stepping stone and then having got in power he had to persuade his colleagues to come up with some kind of legislation to save face. So he came up with toothless legislation, all full of loopholes, so many loopholes you could drive a truck through it, just to save face so he could say, "Here is my conflict of interest legislation." Conflict of interest legislation; Mr. Chairman, that does not mean a row of beans.

The minister points out that the legislation, the conflict

of interest legislation does not require a member to divest himself of his private interests, which of course is completely beside the point that we have been raising here today and the last couple of days.

The matter we have addressed ourselves to are one of the several matters. The one that certainly relates to conflict of interest here is a case of a minister and do I have to repeat it again or have they not heard. Here is a case of a minister, at once a Minister of the Crown involved in the department concerned. Then he wears a second hat, he is involved as the member for the district concerned. Then he wears a third hat, he is the principal, he is the president of the company involved in the work concerned.

Mr. Chairman, we have been maintaining that for various reasons there is an appearance of a conflict of interest. Now the Minister of Finance can think he has the claim on defining all to himself what conflict of interest consist of, but I say to him and I say to the committee that there is a whole lot relating to conflict of interest which never got into the legislation, thanks to his screening, thanks to his ability to come up with some weak-kneed legislation that does not mean a row of beans.

MR. WM. ROWE: The loophole kid, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SIMMONS: The loophole kid, the Minister of Finance. It is one of the more complimentary terms I have heard him described by around the country, Mr. Chairman, in recent weeks; the loophole kid. They have other names for him since the Budget came down but it is probably not relevant to go into these right now, but they are not particularly complimentary names, the ones I have been hearing. Of course none of the names I have heard in the last year or so about the Minister of Finance have been particularly complimentary. They have been realistic, Mr. Chairman, but they have not been especially complimentary. They have been certainly incisive. They have certainly demonstrated perception on the part of those making the comments and all of them, without exception, have not been very complimentary. But that is understandable, most understandable.

MR. WM. ROWE: Short and to the point.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of interest too last night to a number of the speakers, a number of the filibusters from the other side who obviously have their instructions, Mr. Chairman, to kill as much of the time of this committee as possible. The more time they talk the more time they consume of the seventy-five hours, the less the opposition will consume. They filibuster and they blocked our opportunity to comment on the estimates and to ask pertinent questions.

I listened to a couple of them last night and one of them -

MR. BARRY: A point of order, Mr. Chairman. The entire diatribe that the honourable member is now going into is totally irrelevant. I ask that you direct him to get back to the estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN (MR. STAGG): Yes. The honourable member is not relevant at this point. I ask that he deal with matters that are relevant.

MR. SIMMONS: I will try it this way, Mr. Chairman.

I want to react to some relevant statements that were made in the debate by other members of the committee. That is what I was leading up to when the member from Placentia West rose on his point of order, to practice his parliamentary skills and it is agreed that they need practice.

Mr. Chairman, one of the members last night, the member for Port de Grave - we all must have been certainly impressed by his performance last night.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: No doubt the honourable member was.

MR. SIMMONS: I was terribly impressed, Mr. Chairman, just touched beyond words, touched mostly that he could perform at all.

MR. BARRY: A point of order, Mr. Chairman. I submit the vacant member opposite is ignoring Your Honour's ruling and is continuing to persist in the irrelevancy that was brought to Your Honour's attention a few moments ago.

Now, I ask that if the honourable member do not have anything to say on the estimates of the department that he just sit down and keep quite.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, to the point of order. In reference to the comments made by the member from Port de Grave last night, I was about to rebut a point that he had made on the subject of rural development, RDA loans.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Do you have a ruling on that?

MR. CHAIRMAN (MR. STAGG): The honourable member may put it.

MR. SIMMONS: Let the member from Placentia West note that his point was not even worth ruling on.

Mr. Chairman, I get the noise from the member from Placentia

West quite often about the vacant seat from Hermitage. Of course, better a vacant seat from Hermitage than a vacant head from Placentia West.

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

The honourable member from Hermitage is drawn to the point of order originally raised by the member for Placentia West which was agreed with by the Chair.

The subsequent point of order raised by the member for Placentia West, while it was not ruled upon nevertheless was completely in order. The honourable member was irrelevant on these two occasions.

Now, the honourable member is irrelevant again. The honourable member is directed to a rule of the Standing Orders. If an honourable member persists in irrelevance, he can be directed to discontinue his speech.

Now, the honourable member obviously has many things that are relevant. I suggest that he deal with them.

MR. SIMMONS: It is so difficult to be relevant, Mr. Chairman, looking at all the irrelevancies opposite.

To the very relevant point which the member for Port de Grave mentioned last night. He did talk about - I think I quote him correctly - I did hear him say in talking about RDA loans that of the five loans that he was aware of in his district, four had been dispensed to Liberals. Indeed I believe it was the member for Green Bay, earlier in the debate, in talking about the thirteen or fourteen names that he had before him at that time, made the guess that ten of the fourteen loans indeed were in the hands of Liberals.

Well, of course, four out of five, ten out of fourteen, the ratios will differ from district to district, Mr. Chairman. I think it is revealing that the ratios are such across the province and that at the moment, if this be typical, then four out of five in Port de Grave may well be Liberals. That is pretty fair. Ten out of fourteen Liberals in Green Bay. So, that is a fair comment. One must note that the member for Green Bay and the member for Port

de Grave did make a valuable contribution to the committee in giving us that information.

Mr. Chairman, I want again to repeat for the minister a couple of points that were made and appeal to him once again to respond to three constructive suggestions, among others, that have been made by members on this side. One, that the matter of the apparent conflict of interest be put in the hands of an independent body, probably the Auditor General as has been suggested by one of my colleagues. That is our first suggestion. We would like to have some response from him on that.

Number two, that the membership of the Rural Development Authority be replaced in its entirety. All six members be removed from it and these be replaced by six or how ever many you want according to the legislation, five, six, seven or whatever, nonpartisan members, Mr. Chairman, who can carry out the function of the authority as laid down in law without being intimidated, without political considerations entering into their decisions.

Number three, Mr. Chairman, that there be a hard and fast set of guidelines which reflect the actual practice of the Rural Development Authority in dispensing loans. I gave an example last night of a prospective retailer in White Bay North who applied for \$10,000 in June and was told that he was being rejected because his proposal would not develop basic resources. Yet, three or four months previous, in February, in the same district, in another community a few miles away, another potential retailer had been given the identical amount the first man had applied for, \$10,000. For him it was okay. So, different guidelines are being used differently depending on the individual applicant.

The member for Green Bay himself, in talking about this last night, said something to the effect - I do not have his actual words but I believe the committee will recall the essence of what he said on this point. He said that he would be the first to admit that first when the authority came in the emphasis was on resource based industries. Then he went on to say that the emphasis had now broadened and that indeed loans were being dispensed for reasons other

than resource based industries. By his admission, this is the case.

Well, if that be the case, Mr. Chairman, let us change the rules so that all applicants, all potential applicants know where they stand beforehand. That is our third constructive proposal, that the Rural Development Authority guidelines for dispensing loans be changed, be broadened and be made hard and fast and, more important, be made to reflect what is the current practice of the authority in dispensing those loans.

Mr. Chairman, I would honestly hope, sincerely hope that the minister would respond to these three constructive proposals. (1) the need for an independent enquiry, (2) the recommendation to change the membership of the authority and put on it nonpartisan people and (3) the suggestion from us that guidelines be laid down, hard-and-fast guidelines which will be the same for all and which will reflect the current practice of the authority in dispensing loans. I appeal to the minister before this head passes to respond to these items so that the committee might have some direction as to what we can expect with respect to the administration of RDA loans in the future.

On motion 16-01-01 carried.

MR. W. ROWE: Here he comes. Here he comes. I would just like to know why that amount is up so much. I mean, what has he done with the general administration office in the department? Just very briefly, Sir. I am not interested in too many details.

MR. CHAIRMAN (MR. STAGG): If the honourable member will permit, we are on 16-01-02.

MR. W. ROWE: Oh, yes. I will wait until that is passed.

On motion 16-01-02 carried.

MR. W. ROWE: Explain the increase, substantial increase.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: The salaries, general administration.

MR. REID: Mr. Chairman, that is the regular salary increase as set out by my department for the department.

MR. WOODWARD: Maybe the minister did not understand. Maybe the

minister can explain how many new people he has brought in, all the additional people there are in that vote.

MR. REID: The honourable member says extra people brought in under this - I am not too sure. I will certainly get it for him.

MR. W. ROWE: The revised estimate has gone up. The revised estimate was \$92,000 for salaries for general administration. The estimates for this year show \$158,000. Now, is it envisaged that new employees will be taken on for general administration purposes or have they been taken on? I mean, the deputy minister must know. Surely he could tell the minister.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, is this a hideous plot on the part of the government to have ministers take a half an hour to answer simple questions?

MR. REID: Mr. Chairman, block provision for new posts and we had one accountant, Clerk I. That was the reason for the increase, \$23,495 and \$5,975.

MR. NEARY: That does not make sense, Sir. Did the minister say, block provision for new posts? Would the minister tell us what these new posts are going to be?

MR. REID: Accounting posts.

MR. NEARY: I beg the honourable gentleman's pardon?

MR. REID: Accounting posts for accounting.

MR. NEARY: Current?

MR. REID: The new ARDA programme which we had already come through there a few weeks ago for the ARDA programme. In the new ARDA programme they are financing fifty per cent of our salaries.

MR. NEARY: Yes, but have the posts been filled or are they going to be?

MR. REID: They are new posts. We are going to fill them, yes.

MR. NEARY: Well, what are they? Would the minister tell us what they are? Would he give us a list of them?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Stop the clock, Sir.

MR. REID: Mr. Chairman, I do not have it but I will certainly bring it in here probably tomorrow or the following day. I do not have it here right now.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, the minister at some point along the line or his deputy, who is sitting with him, must have gone to Treasury Board and got the Treasury Board approval of block provision for new posts and some argument must have been put up to Treasury Board and Treasury Board must have consented thereto. I know from the Hon. Minister of Finance that he is not given to consenting lightly.

I am sure that a convincing case was put to him, "Old Crusty Crosbie." The Minister of Finance, Sir, did not just say, "Yes, have your block provision, \$38,000 or whatever it was." I am sure that some case was put up. Just as a matter of interest, I would hate for this to become any kind of a great cause or issue, Sir. It is a simple question that should have been answered in four seconds at most. Yet, here we are wasting time. Fifteen minutes has gone by already. If the minister or his deputy would simply say to us what new posts they intend to create and pay people out of the public purse for, Mr. Chairman.

MR. REID: Mr. Chairman, the only answer I can give is certainly that we are going to require accounting clerks for the coming year because of the new ARDA programme.

MR. NEARY: How many? What salaries?

MR. REID: I do not have the full detail here.

MR. W. N. ROWE: The minister will bring it in later, I suppose.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, first of all would the minister agree to get the information on 1602-01 and agree to do his homework, so we do not waste time. We have been held up just waiting for him to educate himself over there or be educated by those sitting around him. Why does he not do his homework? We are looking at an increase of \$66,100. Now that is an increase of sixty or seventy per cent or something from what I see here in one year in the salaries for this division of his department. He looks appalled that we are even asking the questions. Well let us give him notice now that we are going to ask questions as we go through the various heads. Could we appeal to him to do his homework and be ready for them as we raise the questions?

MR. CHAIRMAN: On motion 1602-01, 1602-02-01, 02-02, carried.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, on 1603-01, I think this is the appropriate subhead under which I might ask this question. Is this the programme that was formerly called resettlement? If so, whether or not there has been a fundamental change of policy? What is the present policy on community consolidation?

MR. REID: Well there is not very much difference between it.

The only thing about it - \$1,200 now for the head of the household, \$200 each for additional members and also up to \$3,000 towards household lots and if required the \$1,500 for house moving.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. REID: Well, \$1,500.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister could tell the committee if there is any community consolidation taking place this year? Are there any communities where families are moving from or moving to? Is there such a thing happening in the province right now? There is a large expenditure for it this year of \$104,000. Is this the real thing or is it just an estimate?

MR. REID: Mr. Chairman, we are not moving too many communities. We do not believe in moving communities now. We moved a lot of individuals who we think should be moved. If there are job opportunities in various places, we will move them.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Chairman, maybe the minister can tell the committee then what the criteria is for a family to move now under the new Community Consolidation Programme? What qualifies a person for the funds to move from one community to another?

MR. REID: Mr. Chairman, families in an area where they are unemployed, we will do our best to move these people to a place where we know they are going to get a permanent job.

MR. W. N. ROWE: That is very interesting.

MR. REID: (Inaudible).

MR. W. N. ROWE: Is the minister finished?

MR. WOODWARD: Working under whose equipment?

MR. W. N. ROWE: Do not be knotty.

MR. REID: Is that a question? We have our own barges. Community Consolidation has its own barges. Normally we use that equipment to move the houses on.

MR. W.N. ROWE: That is a very interesting reply by the minister. If a person be unemployed, he will be helped with public money to be moved to a community where he can obtain employment. Would

the minister mind pointing out to the committee what the difference between the resettlement programme, the Community Consolidation Programme and the Canada Manpower Mobility Programme is? If a person from any community in the province should get a job and should wish to move to another community, then under certain circumstances laid down by the federal regulations the Manpower Mobility Programme comes into play and he gets certain grants and certain help. I do not have all the figures or details in my head now, Mr. Chairman. What is the difference between this programme and the Canada Manpower Mobility Programme? Is there any difference?

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. W. N. ROWE: The minister wants to speak. The defeated president, Sir, of the Human Rights' Association has not yet -

MR. REID: They never found any money for moving houses, did they, Canada Manpower?

MR. W. N. ROWE: Is the honourable gentleman asking me a question?

MR. REID: Yes.

MR. W. N. ROWE: I asked the minister.

Well assuming that there was a programme for the physically moving of a house, Mr. Chairman - forget about that. A lot of people move without ever moving their houses. They just move themselves and their families, leave their house behind. In certain cases they can get a grant from the Department of Manpower. Now I do not pretend to be laying all the criteria here. I would have to look at the regulations.

Now we have a situation where the old resettlement programme, (the fancy new name is Community Consolidation) tried to hide the fact that this government, this party, Sir, said that resettlement is an evil thing and that it should be wiped off the face of the earth. They wiped it off all right. They changed the name. Resettlement now becomes Community Consolidation.

Now there are, I will be the first to admit, certain changes brought about by consent with Mr. Jamieson in Ottawa, things which I would have liked to have seen myself when I was minister but did not come through . I am glad to see that Jamieson, when he became Minister of DREE and knew more about the Newfoundland situation than previous ministers, readily agreed to, i.e., letting people move on an individual basis. If the minister should check with his officials down there, Mr. Harnum and them, he will know how hard they tried to get that brought in years go but were always

resisted by the Government of Canada, because the reason given to me four or five years ago when I first broached this subject of forgetting about communities being moved, forgetting about eighty per cent, forget about fifty per cent, forget about substantial proportions of communities and concentrate on the individual, allow an individual family to get a resettlement grant if he or she and the family could better their environment. This might mean in certain cases, for an example, an old woman or an old man who wanted to move near to a son or daughter being able to avail of a settlement grant for that purpose, even though eighty per cent of the community might have wanted to stay behind, to allow them to move out of a community with few amenities into a larger community where there might be some amenities and facilities, allow that to happen if they wanted to say be near the younger members of their family.

Now, we fought for that. They always turned us down until Don Jamieson became Minister of DREE and then he acceded to it. The reason given by Ottawa every time I broached the subject was that if you allow people to move on an individual basis, especially where employment is the criterion, then you have basically a manpower mobility programme. Tom Kent, who was the Deputy Minister of DREE subsequently moved to Delco I believe it was, in Sydney. He was the father of the Manpower Mobility Programme. He was also the Deputy Minister of DREE when I used to put this forward.

Suddenly we have a programme which is more or less identical to the one that the Government of Canada would turn down consistently because it would conflict with or overlap with the Manpower Mobility Programme. Now, what I am asking the minister is - maybe the deputy minister can help him on it - what are the differences between this programme, the Community Consolidation Programme and the Manpower Mobility Programme? Because if there are no differences, then I would suggest that we are wasting a lot of provincial money because the Canada Manpower Mobility Programme, of course, is all federal funds. If these two programmes are basically the same, then we should not be wasting provincial money, we should

rely on the federal money. If the criteria are basically the same, perhaps the minister might be able to elucidate what this programme is all about.

MR. REID: Mr. Chairman, one thing now, we assist them to move. We give them \$1,200 now to move. When we were under the other manpower, they had to have the job before they moved into those places in those communities.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Had to have a job before they moved?

MR. REID: Yes.

MR. W. ROWE: Under manpower. What does the honourable minister mean? I see. If my colleagues would allow me to pursue this, Mr. Chairman, for a little while because I am genuinely interested.

So, under the resettlement programme as presently constituted and set up a man does not have to have a job to move. Is this the idea? Let me try to help the minister. If it looks like he might get a chance of a job.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Right. Potential.

MR. W. ROWE: Oh, the potential. I see. So, he does not have to have a job. If he should come to the minister and say; "Look, I want to move from S.A. Tickle into St. John's because I think I might get a job", then he will get a resettlement grant. Is that the idea? What can -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. W. ROWE: Look, the defeated President of the Human Rights Association who is very testy today, Mr. Chairman, because he was wiped out in his power grab -

MR. ROBERTS: The coming events casting their shadow.

MR. W. ROWE: If I were him, I would not have made that particular power grab because I think, Sir, that it might carry over into the next election.

I am seriously asking a question of the minister. If I lived in a certain small community and I say that I want to go to St. John's because I have no chance of a job here and I may have a chance of a job in St. John's, what then does the Department of Community and Social Development or Rural Development or Community

Consolidation, whatever the case might be, what do they say to that man? Do they say, "Yes because your community is one which is designated from which resettlement can take place"? Or, "No, your community is not designated as a community from which resettlement can take place"? Or, "Give us proof of the fact that you might get a job"? Or, "Prove to us that you do have a job"? I mean, what are the criteria?

MR. REID: Mr. Chairman, under the system of manpower mobility it was \$400. That is what they received in those days, was it not?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: In what?

MR. REID: On the average around \$400 dollars.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: For what?

MR. REID: That is what the manpower paid.

MR. ROBERTS: We are not talking about manpower. We are talking about community development.

MR. REID: Yes, it was. Under this new system of ours, it is \$5,900

MR. ROBERTS: Manpower is a federal programme.

MR. W. ROWE: I am trying to see if this overlaps or what.

MR. REID: What does the honourable member mean? How it overlaps?

MR. W. ROWE: What are the differences between the resettlement programme as presently conceived and operated and the Manpower Mobility Programme operated by the federal government? That is all I am asking, Mr. Chairman. What are the differences. Now, there may be differences in amounts. There may be differences in one or two small things like that. Basically what are the differences in criteria used? That is all I am asking.

The question is, if the minister will answer when he gets an opportunity, how does one get a resettlement grant these days, Mr. Chairman? That is all. How does one get them? What are the criteria used? What does one have to show? What does one have to prove? Are there designated sending communities? Are there designated receiving communities? Sir, give us some answers, Mr. Chairman.

MR. REID: Well actually, Mr. Chairman, there are no more sending

communities. What we are trying to do is in the communities where the people are living, try to develop something. Now, if we have to move people, then we move them out to the various communities where they can make a living, where they have something permanent, a permanent job. We will move these people out there and help these people to get there and set them up and settle them in the various communities.

MR. W. ROWE: What does the minister, if the minister is finished. The minister says, "If we have to move people". What does he mean by that, "If we have to move people"? Who decides who moves?

MR. REID: Not if they have to, if they want to move.

MR. W. ROWE: Is it based on the whim of the man who - just take a community, take Fischot Islands for example, does a resident of that community write in to say Ken Harnum, first-class, fine gentleman, one of the gentlemen of this earth, Mr. Chairman, a man much maligned I might say by this administration in earlier days, but a gentleman, perfect gentleman, sympathetic, sincere. Look, the defeated president, Mr. Chairman, who was wiped out in his power bid should keep quite and be a little bit humble today. He should not be shooting off his face.

MR. ROBERTS: He is just proving why he was defeated.

MR. W. ROWE: If I planned for six months to take over the Human Rights Association and brought in my crowd to try to take over the presidency and failed, Sir, I think I would go underground for about six months to recover from the shame of it.

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

MR. W. ROWE: What I am asking the minister is if one should belong to Fischot Islands and one should want a resettlement grant, what does one do? Do you write the director of resettlement and say, I want a resettlement grant please? How does the director of resettlement or the resettlement committee or the minister or whoever makes the decision, how do they decide whether that particular family gets a resettlement grant as against me living in St. John's, say, who says: I have a better chance of employment in Grand Falls? I think

probably the record will show that there is probably a higher unemployment rate in St. John's than Grand Falls. I do not have a job in St. John's and I want to move to Grand Falls to get a job, what is the difference between those two sets of circumstances?

MR. PEID: Mr. Chairman, if we are moving in from a certain community, if they want to move in from a certain community, we send -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. PEID: If a certain family want to move from a certain community, we would send our man in there and see if we should move them or not, see if there is a possibility that where we move them that there is going to be a place where they can survive or make a living. Mostly that is what we are doing. We are not trying to move people because a lot of people want to move. We are moving people in areas where they can make a living.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: What is the difference in that policy and the old policy?

MR. PEID: I am not saying that there is that much. The older policy, what we were doing is we were moving most everyone out of every community. Regardless of job opportunities

or anything else, they had to move. We are not doing that, we are moving individuals who cannot get a job or who are probably on welfare and then they can get a job in another area, and they do not have to give up their homes. They own their homes and that and someday later if possible they can sell them.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, the minister's explanations lead only to further questions. Now there was a resettlement programme. I reject his analysis of it. It shows a complete lack of understanding and a complete lack of what the old programme did. Be the old programme good or bad is a matter that can be debated and maybe should be debated, but there was a resettlement programme.

There is now a community consolidation programme. What we are trying to get the minister to do is to tell us what is the difference. He tells us they are not moving people and then he stands and he twice I think, Sir, used these exact words, that if we decide. "We" could only mean he and his officials or we the government. It is not James G. Reid and Sons Limited, or if Mr. Harnum decides. Now I want to know by what standards he decides.

Mr. Bromley, in Fischot Islands, probably the smallest community left in my constituency where I think there are six families now, and when they are not in Fischot in the winter they move into Harbour De Vue on the mainland. It is the sort of thing that happens in Labrador South; it is the only place left on the island to my knowledge. But they are in now, in Harbour De Vue for the winter. If they want to move, they, according to the minister, drop a note to him or to me or to some point of contact with the government as such and eventually it comes to Mr. Harnum's desk. Are we on common ground there? Let us say Mr. Bromley in Fischot wants to move or Mr. Aylward and so eventually Mr. Ken Harnum has on his desk a piece of paper which says, "We, the Bromleys, we the Aylwards, wish to move from Fischot Islands!" Now, Mr. Harnum gets up on his horse and he goes down to Fischot Islands and if I follow the minister correctly and I have been listening attentively and trying to follow him, Mr. Harnum or one of his

associates then says, "All right, we shall help you to move."

All I want to know is, and all any of us want to know is on what standards, is it completely ad hoc? Is it a matter of Mr. Harnum's decision and if so by what standards does the official and it does not matter whether it is Mr. Harnum or anybody else, by what standards does the official decide?

Now a year or so past, the former Minister of Community and Social Development stood in his place which was I think probably where the Minister of Manpower now sits. An uneasy omen I would say to the minister. The minister may get the same sort of treatment he got from his Premier in front of a number of other officials the other day. He is chewed out by the Premier. They have told me, the people who were there. Such as, where do we find the money to pay the hospital workers? But the then Minister of Community and Social Development announced a great review, as I recall it, of the resettlement programme. We have heard nothing of that since, possibly because the minister was dismissed from his office. But what I want to know from the present minister, the gentleman from Trinity South, is what standards are there for resettlement? Now it is close to six o'clock. The minister is consulting his deputy and that is a good thing. Maybe if the committee want to call it six o'clock we could come back at eight, and the minister could make a statement.

All we are trying to do is to find out by what standards - Can anybody move? If somebody from Carbonear should decide he wants to move to Fortune Bay, can he get help? No? Well, what are the standards? There are people unemployed this day in Carbonear. There are jobs going begging, we keep hearing, on the Burin Peninsula, in the fish plants, I think that is true. I mean the managers of the fish plants, Mr. Moulton and Mr. Major and Mr. Russell and Mr. Martin (Is it?) of the Atlantic Fish Plant in Marystown, are constantly looking for people, looking for workmen.

Now the federal people have a manpower mobility programme which helps people to move to a job. It has some good points and I think it has some bad points but there it is. If that apply it would help

the minister to move to Toronto if he qualified under it. There are no restrictions in geography that I know. The resettlement programme or whatever it is called, clearly consolidation, now that is not manpower mobility. If that is manpower mobility, why is it called community consolidation? The minister is asking the committee to vote a net of a little under \$300,000 for community consolidation and since that includes getting about \$270,000 back from the Government of Canada, the minister proposes to spend about \$600,000 in round figures this year on community consolidation, \$300,000 of it is in grants. All we want to know is who can get the grants and by what standards is it measured. What is the programme about? How does it differ from resettlement?

Under resettlement, a community - and did it not get down to a single person eventually?

MR. WM. ROWE: Next thing to it, if a substantial majority expresses some desire to move in -

MR. ROBERTS: If they wanted to leave. It is six o'clock, is it? Well let us have supper.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It now being six o'clock I leave the Chair until eight o'clock this evening.

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

APRIL 30, 1974

QUESTION No. 15

The following information is supplied by the Honourable Minister of Industrial Development in reply to Question #15 asked by Mr. William Rowe (White Bay South) as appearing on the Order Paper of April 18, 1974.

Q. For the fiscal year which began April 1, 1973 and as of a current date, what is (a) the number of applications for financial assistance approved and (b) the value of financial assistance so offered the persons and companies making the aforementioned applications, by the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation in respect of the expansion of existing facilities and/or services?

A. The following information is provided:

- (a) As of April 16, 1974 16 applications for financial assistance were approved.
- (b) \$1,443,800 in term loans and \$145,000 in equity participation.

QUESTION NO. 16

The following information is supplied by the Honourable Minister of Industrial Development in reply to Question #16 asked by Mr. William Rowe (White Bay South) as appearing on the Order Paper of April 18, 1974.

Q. For the fiscal year which began April 1, 1973 and as of a current date, what is (a) the number of applications for financial assistance approved and (b) the value of financial assistance so offered the persons and companies making the aforementioned applications, by the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation in respect of the modernization of existing facilities and/or services?

A. The following information is provided:

(a) As of April 16, 1974, 7 applications for financial assistance were approved.

(b) \$265,000 in term loans and \$30,000 in equity participation.

QUESTION NO. 17

The following information is supplied by the Honourable Minister of Industrial Development in reply to Question #17 asked by Mr. William Rowe (White Bay South) as appearing on the Order Paper of April 18, 1974.

Q. For the fiscal year which began April 1, 1973 and as of a current date, what is (a) the number of applications for financial assistance approved and (b) the value of financial assistance so offered the persons and companies making the aforementioned applications, by the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation in respect of the establishment of proposed new facilities and/or services?

A. The following information is provided:

- (a) 24 applications of financial assistance were approved.
- (b) \$4,135,000 in term loans and \$293,000 in equity participation.

QUESTION No. 18

The following information is supplied by the Honourable Minister of Industrial Development in reply to Question #18 asked by Mr. William Rowe (White Bay South) as appearing on the Order Paper of April 18, 1974.

Q. For the fiscal year which began April 1, 1973 and as of a current date, what is the number of applications for financial assistance in respect of which financial assistance was offered by the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation for each of the following general categories of industrial enterprise: (a) secondary manufacturing (b) agriculture (c) forestry (d) mining (e) fisheries, harvesting (f) fish processing (g) tourism (h) service industries and (i) other?

A. The following information is provided:

- (a) Secondary manufacturing and processing - 11 applications approved.
- (b) Agriculture - 2 applications approved.
- (c) Forestry - 7 applications approved.
- (d) Mining - 1 application approved.
- (e) Fisheries (Harvesting) - No applications approved.
- (f) Fish Processing - 10 applications approved.
- (g) Tourism - 10 applications approved.
- (h) Service Industries - 6 applications approved.
- (i) No applications approved in other sectors such as wholesale/retail trade, etc.

QUESTION NO. 19

Answer to question No. 19 - addressed to the honourable
the Minister of Justice - not tabled on this date, as
stated in Hansard.

QUESTION NO. 20

The following information is supplied by the Honourable Minister of Industrial Development in reply to Question #20 asked by Mr. William Rowe (White Bay South) as appearing on the Order Paper of April 18, 1974.

Q. For the fiscal year which began April 1, 1974 and as of a current date, what is the number of applications for financial assistance which were received by the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation and as of a current date (a) what is the number of these applications in respect of which financial assistance was offered by the said Corporation (b) what is the value of the financial assistance that was offered the persons who made the applications referred to in (a) above (c) what is the number of applications which were rejected by the Corporation and (d) what is the number of applications in respect of which no decision either to offer or not to offer assistance has been made?

A. The following information is provided:

371 applications were received as of April 16, 1974.

- (a) Financial assistance has been offered to 47 of these applicants.
- (b) The value of financial assistance offered totaled \$5,843,800 for term loans and \$468,000 for equity participation.
- (c) 49 applications for financial assistance were rejected.
- (d) 48 applications for financial assistance are presently under assessment and 227 applications for financial assistance have been directed to other sources for financing.



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND**

Volume 3

3rd. Session

Number 60

VERBATIM REPORT

TUESDAY, APRIL 30, 1974

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL

The Committee resumed at 8:00 p.m.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please!

MR. NEARY: The minister was giving an explanation, Sir, of the government's resettlement programme before we rose at 6:00 p.m. Is the minister prepared to carry on with his explanation now?

MR. MARSHALL: (First part inaudible) communities as the previous government did. The previous government drove them out just as effectively as the British in ancient days scourged the communities. This particular government, being much more humane, allow people to exercise their own judgement and do what they want to do. It is as simple as that.

MR. F.B. ROWE: It is pathetic, Mr. Chairman, when a government (the previous government) had a policy that allowed people to move from small communities without water services, without school facilities, without medical services and allowed them to move to communities where they could get employment, where they could have health services and medical services and educational services and this sort of thing. The point that the Minister without Portfolio made is absolutely ridiculous.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Rural Development this afternoon had some difficulty in trying to define exactly what the criteria was for having people move from one community to another. He also had difficulty, Mr. Chairman, in trying to define whether or not there was an overlap with the manpower mobility programme and with the programme of his own provincial department. Probably I can get the minister to try and define what the criteria are for moving from one community to another by giving the honourable minister an example and asking him the question; why it was this particular individual was turned down?

I have had a number of requests from constituents of mine who simply wanted to move their homes during the winter from one community to another community in order to get closer to a place of employment. I am thinking particularly (I will name the communities. I was looking for the letter but I could not find a copy of the reply

from an individual in the minister's department) but the request was that this individual gain assistance in moving from a community called Bear Cove to another community some twenty miles or thirty miles away, St. Barbe, where the Highways Depot for the Department of Transportation and Communications is located. This individual happened to work at the Highways Depot and he simply wanted to move his home closer to his place of employment.

I might add, Mr. Chairman, that twenty miles in St. Barbe North, on the highway up there, is equivalent to one hundred and twenty miles on the Avalon Peninsula. Now, Sir, this individual was refused assistance for the purpose of moving his home by tractor during the winter for (I am not quite sure what the exact reason was) but the reason was that either the community he was moving to was not a receiving community or the community he was moving from was not a sending community.

The minister mentioned this afternoon something about the policy of his administration being to assist those individuals who want to move to areas of employment opportunity. This is precisely what this individual was asking for and he was turned down. I have other cases of individuals being turned down on the basis of receiving and/or sending communities. The first point, Mr. Chairman, using that example, can the minister indicate why this particular individual was turned down? Once again I appeal to the minister to answer the question that was asked by my colleagues and that is: What are the criteria for people who wish to move from one community to another? Are there any sending and/or receiving communities left in this province?

AN HON. MEMBER: Any what?

MR. F.B. ROWE: Are there any sending or receiving communities designated in this province? I think this was the question that the Member for Labrador South was asking earlier this afternoon. It is a simple question, Mr. Chairman. Are there sending and/or receiving communities designated by the minister's department at the present time? That is question No. (1). Question No. (2) was asked by my

colleague, the Member for White Bay South: Is there any overlap with the minister's programme (The programme of the minister's department) and that of the Canada Manpower Mobility Programme?

I think that was a legitimate question. I think the problem was that the minister probably did not quite understand the nature of the question. Is it as simple as that. Is there any overlap with the Canada Manpower Mobility Programme? These are the three questions; that one I just mentioned and: Are there any designated sending and/or receiving communities in this province at the present time? What are the criteria for moving? And why would an individual such as the one I described be refused assistance for the purpose of moving to a place where he would have an employment opportunity?

MR. REID: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the Member for St. Barbe North, Manpower Mobility is one thing we are not supposed to overlap. To be honest, straightforward and honest about the whole thing, I have not been too familiar with Manpower Mobility but I am getting very familiar now with this resettlement programme that we have at the present time, this Mobility Employment Assistance Programme. There are no sending communities but there are several receiving communities. Our reason for moving these people is job opportunity. We have been working the last eight or ten months trying to get a new programme through for moving people all over Newfoundland and Labrador and the various places. We do not believe in moving out communities unless we see that it is impossible for the general public to survive in those communities.

We do what we possibly can to have the communities take advantage of all the opportunities that are in the communities. What we tried to do, and I would like to read what we have been working on now for the last ten or twelve months, with very, very little co-operation, and I can tell the committee how many messages and letters that we have sent to the honourable Don Jamieson, Minister of DREE. This new programme is playing an important part in the development of our

province. (a) Assisting workers and their families who wish to relocate and live where they work. This is what we want to do. This is what we have been trying to get aid from the federal government for. (b) Assist the unemployed labour force to relocate and live with their families near assured employment. (c) Assist fishermen to relocate in communities where there are improved harbour facilities together with an assured market for their catch. (d) Assist aged widows and incapacitated persons to relocate only if moving to greatly improved circumstances where council is satisfied that suitable accommodations are available. (e) Assist other householders only on strong recommendations where councillors and committees have carefully taken into account: (1) The need for medical services; (2) Educational and vocational training; (3) Communications; (4) Emergencies where life and limb may be in danger. Such places as Harbour Breton, Bishops Falls, Stephenville, the Salmon Brook Area, Glenwood and those places.

The programme; before they leave the people must volunteer to move. We do not believe in taking them out unless they are quite satisfied to go. Full counselling must be available. Where houses can be moved, the department will do so and absorb the cost up to \$1,500. The houses that cannot be moved will remain the property of the householder. The householder will own that home and he can sell it any time later on. (6) The following assistance is available at the present time; a grant depending on the number making up the household. For an average family of five \$2,000. Houses may be moved free of cost. Site to site \$1,500. Assistance for service-bearing lots up to \$3,000. The programme pays cost of moving family, furnishing, fishing equipment etc. to the new community on an average of \$500. The total grant is \$7,000.

Grants to special areas, \$6,500. Provincial is going to cost us \$500 to do that. Grants to other areas, \$4000, \$4,500, provincial \$2,500.

I might add that we have been working on this and I have all kinds of correspondence, messages and everything. I have been trying to meet with the honourable Don Jameison and Mr. Harnum who is in our department, who has worked for years and years and years with the resettlement who is getting very depressed over the lack of co-operation that we are getting from the minister. This is something we need very, very badly at the present time in order for us to be able to continue on and move the various homes that we know and the various people in different communities that we should move now.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, so basically what the minister has said as a result of reading of the list of criteria for moving there is that really there is not any substantial difference between the policy of the department and that which existed at the time of the previous administration which has been so savagely attacked by all the members on the other side.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: They were forced out before.

MR. ROWE: They were not forced out, Mr. Chairman. I take issue with that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: These people were not driven out. They moved at their own request, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Honourable members, both to my right and left, especially in this particular incident, honourable members to my left have the opportunity to engage in the debate in the parliamentary way. It is completely out of order for honourable members to interject the short sentences or semi sentences in which they are interjecting while the honourable member for St. Barbe North is speaking.

The honourable member for St. Barbe North has the right to be heard in silence. Honourable members have known this. Indeed, I would say it is probably one of the first rules learned by any pledging member

of the House.

MR. REID: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to finish one thing I left out there.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: What is going on here, Mr. Chairman?

MR. REID: Oh! I am sorry. I am sorry.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Stagg): The honourable member for St. Barbe North has the floor.

MR. F. ROWF: Mr. Chairman, I would not have raised this point except that the honourable the Government House Leader saw fit to jump to his feet at eight of the clock and make another savage attack on the previous Liberal administration. When the previous administration was doing nothing more than setting up a policy to allow people of their own free choice to move from communities that did not have the facilities, particularly that their youngsters needed in order to keep up with the twentieth century in this Province.

If that is to be attacked, I would be glad to defend it at any day at all.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the minister stated that there are no longer any sending communities in this Province. Am I correct Mr. Chairman, on this?

Could the minister please inform the committee of the names - and if the minister does not have the names of these communities at the present time, would the minister promise this committee that he will table a list of the receiving communities that are designated in the Province at the present time because as I understood the minister he said that there are a number of communities that have been designated as receiving communities.

I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that the committee would appreciate the tabling of the list of receiving communities in the Province. The minister has admitted, Sir, that he is not familiar with the Manpower Mobility Programme and therefore one can only assume he does not know whether or not his programme is overlapping with that particular programme or not

and I would suggest that the minister check into that particular point.

The minister also did not answer the question as to why this individual that I mentioned and I could table other examples similar to the example that I did mention of why this individual, presumably must have been turned down for assistance on the basis of the fact that St. Barbe itself was not a receiving community.

Now I would like to know, Sir, what the criteria are for receiving communities, what the criteria are for receiving communities. I mean is it the size of the community? Is it the availability of the services in that community? Is it the availability of employment opportunities in that community or is it a combination of both? Because I can think of a community in St. Barbe North with only about ten houses. It happens to be an employment area simply because of the fact of the highways depots there. On the basis of social services water and sewer lines and population, it probably would not be considered to be a receiving area.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: Well, I do not expect he would be working with the highways depot if he was not - Is this the kind of a statement that we have to put up with, Mr. Chairman?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: If he is working with the Department of Highways, the minister is wondering whether he is employed by the Department of Highways. So, Mr. Chairman, I simply ask the minister if he would (1) table the list of receiving communities, and (2) I think it was probably built in. I assume that the criteria that you gave for assistance to move would be the same criteria for the designation of a receiving community.

MR. REID: Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister of Manpower probably could have given you a better answer there. If the Minister of Manpower would not mind letting the House know, okay.

MR. J.G. ROUSSEAU: Okay.

MR. REID: - He is more familiar with that than I am.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I know certain points of it, of course. It is a federal programme but I am somewhat interested in it. I have written, just jot down a few points here and I hope it will generally clarify the situation. I am not that conversing with the actual details but I know that for the Federal Manpower Mobility Programme the applicant must be unemployed to no fault of his own or he is about to become unemployed. In other words, there is a chance of his job becoming redundant or about for him to be laid off. That has, I guess, to be checked out. There is another criteria they use, if a man is under-employed which means that if a man has certain basic skills as a tradesman and he has to work at a labour job I think that they would also consider it of these circumstances.

It is not necessary for a man to have a job in the area he intends to move but I think one of the criteria for the Federal Department is that -

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I do not know about the other members of the House but I for one and I would assume my colleagues are genuinely interested in hearing what the honourable minister has to say. He obviously knows what he is talking about, and here is four or five of his own colleagues involved in some kind of a like a beer garden discussion, Mr. Chairman. I would suggest to Your Honour, submit humbly to Your Honour to draw their attention to the fact, especially one of their own colleagues should be allowed to speak and be heard in silence.

MR. W.G. DAWE: To that point of order, Mr. Chairman. They did not interrupt me. I heard every word the honourable minister had to say. Now then, that is no worse than the honourable member from Bell Island who spent all yesterday evening listening to a radio, transistor radio and who interrupted the debate in the House on several occasions to give us the count as to how well the Liberals were doing in P.E.I.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Stagg): Well, if the honourable member would remember that -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! To the point raised by the honourable the Minister of Provincial Affairs and Environment, I think if we recall last evening I believe I interrupted the member for Bell Island on seven or eight occasions to indicate that he was not in order for certain of his interjections and the point raised by the member for White Bay South is quite correct. I did hear a certain hum of activity to my left and certainly I think that honourable members will direct themselves properly.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Chairman, just to clarify the situation, does that mean -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: - point of order.

MR. DAWE: Yes, point of order, okay. Does that mean, Mr. Chairman, that I can no longer carry on a conversation with my desk partner here, that I cannot ask him questions or converse with him while somebody else on the floor is speaking.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Stagg): It is a matter of courtesy to the honourable gentleman that I answer this question. It is certainly a hypothetical situation. If the honourable gentleman can carry on conversations with his seat mate without interrupting the proceedings of the chamber then by all means he may do so. If any honourable gentleman's voice or conduct is such that it does disrupt the ordinary normal proceedings of the House then he has violated the rules which is that honourable members are silent while another honourable member has the floor.

The Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations.

MR. ROUSSEAU: So I suggested three points, the man would be unemployed through no fault of his own, the second point being that he would be about to become unemployed and that would have to be checked out. In other words, there is a chance that his job would become redundant.

and also if he is underemployed which would suggest that. That is, a skilled tradesman would not have to stay in an area and work as a labourer in some other area if there were a job in his skilled trade available in another area. It is not necessary that the applicant should have a job in the area to which he intends to move but they do check the fact that the prospects for a job in the area to which he is moving to get this grant would be at least as good and preferably better than it is in the area in which he is.

Now as I understand it there are two basic kinds of grants: The first one is called the exploratory grant which one might think is not used very often but I think it has been used quite a bit, especially on Bell Island, during the crisis over there a few years back. The Manpower Mobility Grant will pay the transportation of the worker and his wife to survey the employment opportunities. They would also pay the accommodations while they are there. If the person were not able to secure a job, they would pay his way back. Now my question was and undoubtedly the honourable gentlemen's questions will be that that is one that is not used very much. I understand that it is used surprisingly well. I do not know what the number means but it is used more than most people think. It is called an exploratory grant under the programme.

The other one is the mobility grant and if he should get a job at the place he moves, they will pay the moving costs of his complete family and his belongings from the area he left to the area he moved if he should secure a job. In addition they will pay the worker \$100, a further \$100 for the first dependent, \$200 for the next two dependents, which could have been put \$100 for each actually, and \$100 for all additional dependents. Actually the worker gets \$100 and each dependent, his wife would be the first if she were alive and everybody else would get \$100 as a mobility grant. If within twelve months after the mobility grant has been approved, he wants to buy a home, there would be a further \$1,500 available for him to purchase a home. He would be eligible for \$1,500.

Now these are just the basic facts. As I say it is a federal programme and these are the basic facts involved with the two kinds of programmes, exploratory and mobility. If there are any questions on what I have said, I do not know that many details but it is the Federal Mobility Programme.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Chairman, it is amazing to me how interested all of a sudden the members on the opposition are over the resettlement programme or as it is called now, under 1603, the Community Consolidation Programme. These people sitting on the opposition side were not very interested in the resettlement programme or interested in the people who were manipulated under the resettlement programme prior to 1971 when they were deprived of services in order to force them from their communities, from the places where they were born and brought up and where they lived, fished and worked. Prior to October, 1971, Mr. Chairman, they were deprived of teachers, of doctors, of dentists, of electricity, of telephone services, they were deprived of everything until they were forced to move out.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point to Arnold's Cove as one prime example of what has happened to our people as a result of the Liberal Administration, of the resettlement programme, where people were forced to leave their own homes, to move to a foreign area to them, where people had to return to their birth place in many instances to fish to make a livelihood. Only last year we saw where a longliner with a crew of fishermen and their family returning to Merasheen Island, Placentia Bay, caught fire and there was a loss of life because these people were forced to leave their homes by the Liberal Administration, forced to leave their homes and settle in Arnold's Cove and forced to return to their birthplace. to where they had lived and where they had been used to -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. DAWE: Working for a living, fishing for a living.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

AN HON. MEMBER: The honourable gentleman cannot take the medicine - that is all is wrong with him.

MR. DAWE: It was scandalous! That is what it was, scandalous! Today we do not wish, we would not wish, we are not going to force anybody. Sure it is parliamentary. Like I said, it was scandalous. We do not wish to force anybody to leave their homes today. If they should wish to voluntarily leave their homes, leave their birthplace, leave their communities, we will help them. We will gladly help them. We will provide the funds for them to move. We will not force them by depriving the people of telephone service, electricity services, of doctors, dentists and teachers. I have people even in my own district who came from areas in Placentia Bay, like fish out of water themselves, who do not know what to do or did not know what to do when they came. (That is a couple of years ago now.) They said to me, "What can I do? They drove me out of my community. There was nobody left, I had to go. I had to go. I could not stay there by myself, so I chose to move to Conception Bay. I do not know anything in Conception Bay. I do not know where the fishing grounds are. I am a fisherman. What do I do?"

MR. SIMMONS: He chose to move.

MR. DAWE: He chose to move because he was the only one left. The Hon. Member for Hermitage might choose to go out and live on one of these island all by himself with the sea gulls. Of course, he might be well-suited to it because he is as full of this stuff they call guano as one would find on some of these isolated islands.

Mr. Chairman, the point I want to make, of course, is that we of this administration are not going to force anybody. If they should want to leave, the money is there, it is waiting for them. All they have to do is let the Rural Development Department know, in conjunction, of course, with the manpower, that they want to move from where they are living to some other area, an area of their choice. There are no such things any longer, no such thing as a moving community. It is gone, it is finished. There are no moving communities, No community is marked with an "x" on the map of Newfoundland today, like it was prior to October, 1971. There are no "x's" on the map of Newfoundland today, not one.

We do not intend to point the finger at any community and say, "You have to go." No community in this province today has to go. If they can make a living, if they enjoy living there, then they have that right as free Newfoundlanders to live where they wish and that goes for the Island of Newfoundland and for the province part of Labrador. If they should wish to move, it does not matter where they live. If they should wish to move, we are all here to help them.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words on this vote on Rural Development, 1603. It is amazing to listen to the last spokesman on the opposition side of the House of Assembly, to stand and say that there is no changing the policy of this government in comparison to the policies of the last government. It is amazing.

The Department of Rural Development is just what it says it is, the Department of Rural Development. The main function of the old department, the Department of Community and Social Development, under the previous Liberal Administration, all the top echelons in that department were revolving around one point, resettlement. That was their main baby. That was their main programme. Day after day they would sit down in that department downstairs, in the basement of this building, and they would decide the futures of thousands of Newfoundlanders. They were doing it for years. They decided what communities should exist in this province. The policy of this government is

far, far in contrast to that. We do not sit in this building, any group of civil servants, any group of politicians, or any committee, sitting here in this building deciding the future of communities in this province and the lives of thousands of Newfoundlanders without going to them and consulting them first. That is the most important thing. The previous liberal policy was not to consult the people, it was to go in and do as they said. "We are going to move you into Bonavista from Amherst Cove." "We are going to move you from St. Brendan's to Burnside, from Flat Islands to Glovertown." That was their policy. "The reason why we are going to move you is because our policy is to give you people the services and we cannot afford to give you the services on Flat Islands." I was born on Flat Islands, Mr. Chairman, and I resettled in 1957 with my parents, the last five families to leave the island. I got my high school education there the last year the school was opened, grade eleven.

I saw what that government was doing. I could see it and from that experience I am talking about tonight. The Liberal Government came along and said, "You do not get a new wharf, fishing facilities, you do not get a community stage. We cannot give you water services. We cannot give you a new school. The only way we can give it to you is if you move to Eastport, to Burnside, or to Glovertown." This was Flat Islands. They did not come down and meet with the people and say, "What do you want to do? Do you want to try to start some small industry in Flat Islands? Do you want to have a fishing facility here? Do you want us to help you improve your fishing facilities? Do you want us to give you some money in alternative to resettling so you can develop your services?"

That was not done. They went in and told them: "You are going to move if you want the services, if you want to exist in this province, if you want to enjoy the amenities that other people in the Province of Newfoundland enjoy. You are not going to get them while you stay here." Now if that is not forcing people to move, if that is not forcing resettlement on the people of Newfoundland, and I know because I saw it, then to stand in the

House of Assembly, as a member of the Liberal Party and say, "The Liberal Government in the previous years, the policy of this government is not different from the policy of the previous government." It is completely untrue. There is a tremendous difference in that the people are consulted and that the people have the alternative of accepting the services where they are today or resettling to places to where the potential is greater with regards to employment potential, through the primary resources, mainly fishing and farming and lumbering. That is the main difference.

When the first policy statements made by the rural development and even prior to the initial founding of the Department of Rural Development by this government, the initial policy was, and it was stated by the Premier, that there will be no more sending communities. Now this means that if a person in Open Hall or a small committee in Open Hall in my district, or Red Cliff or Keels or Tickle Cove, if they apply for some kind of services, it could be only a garbage disposal area, a dump, it could be only a few artesian wells, they can come into government and sit down and discuss the possibility of obtaining these services but prior to 1971 if they came in to sit down to talk to the officials the first thing the official said "One second, gentlemen," (He checks off his list.) "I am sorry, your community is a sending community. We cannot put the funds into your community, it is labelled as a sending community." The obvious question from the committee from the area, "Who decided that our community is going to resettle? Who decided it is a sending community? We did not decide. We had no meeting with government. We had no consultation. We had no input in the government. Who decided?" Surely it was not the policy of a few civil servants in the Department of Community and Social Development who sat down and decided all of a sudden we are going to do this as government policy. There had to be policy from the top somewhere. It came from the Liberal politicians, because it was their official Liberal policy to resettle as many communities in this province as possible in order to give the people the services.

It was bad because there were no alternative given. The alternative should have been given, if they wanted to stay and maintain their way of life with the amenities that other parts of the community were enjoying. They were not offered that alternative. That is the bad part of it. It is not bad to resettle to obtain services but they should not have to move to get the services. Every attempt should be made by the government to keep the people where they are if they want to stay where they are, and that is the policy of this government. The policy of this government also and the most important is to consult the people as to what they want to do and not go in and force the views and ideas or policies of a dictatorial government as we saw in the past.

No policy change. That is the reason why we are talking tonight on the estimates of rural development, rural development, community and social development. The honourable member for White Bay South was minister of that department for I think two years. I never heard the honourable gentleman once stand up and say that he believed in making loans available to those people in those small communities to help them.

I must admit the policy of helping rural development associations was a good one under his administration. That was a good one under the previous government, making loans to development associations to help them, working on committees etc., to establish or try to establish industries in their area. But never once was there any talk of developing the small semi-isolated communities along the coast, never once. That is the policy change of this government.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Throne Speech.

MR. MORGAN: No, Mr. Chairman, not the Throne Speech, we are talking about community consolidation. We are talking about the expenditure of approximately \$292,000. Back in 1969 what was the expenditure for resettlement in this province? We do not call it community consolidation; we did not call it that then, we called it resettlement.

The Premier's big word was centralization. "Centralize Newfoundlanders to give them the services."

The barges were going left and right. The barges were occupied day and night during the summer and spring and fall season, moving people continuously, uprooting their way of life, destroying their way of life, destroying their moral fibre, that you see in those outport people, moving them from places where they had a sound economic base, from their primary resources, mainly fishing, moved them into places where there were no fishing facilities, where there were no fishing grounds even. We find some of these people today and I can find them very easily, I know them personally, I grew up with them, those old people who were uprooted from their way of life not because of their choice but because it was government's choice.

I thank God for the Progressive Conservative policy. Since 1971 we will not see any future uprootings of small communities, a tearing apart of the way of life of these Newfoundlanders in the outport areas. Then to listen this afternoon in the same heading and listen to the honourable member for White Bay South stand up and say, "What is the difference between the Canada Manpower Mobility Programme and the resettlement programme or the grants under the community consolidation?" A fair question - that same member asking that question being the minister of the department responsible for resettlement for two years.

Surely Manpower is not going to move in and take a fisherman, take a fisherman and move him from one location where he is making a living or trying to and move him to a place where there is no employment potential for him at all when the only potential for him is to stay with his way of life, the fishing industry. Surely Canada Manpower is not going to get involved with a person who is developing the primary resources, nonskilled trade. They are not going to pay for these people to move from Amherst Cove or Newman's Cove in Bonavista Bay into St. John's to find jobs, a fisherman, a fisherman all his life. They do not do that. They do not do that.

That is where this Department of Rural Development, under the Community Consolidation Programme, steps in. They will resettle a fisherman if he is living in a community where there are no facilities or if he can move to a place where there are chances of making a better living from the same industry, the fishing industry. That is where this department of government is going to move in and resettle them and resettle that individual and his family, not Canada Manpower.

If a tradesman with an electrical trade is sitting out in the same community and he applies to move into a neighboring community which is larger and because there are fishing grounds there, surely Canada Manpower is not going to move him either, and neither will this department unless there is potential for him to find a job of his trade in that community. If that same individual, a tradesman, applied under the Canada Manpower to move from Newman's Cove to St. John's, he would qualify and rightly so. Common sense will answer the question.

To have the same man who was minister of that department for two years to ask these kind of questions, either he is doing it intentionally or it is just beyond me how he does not comprehend these things. Maybe he is intentionally trying to embarrass the Minister of Rural Development in which he has obviously a long way to go.

So, Mr. Chairman, there is a big difference in policy. If the honourable members in the opposition cannot recognize it, I am sure the people living in small communities both in Bonavista North and Bonavista South that I am familiar with, these people can recognize it and these people are realizing it, realizing that in fact they are being helped in the communities where they are now residing and in the communities where they are going to reside in the future, obtaining the services the same way as other parts of the province. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. W. ROWE: Well, Mr. Chairman, we have had - is the member for Grand Falls's feelings hurt or something? Okay!

The Chairman in his fairness usually tries to take everyone back and forth. I guess it is an equitable Chairman we have.

Mr. Chairman, we have had two speakers on this matter. I must say, Sir, the first is the greatest exemplar of the adage that 'Ignorance is bliss', as one can tell by the silly look on his face, Mr. Chairman. It looks blissful. The first speaker, the Minister of Provincial Affairs and Environment, no greater polluter of the political environment, Mr. Chairman, in this world than that honourable minister. I realize that I am getting dangerously close to irrelevancy. He knows nothing, Mr. Chairman, whatsoever about a programme he just got up and cheaply and slyly tried to talk about, bringing in maritime disasters and trying to pin political consequences or political fault because of a disaster in Placentia Bay a summer or two ago.

Mr. Chairman, what kind of cheap, sly, petty politics do we have to put up with in this House next? He had no knowledge whatsoever, he did not even know where a place was in Placentia Bay. Yet, he presumes to get up in this House and to try to show the members or the press or anybody looking on that he knows something about the Resettlement Programme or the Community Consolidation Programme. Complete and absolute ignorance! I do not mean unmannerlyness or being discourteous, I mean complete and absolute lack of elementary, basic knowledge of what he presumed to talk about, Mr. Chairman; no idea whatsoever.

When we left at six o'clock the Minister of Rural Development was giving a very pathetic show of his knowledge of his own department I thought. I felt sorry for the honourable minister. He now shines brightly as a paragon of knowledge, Mr. Chairman, after hearing the Minister of Environment, the Minister of Provincial Affairs, the Minister of Rural Development is now the most knowledgeable man on the face of the earth compared to his colleague. I do not know why I even waste words on such a contemptible show that the minister just gave.

Now, to turn my few remarks to the other honourable gentleman who spoke, the member for Bonavista South: He would be -
AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. W. ROWE: What is wrong with the honourable minister, Mr. Chairman? Did I hit a sore spot or something? He still has the silly look on his face, the 'Ignorance is bliss' look on his face, that blissful, foolish look. Am I hurting his feelings or what?

MR. DAWE: Inaudible.

MR. CHAIRMAN (MR. STACC): I do not know whether the expression was parliamentary or not. It is rather humorous perhaps. Humor may not be the sole criterion on which these things are decided. However, I must suggest to both honourable gentlemen, especially the gentleman to my left, that personal remarks are irrelevant in this debate.

The gentlemen to my right, the member for White Bay South is in the realm of the irrelevant - he skirts into it and out of it very adroitly. I would have to suggest that he be relevant to the topic.

MR. W. POWE: Anyway, Mr. Chairman, if the honourable Minister of Provincial Affairs is the living exemplar of "Ignorance is bliss," then his would-be colleague, the member for Bonavista South, who is scrambling to try to get into the cabinet and become a colleague of the minister, would be the living exemplar in this respect. Now, I am not saying that he is lacking in knowledge in other respects but he would be the living exemplar of the old adage, "A little knowledge is a dangerous thing." He does have some knowledge of what goes on here in the Resettlement Programme and in the Community Consolidated Programme. His knowledge, Sir, is exceedingly sparse. A certain paucity of knowledge. He has some knowledge, but a little knowledge is a dangerous thing. He is using -

MR. DAWE: Inaudible.

MR. W. POWE: Mr. Chairman, what is wrong with that honourable minister? Sir, what was the old Beothuck saying? "You could throw a rock into a pack of dogs; the one that is hit yelps." Well, if that adage, Sir, has any validity, the honourable Minister of Environment certainly is yelping. He must have been hit.

The member for Bonavista South has shown tonight, Sir, again I think in a cheap way, why not only was he defeated in the

Human Rights Election for the presidency but thrown out -

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

MR. W. ROWE: I am merely showing comparison, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN (MR. STAGG): Well, the relevancy of the honourable member's comparisons escapes the Chair. I would suggest that the honourable member get back to points that are relevant. The honourable member does not necessarily have to answer arguments that have been put by the other two honourable gentlemen. The honourable gentleman can make points of his own which are relevant.

MR. W. ROWE: If a member got up and talked about community consolidation, Sir, it is my argument that he was extremely loose with the truth. His method of approaching this type of a problem is to attack in full flight, Sir; careless and heedless of the truth.

Now, I am saying merely by way of comparison that it is not surprising that not only was he not elected as the Chairman of the Human Rights Association where the truth is very important but he had the utmost humiliation that no member would even nominate him for the executive or the board of directors - talk about getting elected. There is a good reason for that, Mr. Chairman, because he is extremely careless with the truth.

Without getting into some of the emotional arguments put forward by these two honourable gentlemen, I would like to reiterate and add to some of the things I said earlier today. There is, in my estimation, Sir, very little distinction at this moment between the Resettlement Programme based on the criteria that the minister himself gave, the Community Consolidation Programme, and the Manpower Mobility Programme. I am not going to give any examples myself although there are many where there has been some confusion and overlapping in people's minds.

I know the member for Labrador North who is highly involved in this type of a situation because of the number of people going back and forth I believe between the island and Happy Valley with regards to the woods operation and this sort of thing where people are, Sir, to use a colloquialism, getting an awful hosing because of

the confusion which exists in their minds and in the minds of, presumably, the government with regard to the Manpower Mobility Programme and the Community Consolidation Programme. There is a certain overlapping.

The minister today, Sir, could not even stand up in this Committee and give us some idea as to how the programmes differ. Now, Sir, any minister of a resettlement programme or a community consolidation programme, call it what you will, surely, Sir, would have in his mind if he were doing his job properly and correctly, would have in his mind the points of differences that exist between a resettlement programme on the one hand and a Manpower Mobility Programme on the other because there is always the problem of overlapping and confusion. He should be going out of his way. Mr. Chairman, as should other members of the government, going out of their way to try and make sure that any member of the public who is interested in availing himself and his family of these two programmes to make sure that they chose the proper one.

Now I must say I find it very difficult, based on what the honourable minister had to say in the Committee and what the Hon. Minister of Manpower had to say, I find it very difficult to separate in my own mind basic differences between the two programmes. Perhaps we will hear a little more from the Minister of Rural Development on it as we go ahead in the debate.

The other point that I would like to make, Sir, is this, this insidious sort of accusation being flung out about depriving people of services and this sort of thing, Mr. Chairman, to try and get them to move. Well I would ask the minister now, is he trying to get the people of Jackson's Arm to move? Or is anybody trying to get them to move? Because although three or four years ago we made money available for the first phase of a water system in Jackson's Arm, since this government got into power they had consistently and until recently, consistently refused to provide a measly few thousand dollars, Mr. Chairman, \$10,000 or so dollars to do the second phase of a water system for Jackson's Arm to provide the people with water. Now is that depriving people of the services? Is

this government interested in getting the people of Jackson's Arm to move? What about the people of Wild Cove where money was given, Sir, some years ago, when we were in power, for a water system? It has subsequently broken down on a number of occasions. I have been asking the various ministers concerned, Community and Social Development, Municipal Affairs to get a few measly thousand dollars to get a water system in Wild Cove, in order to allow the people to have one basic of life, Sir, but the government refused to provide those few thousand dollars necessary to upgrade the existing system.

The same thing applies to Ming's Bight which is a municipality. They have been trying to get a few thousand dollars for a water system. Is the government trying to get these people to move? Is it depriving them of these services, to take the words out of the mouths of the various members who spoke, to try and get them to move to another place?

No, Sir, I do not accuse the government of trying to get these people to move. I do not, any more than when we were in power we tried to get people to move, so-called, by depriving them of services. It is very difficult when you have 900 or 1,000 communities to try and provide each one of them with the basic services of life, water systems. Ming's Bight, a hundred or so families? Perhaps a couple of hundred thousand dollars to provide a water system. The minister would have the exact figures; they just slipped my mind now. Multiply that. Ming's Bight would be one of his smaller communities. Multiply that by 600 or 700, Mr. Chairman, and what have you got? You have a massive problem of providing services to the people of this province and to smaller communities.

I do not, Sir, think to the level of trying to accuse any minister in that government of depriving people, consciously, deliberately depriving people of services in order to try and force them out of communities in which they were born, to try and uproot them out of communities. No, Sir, I do not accuse any member of this government of doing that, any more than any other member of the previous administration ever did that. It was not done, Mr. Chairman. The Yahoo for Bonavista South knows that it was not done.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. POWE, W.N. I will deal with the sending communities in a moment and I hope that the minister can provide us with some answers on this.

The problem, Sir, is the lack of money for these services and also in some cases a certain niggardliness among governments when it comes to spending money for this type of purpose. Government seem to be delighted to spend money for great big schools and great big water and sewer systems in larger centres but there seems to be a certain parsimony or niggardliness or stinginess in government when it comes to passing out the few thousand dollars needed to upgrade some basic services of life.

But I do not say it is because the government, this government or any other government, federal or provincial, tried to unroot people by depriving them of services. Depriving them of services really; the connotation there is that they once had them perhaps and they were removed or taken away. What the minister should be saying is that the government, then or now, refused to provide certain services, rather than depriving them of it. But I do not say that they refused to provide certain services to get people to move, this government or the last government. I do not say it, Sir. I would not say it. I think it is a cheap attempt to make political points once more.

I would ask the minister to please for the sake of the people of the the province to bone up on some of the basic issues in this province, get some knowledge of what is going on in government, learn about the Manpower Mobility Programme, compare it to his own programme. Perhaps the time has now come, since Ottawa has under Don Jamieson's department finally acceded to the request made hundreds of times. They can ask a gentleman who I saw in the House, I can still see him in the House now, who was connected with the old resettlement programme, probably still is with the Community Consolidation Programme. Ask him. Ask Mr. Ken Harnum how many times approaches were made? How many times Mr. Harnum was frustrated, as he probably is now, in trying to get certain basic changes made to the Resettlement Programme?

What I say, Sir, is that if the Resettlement Programme has reached the point now where it is more or less equivalent to the Manpower Mobility

Programme then perhaps the time has come just to get rid of the Resettlement Programme altogether. The only reason why it was in existence before was because there were basic difference, mainly because of constraints imposed on the programme by Ottawa, the desire or the necessity for a certain number of persons in a community to have to move before a grant could be made to individual families. Well that has been done away with; Ottawa's desire that for bureaucratic purposes there would be sending and receiving communities, easily identified and actually down on paper. So that has been done away with; at least the sending communities have been done away with.

All these constraints which were imposed by Ottawa have now been whittled gradually over the years; when I was minister and now the present minister of this department, gradually whittled away to the point where there is very little difference between the resettlement programme on the one hand, which is employment orientated and the Manpower Mobility Programme which is certainly employment orientated.

Now there are other things under the resettlement programme which are not employment orientated, for example, hardship and the facilities and all this kind of thing. Perhaps a remnant of the programme can remain for that, if it turns out that a community decides of its own volition or a number of people in the community that they want to get out, not on grounds of employment or anything else but perhaps it will cost \$10 million to get a road link in to them or it will cost a certain number of dollars to get medical services into them, and so they just decide that they want to get out of that community and move into another community where amenities are available, perhaps some programme, even on an ad hoc basis, could be available to persons and communities in the province.

But if in ninety-five per cent of the communities there is an overlap between the Resettlement Programme and the Manpower Mobility Programme then perhaps the time has come to scrap this completely and save the few provincial dollars that are going into the programme. It comes to a net of \$292,000, all totalled, salary, expenses, the grants; less the amounts available from Ottawa, but there is still an amount of \$292,000 left of

provincial funds. Perhaps the time has come to scrap the programme altogether and rely on Manpower Mobility. Perhaps with some representations made to Ottawa by the government, perhaps the Manpower Mobility Programme can be improved to help certain cases of hardship in Newfoundland which may not come under the regulations as they presently exist.

But I would like to hear the minister on some of these problems, problems of great moment in the Province of Newfoundland, philosophical issues that should be resolved by any government which is doing its homework. Certainly a minister or a government which is going to try and improve the lot of the people of Newfoundland should have some elementary knowledge of certain similar programmes that are available. That is not asking too much, Mr. Chairman. I do not think for a minister to have some knowledge.

Does the minister have some knowledge of what is going on around him outside his own department? So I would like to hear the minister on that when he gets an opportunity.

Finally Sir, for the nonce, I would like to go into this whole question of so called sending communities. Surely, Mr. Chairman, there must be some criteria here, some basis laid down, some yardsticks whereby the government's resettlement programme, the Community Consolidation Programme will say it is all right for a person to get a resettlement grant from one community but not from another. I mean surely they must have something, something they go by in that regard.

For example, if a person be unemployed in Grand Falls, can he move to Lewisporte? Say he had a job in Lewisport, can he move to Lewisporte and get a resettlement grant?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Did it work that way?

MR. ROWE: I beg your pardon?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Did it work that way?

MR. ROWE: No, I am asking now. I mean I am not talking about what happened or anything. I am talking about under the present programme. In other words what I am saying is this:

MR. REID: Grand Falls is already a receiving community.

MR. ROWE: Yes, but I am talking about sending communities, so called, now.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: Well, why not? If there are no sending communities -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: Pardon?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: Yes, okay, well, what about - I mean the question is this: Resettlement grants are given out for people who live in certain communities. Is that not correct? Well, where is the line drawn? The minister agrees that no resettlement grant would be given for anyone living in Grand Falls to go elsewhere. No resettlement grant

would be given for anyone in Grand Falls to move to St. John's or to Corner Brook I would assume, I would say. So Grand Falls is not a sending community.

Now I would assume that as a case used here today, Fischot Islands, if somebody wanted to move from Fischot Islands to Grand Falls then a resettlement grant would be given, would it not?

MR. REID: Providing a job opportunity were there.

MR. ROWE: Well, does he have to have the job first?

MR. REID: He should.

MR. ROWE: Well, if that is so, what is the difference between - again, it keeps coming back - what is the difference between this and the Manpower Mobility Programme? Really, Mr. Chairman, -

MR. REID: What is the difference is letting him stay where he is now rather than if he go to another community and do not get a job.

MR. ROWE: Yes, I know. I agree. That is good. I am glad that the thing is based on employment opportunities. I am glad that is so. If that is so that is the complete basis of the Manpower Mobility Programme. So why are we taking over a quarter of a million of provincial money and throwing it into the Community Consolidation Programme this year? I am sure that in the honourable member for Bonavista North's district they could use a quarter of a million dollars on the roads there, easily I mean that is my simple question.

Now we are at a disadvantage. The minister knows nothing about the Manpower Mobility Programme, which is surprising, a programme which is very similar if not identical. It seems to appear to the Resettlement Programme. On this whole question, let us not be lead astray, Mr. Chairman, We are after some semblance of truth in these debates. Let us not be lead astray by this hypocritical nonsense such as we heard from the Minister without Portfolio (Thank God!).

the member for St. John's East.

Now, there are no more sending communities. I would say that by a process of elimination, Mr. Chairman, you could come down to a list of communities which would fall under the criteria, under some measurement as being sending communities. We know St. John's is not a sending community.

We know Grand Falls is not, Corner Brook, Gander, Lewisporte, Bay Verte. You can go all the way down the line. Bonavista would not be. You go all the way down the line, Mr. Chairman, and then you would come to some communities where you would have a gray area, not quite sure whether they would permit resettlement from these gray area communities. Then you would come to a number of communities perhaps two or three score of such communities where there is no doubt in anyone's mind, the minister or the officials in the resettlement Programme that these communities are ripe for assistance to allow the residents to resettle.

For the Minister without Portfolio ("Thank God!") to get up in the House and to try to hypocritically persuade the members or convince the members that there are no longer any sending communities is stretching the truth to the limit, Mr. Chairman. The minister knows that. I have not heard the minister make such an asinine statement himself. I believe the minister is dutifully trying to convey information to the House. I believe he is trying to do that.

Now he is at a disadvantage because he does not seem to know much about the Manpower Mobility Programme or the Resettlement Programme for that matter. He is, I think within those limitations, trying to convey some information to the committee. I do ask the minister to try if not now then at some stage in the future, some point in the future to give us a reasoned statement as to the differences that exist between this Resettlement Programme as presently constituted and the Manpower Mobility Programme. Because if the minister should go into it and his staff go into it they may find that there is a way we can save this Province a quarter of a million dollars by scrapping this Community Consolidated programme altogether and leaving in reserve a programme which will be based on each individual case as it arises which could be probably dealt with by his department and probably dealt with better by the Rehabilitation and Recreation Department or some other department in cases of hardship for example, if an

older person or some person lacking in health and needing to be near medical services but not having the resources to get there could be assisted by the government to go to a centre with amenities.

In some cases where aside from employment opportunities altogether, forget about the employment opportunities, in some cases, for example, if it turned out that there were a community of a dozen or so families, and there are some communities like that still in the Province, Mr. Chairman, where it became simply impossible to provide any education to those children that perhaps the families involved might be assisted, if they so desire, with provincial government funds to move to an area where education opportunities are available, outside of employment opportunities altogether, Mr. Chairman.

Keeping that in reserve, I would say, Sir, that we have now come to the point where in a vast majority of the cases there is an overlap and a confusion between the Manpower Mobility Programme and the Resettlement Programme. I do hope that the minister does a little homework, bones up on some of these similar programmes and with the assistance of his officials comes up with some kind of a reasonable programme for helping, allowing people to go to where the job opportunities exist.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Minister of Rural Development.

MR. SENIOR: I have the floor, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The member for Grand Falls.

MR. SENIOR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have just a few brief remarks to make relative to this heading of community consolidation and also in relation to some remarks that were made this afternoon which may need to be clarified, concerning the former Department of Community and Social Development of which of course I was a minister for several months.

Let me deal with the old Department of Community and Social Development first: This department was set up with many functions to perform. One of the functions was to administrate, co-ordinate, negotiate the various special areas agreements with the Federal Government. Also we have the

Resettlement Programme and the Resettlement agreement with the Federal Government. We also had a section that was dealing with the ARDA Programme and the ARDA Agreement with the Federal Government. We also had a section that was dealing with providing water services for various communities around Newfoundland. In a very minor way we had a group that was dealing with development associations around the Province.

Sir, if you look at that, you will see that the only thing that we did not do in that department was Community and Social Development. We did almost everything else. It is not my intention to be unkind or to deal with personalities. I think to give a fair assessment to this situation I can refer to the so-called five wise men who headed up these very sections of this department.

MR. ROBERTS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I am quite willing to listen to the talk about five wise men or fifty-five wise men; speaking of unwise men; but the heading before the committee, Sir, is community consolidation, 1600(03). The gentleman from Grand Falls feels impelled, I have listened to him now for two or three minutes, to talk about a wide variety of subjects, one of which community consolidation is relevant but I would invite Your Honour to invite the gentleman as a number of us have been invited on occasion, quite properly, to confine his remarks to community consolidation. He may want to say a lot of things about the department. So whether we have passed that particular item in the estimates, I am sure he could be most enlightening on community consolidation and I for one would very much like to hear him talk about that.

MR. J. MORGAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The honourable gentleman presently taking part in the debate, the honourable member from Grand Falls, is not being any more irrelevant to the debate than the honourable member from Bell Island who stood and more or less attacked the honourable gentleman from Grand Falls, based on a statement made by the Minister of Rural Development. So the point of order is, Mr. Chairman, that the member presently involved in debate is relevant to the debate as brought up by the opposition members.

MR. MARSHALL: On that point of order, Mr. Chairman. I would like to just -

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. MARSHALL: Well, if Your Honour, if he wish to hear me he can hear me, if he does not wish to he can (Inaudible). We are talking about community consolidation. For the honourable Member for Grand Falls community consolidation involves the entire area really of rural development. It is not like general administration or promotion and training or what have you. The honourable the member for Grand Falls, I would submit, was being perfectly relevant and certainly the debate on this area as we have seen from both sides tonight has gone on in a very wide-ranging manner and necessarily so it goes on in a wide ranging manner because this whole Department of Rural Development is really, the whole nature of it, Mr. Chairman, where it revolves around community consolidation and revolves around the efforts of this government to develop the rural areas of this Province rather than just resettlement.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, to that point of deliberate filibuster, I submit that the committee are being subjected by the government members to a deliberate filibuster, an attempt to delay the committee's work and deprive us of very limited and very precious time. The points made by the gentleman from Bonavista South and the gentleman from St. John's East are at best specious. If either of them had any knowledge of the rules of the committee, neither of them would make it but at best they are specious.

The gentleman from Grand Falls was well into an argument or a discussion not about community consolidation which would be both relevant and eagerly anticipated by those of us on this side but was well into a discussion instead of the structure of the department. Well that has little to do with, as the gentleman agrees, community consolidation. I would like to hear him speak about community consolidation because I think his views would be of great interest.

April 30, 1974.

Tape 1426 (Night)

RH - 7

MR. CHAIRMAN (Dumphy): The Chair would like to apologize to the committee. When the honourable member for Grand Falls was speaking initially, I did get most of the words he said but shortly thereafter I was talking to the member for White Bay South and I lost the continuity of his talk, his words entirely. So I find myself not able to rule on this, but I did feel that he was wandering in a different direction and not along the issue which we are

now discussing, 1603-01, Community Consolidation. So I would ask the honourable member to continue and hopefully he will be relevant to the issue at hand.

MR. SENIOR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I had intended to be relevant, Sir, but in order to explain the resettlement programme as it existed and the Community Consolidation Programme as it exists now, I think we will have to relate it to the other programmes that existed in that department because of the other agreements that were signed with the federal government. Because of the other activities, some of the other activities that were going on in that department, it in my opinion encouraged resettlement in Newfoundland. It is in that sense, Sir, that I feel discussion of the special areas programme, the ARDA programme, etc., relates to resettlement.

If I had been granted the time to make a couple of more sentences I could have made that point, Sir, and I hope that that is relevant to the subject that is being discussed.

MR. AYLMARD: If I may, Mr. Chairman, on that point, I think this gentleman could make a very valuable contribution to the debate. I think his remarks are quite in order. I suggest the he be permitted to just -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. AYLMARD: No, I do not think his ruling was that definitive. What he indicated was that he had not heard what he said. I, for one, Mr. Chairman, would suggest that the member has indicated that he would like to by way of explanation, gives us the background remarks. So I certainly think myself that he should be entitled to make those remarks. I respectfully submit that he be allowed, as an introduction to his remarks on consolidation to give us his views.

MP. NEARY: Sit down! Sit down!

MR. AYLMARD: Just one moment now, I am speaking to the point of order.

AN HON. MEMBER: What point of order?

MR. AYLMARD: The point of order that was raised a moment ago.

AN HON. MEMBER: But the Chair has rules on it.

MR. AYLMARD: As I listened to the Chair, as I understood his remarks - now if I may, Mr. Chairman -

AN HON. MEMBER: Sit down!

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Chairman, as I understood your remarks -

AN HON. MEMBER: Bring the member to order -

MR. NEARY: Sit down!

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Chairman, do I not have the floor on a point of order?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Sit down!

MR. AYLWARD: I did rise on a point of order. I have the floor, Mr. Chairman.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

The Member for Placentia East did rise on a point of order, so the Chair recognizes the Member for Placentia East.

MR. ROWE, W. N. What was the point of order?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I do not know yet.

MR. AYLWARD: The point of order was, Mr. Chairman, that the Member for Grand Falls had indicated that he had a few remarks that he would like to make, by way of introduction to his remarks on consolidation. I think myself from listening to him, he made a great deal of sense and I for one would suggest to Your Honour that he be permitted by way of elaboration to make those few remarks.

MR. R. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, to that point of order: Of course, I suggest it is no point of order at all. If the Member for Placentia East wish to appeal the ruling of the Chair, he knows the procedure by which this should be done. I suggest that he follow that procedure or else let the Member for Grand Falls proceed.

MR. AYLWARD: If I may, Mr. Chairman, just to reply to my honourable friend, the Member for Hermitage. I am certainly not trying to delay this or just a matter of antics, I really do feel that he has a valuable contribution to make.

I understood your ruling not to be definitive. The honourable member has suggested that he would like a few moments by way of explanation to give these few remarks to preface his views on Community Consolidation.

Now surely he as a minister of that department is who is quite familiar with it, administered it for some weeks. After listening to debate in this House since February, surely we can allow that honourable gentleman three or four minutes to give us what I feel is some valuable information.

MR. BOBFRIS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, if I may. I suggest, Sir, that the gentleman for Placentia East is out of order and is deliberately trying to delay the committee. Your Honour made a ruling which was quite clear. The gentleman for Grand Falls was carrying out Your Honour's ruling. Indeed, we all heard him to say; if he had been permitted by Your Honour to say a few more words this is what he would have said. He said it. And he was going along swimmingly and was coming to the heart of whatever argument he is going to make. We were all here listening with interest to him and courteously.

The gentleman for Placentia East obviously under orders to delay the Committee to do anything to keep time wasting, got up on a completely spurious point of order. I think Your Honour should not only rule out of order the gentleman for Placentia East but indeed should stop the clock for two or three seconds to make up for this deliberate attempt by the government and their supporters in the House to waste the time of the Committee, to rush towards that guillotine, seventy-five hours we are thundering down the track towards. I think Your Honour should end this now and get ahead with it. The gentleman for Grand Falls has been trying for fifteen minutes to get his point across and we have been delayed by needless points of order, one of which was raised by the gentleman for Placentia East. We have been delayed as well by a necessary point of order which I raised, which Your Honour ruled to be in order.

MR. CHAIRMAN (DUNPHY): When the Chair took issue here a few moments ago with the Member for Grand Falls, there was no definite ruling made at the time because there was insufficient information because I had not heard what he said. However, if the member must make a point, he must go outside of the issue, I suggest that he continue by all means.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. SENJOR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to be relevant, Mr. Chairman, I also want to obey the rules of the Committee at all times. If I had been granted the levity of making a couple of more sentences, I think I would have pointed out where what I was saying was relevant to the heading being discussed. That is this: that you cannot take the heading of resettlement or community consolidation out of the context of the whole Department of Community and Social Development because they were interrelating programmes, that were negotiated with the federal government and which I say encouraged resettlement in Newfoundland.

I think, Sir, granted a little bit of time, I could point out how that was so.

But before I get into that, Sir, if I may be granted the leeway to deal with some remarks that were made this afternoon that I feel I should have the right to make and defend myself because they did cast a reflection on my performance as a minister. I am asking for the leeway to do it. If the Committee do not want to grant it to me, then I will just have to leave it there. I am asking the Chair for that leeway.

AN HON. MEMBER: Was the honourable member in the House this afternoon?

MR. SENIOR: Yes.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SENIOR: I was not given the chance. I did not have the floor, unfortunately.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SENIOR: Well okay, let me go on. Okay?

Well I have nothing really that is going to be embarrassing. I think the truth is fit to be told. I do not see any reason why it cannot be told. I have no reason to -

MR. ROBERTS: Your Honour, on a point of order:

If we are going to relax the rule on relevancy, we are quite in accord with allowing the gentleman for Grand Falls to say whatever he feels is appropriate. But all I would ask in return is an assurance from the gentlemen on the opposite side that we shall be accorded the same privilege. We are quite happy.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: No, Sir. The gentleman for Bonavista South says that we were afforded all afternoon. Your Honour and whoever was in the Chair religiously and rigidly and properly enforced the rules all afternoon. My colleagues and I are quite happy to have the gentleman for Grand Falls touch upon whatever points he wishes to touch upon. We will be pleased to hear him, delighted to hear him and hopefully even enlightened by hearing him. But all I ask is an assurance in return that we shall be afforded the same courtesy because there are one or two matters that I would like to bring up that refer to some of the matters that have gone before but I would like to deal with them.

MR. CHAIRMAN (DUNPHY): The Chair finds the member perfectly in order in his remarks and wishes that he continue. I would also like to remind honourable gentlemen on either side of the House that when a member is speaking, you know the rules and that he be given the courtesy of listening and afforded silence. I think it is only fair it be afforded to one another.

MR. SENIOR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Well this time I will be strictly relevant. Seeing I do not have the leeway to express myself in the way that I wanted, apparently,

Mr. Chairman, back in 1961 the Department of Community and Social Development negotiated with the Federal Government a special areas programme which involved the eventual expenditure of some \$125 million which was allocated to specially designated areas in this

province. These areas were clearly defined, clearly outlined on a map and no other communities in Newfoundland could be eligible for funds under this programme. We also had (I can go into that in some length but it is not necessary because it is not really as relevant to this particular heading as some of the other remarks that I want to make.) negotiated or around the same time an agreement with the federal government called the ARDA Agreement, which was merely an enabling agreement, very broad in scope, with no defined financial ceiling but which gave us or gave the government at that time the privilege to negotiate with the federal government programmes for the development of rural Newfoundland. Up to the time that I became minister, Sir, I am not aware of any significant programmes that were negotiated or approved under this agreement with the federal government for development in rural Newfoundland. There was an agreement that was almost limitless in scope, that had no defined financial ceiling but it was never used. This was an area, as a minister, which I pushed, where I saw the potential and I believe that it would be applied for development in rural Newfoundland. It was never used. Why was it not used?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SENIOR: Because at the same time, the government at that time, the Liberal Government and the former minister of resettlement had negotiated with the federal government an agreement to provide financial assistance to resettle people from the rural communities of Newfoundland to receiving communities; most of these communities were in the special areas that were receiving assistance under the Special Areas Programme.

Now, Sir, I think if you think for just a moment, you can see the conflict here: (1) We had an agreement for development of certain special areas in the province; (2) We had an agreement for development of rural Newfoundland; (3) We had an agreement to move the people out of rural Newfoundland.

Now, Sir, this was the problem in this department. There was always a conflict between the people who were administrating the various programmes. One person was pushing special area programmes to develop certain special areas in Newfoundland at the neglect of rural Newfoundland and another group was pushing the ARDA programme, a very insignificant group, shut down in the basement somewhere, who were bearly allowed to speak, who believed that there was some potential for development in Newfoundland -

AN HON. MEMBER: Where did the honourable gentleman end up?

MR. SENIOR: I will never end up in the basement.

They tried to make an impression on the minister at that time and on the government officials at that time that there was some potential in this agreement for development of rural Newfoundland but they could not do it because it was contrary to the political motives and contrary to what that government of that day believed in. They were shut away in the basement, never heard from.

Now we had another group who wanted to resettle Newfoundland, who wanted to resettle the smaller communities. They were in conflict with the people who wanted to develop the ARDA Programme, they had to be. One wanted to move the people out and the other wanted to develop the communities. There had to be a conflict there. There had to be a conflict between the people who wanted to administrate the ARDA Programme, promote that and develop further agreements with the federal government and the people who were developing the special areas programme because they were going in different directions, completely opposite directions. Then there was another group of people who were trying to provide some community amenities in these smaller communities in the form of water services. Then there was another group of people who were trying to promote development associations in the province.

The agreements, the potential for the money to assist these development associations was never taken advantage of. So the development associations were operating in a vacuum. That

is the kind of department that we had, a department that was going in about five different directions at the same time.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SENIOR: I will get to that point.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SENIOR: That is the kind of department it was, Sir.

The former minister had no problem, Sir, because he had no control over the situation. He was wise to stay away from them.

I shared a greater concern for the people of Newfoundland and recognized the conflict that existed in this department. There was no way that I was going to take the advice of any official who saw no potential of development in rural Newfoundland.

I feel that if I am not a minister today because of this stand, then I can stand here proudly and say that I made a contribution to Newfoundland. I am not ashamed of not being a cabinet minister. It does not bother me in the least.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SENIOR: I am speaking for Aubrey Senior, the M.H.A. for Grand Falls. I have a right in my place to speak my mind on behalf of my constituents and I suppose for that matter on behalf of the people of Newfoundland. Is that not true?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SENIOR: Right?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL: The honourable member is making one of the best speeches I have ever heard and as far as I am concerned, he has a right to speak. If the honourable members on the other side can contain themselves - the rules of this House, ordinary, common decency requires that they keep quiet and listen. Maybe the former minister of resettlement over there will learn something.

MR. ROBERTS: To that point of order, Sir: I quite agree and I am delighted that at long last the "Minister of Nothing", the Minister without Portfolio, has seen fit to bring himself to the point of common

decency. His colleagues are the chief offenders. I would point out that all my colleagues and I were doing was using the well-known parliamentary term before approval and saying "hear, hear," when the minister or the former minister was making his speech, his mea culpa. I think he should be encouraged to go on, Sir, but surely it is very much in order for an honourable member to say, "hear, hear," and to generally voice, sotto voce as it were, exhortations of an approval to the honourable gentleman. We do encourage him, Sir, and I do wish he would get on with it. I must say that Your Honour has no choice but Your Honour must be as tired as we all are of the needless points of order being raised by the gentleman from St. John's East who by my count, Sir, has now used up eighty seven minutes in points of order in the committee in the past day and one-half, a deliberate attempt by the Government House Leader to try to push the estimates and to try to delay the debate on the substantive measures and to try to hasten the day when the seventy-five hour, the Marshall guillotine falls. I do not think he should be allowed to do that, Sir. I think he is trying to abuse the rules of the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: The honourable gentleman is doing it now.

MR. ROBERTS: The gentleman from Grand Falls, Sir, is making an excellent speech and we are shouting, "hear, hear." I for one would like to see him go on, Sir, because he is making an excellent speech. I think he should be allowed to go on without this harassment from gentlemen on his own side, Sir. They are scared of the truth. I think he should be allowed to go on and to state exactly what is happening, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stagg): While the honourable member's interpretation of his interjections certainly differs from the Chair's interpretation of them, they are not merely exhortations of "hear, hear," and of approbation and matters of that type. They were interjections of the type to which the Chair has on many occasions arisen. I would suggest that the honourable member who has the floor has the right to be heard in silence.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SENIOR: Mr. Chairman, it seems that when I get to some very significant points, I get interrupted and it is difficult then to maintain one's trend of thought and I am not sure exactly where I left off but I think it is where I was talking about the particular department in conflict, going in about five different directions at the same time.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. MORGAN: Keep quiet!

MR. SENIOR: Well there was some suggestion made that the morale in this department was low.

Now, Sir, if the morale of officials in the government department have to be kept high at the expense of my fellow Newfoundlanders, then I am not ashamed if it were low on my account. I would never stand in this House and admit it because there were many activities carried out under the old resettlement programme which I was strongly opposed to.

I remember back in 1958, Sir, I was living on the Mainland at the time, in Toronto, and I came back to Newfoundland. At that time the tiny community that I grew up in was being resettled or plans were being made for its resettlement. There was no one in my family living on the island at that time except my father and mother who were quite elderly, I remember coming back the next summer on vacation and I did not find my father and mother at home, I found them on a barge in Placentia Bay where they had to stay all night because their house was being moved to a new community. They moved to the Community of Red Harbour. I can remember the expression on their faces. While we are not supposed to be emotional in this House you know, we are supposed to be cold, hard, calculating human beings who have a hide like a rhinoceros and a seared conscience. We are not supposed to be human or be concerned about human feelings or human dignity. This is the kind of thing that makes the headlines. It is not the kind of thing that I am concerned about. I am more concerned about people.

There were hundreds of other people around this province who went through the same traumatic experience because directly or indirectly they were forced to move from their communities. Now as I have said before, and I will say again, I do not think that as Newfoundland was, that people should live in tiny, isolated communities of a half a dozen families or that they should necessarily live on the islands in the bays without being able to take advantage of the communications systems in the province, the road systems and the other amenities provided to the people of Newfoundland, I do not think so, no. But I do think there were many parts of rural Newfoundland where we had viable communities

that were resettled, where people were encouraged in some instances on individual basis to resettle from these communities leaving the community in many respects void of their leadership, of their best citizens and it left no alternative but for the remaining citizens in that community to move. The people that moved out made that necessary. Because the receiving communities, many of them were located in the special areas, in the areas designated for development in Newfoundland, where hundreds of millions of dollars was going to be spent by the federal government, they were encouraged to move to these communities, get away from rural Newfoundland, move to these areas.

"Forget the contribution that you are making to Newfoundland where you are, If you are a fisherman and you are making a contribution to Newfoundland, you are catching fish and you are selling it and you are making money and you are not on the dole, move to one of these communities that we are developing with all the big services and become a liability on that community instead of an asset. There is no potential in Newfoundland. Our Liberal Government does not believe that we can develop rural Newfoundland. We believe in the big infrastructure programmes in these special areas and this is where you should be going, this is where you should be living." So a man who could live on \$1,000 a year in a small community because he owned his own home and he was able to grow some of his own vegetables and catch his own fish and maybe have his own cow, when he was offered \$2,000 or \$3,000 to move it looked like he had reached the gold mine at the end of the rainbow. But when he landed in the promised land he found out to his dismay that that much money was barely enough to buy a patch of land to stick a house on, where he would probably have a mortgage for the rest of his life and become a liability on the community that he moved to.

They say there is no change in the resettlement programme. The community consolidation programme does not differ from the former programme, I will tell you where it differs. One was negative

and the other is positive. One destroyed communities and one develops communities and that is a very distinct difference. We are not saying that they should live in isolation but we are saying that there is potential for development in rural Newfoundland.

I will stand here right now and wager that if the day ever comes when the rural way of life in Newfoundland is destroyed, so will Newfoundland be destroyed.

Newfoundland cannot survive without the contribution that is being made by the people in rural Newfoundland. This is why I could not sit in the Department of Community and Social Development as minister and take advice from people who in my opinion were destroying Newfoundland, because they were from the Bahamas or Ottawa or somewhere else and no understanding, no human feeling, no compassion, completely unable to relate to the situation in Newfoundland. Was I, as a Newfoundlander, just because I was called honourable and just because I was a minister, going to agree with that? Not on your life! Not on your life! The day will never ever come when a job will be more important to me than what I consider is the future for the people of Newfoundland.

MR. NEARY: What is he trying to say?

MR. SENIOR: Well maybe I can come down and put it in baby talk so the honourable member for Bell Island can understand it. The reason the honourable member for Bell Island cannot understand it is because I am talking human matters -

AN HON. MEMBER: He can only understand slander.

MR. SENIOR: Matters that relate to human beings, to people. This is what the Rural Development Department stands for, community development. It is as simple as that, developing the resources in the communities in rural Newfoundland so that people can continue to live there and can continue to make a contribution to this province. To sum it up, that is what it stands for. Community consolidation merely means making the opportunities for the people in rural Newfoundland better to make a contribution in rural Newfoundland not in some special

area where they cannot do anything.

I will give you a typical example of that. I was responsible as minister for changing the attitude of the federal government from the concept of resettlement to one of community consolidation and I will name the community. The community is Hermitage. Hermitage was designated as a sending community.

AN HON. MEMBER: Nonsense, I do not believe it.

MR. SENIOR: Now if you will look at the map of Newfoundland, if you look at the map of Newfoundland and if I can draw a mental picture here, I would tell you the concept which I put forward to my officials because the advice did not come to me, because I did not believe in what they believed in. Unfortunately in the matter of resettlement I had to advise there. That is not the way it should be though, is it?

You can imagine and if I can draw a mental picture of the Connaigre Peninsula -

MR. WM. ROWE: We all see it.

MR. SENIOR: Okay, with the Community of Hermitage about half way down the peninsula and the Community of Sandyville on the opposite side of the peninsula connected by a short road, okay. On each side of this peninsula you got two of the best fishing grounds in this province. If you take the bay on one side you have got people living in small communities around that side of the bay. They come from that side of the bay to the centre of the bay to fish. You take the other side of the peninsula and you have the same situation. Now look at the idea of community consolidation, you will be talking about providing proper fish processing facilities in this community, proper schools, other community amenities. We could make it more attractive for the people in the tiny communities to move into this community. Right? And it does not make any difference which side of the bay they go for the fish,

not a bit of difference in the world. They are still fishing on the same fishing ground. By consolidating the people into a larger community in that area -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: It is still in rural Newfoundland.

MR. SENIOR: It is still in rural Newfoundland. They are providing a better opportunity for them to make a contribution to Newfoundland from the area in which they live.

So, what I am saying is that the Resettlement Programme does not have to be related to a Special Areas Programme. It can be a programme in itself, a programme of community consolidation, not by force. We do not send them. We lead them into better opportunities. I think that is the way it should be. If we can provide a better opportunity in that area, if in that area we have a valuable fishing ground, should all the communities abandon that fishing ground, the only renewable resource we have and move away from it to Central Newfoundland? Sure we would like to have people in Grand Falls. We would like to have more of them there but should those people move away from this area where they can make a contribution, to an area where they cannot and become a liability on that community? I say no. I believe that we can develop viable communities in rural Newfoundland. This is why the Rural Development Department was established, as I understand it. This is why the Rural Development Authority was established as I understand it. This is why we continue to encourage the establishment of development associations.

We did not leave them in a vacuum without any incentive to develop, without any encouragement or any help or any expertise or any money.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SENIOR: That is right. The former administration set up the development associations, a few around the province, and made great political announcements about the potential of these great development associations around the province. They did not provide the money that the development associations needed to develop specific

projects in rural Newfoundland because the former government did not believe that the potential was there for development. That is the truth. There was never a programme established to help small industry in rural Newfoundland.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SENIOR: If that be an untruth, then I am guilty of telling a lie. If I be telling a lie, I should like someone to correct me.

The Special Areas Programme, \$125 million, \$130 million, no problem. Federal government is all for it because their concept was, "Move them all in, boys! We will set up four or five big areas in the province and these will become industrialized areas and we will have them all in there and we will have no problem with the rest of the communities. We will not have to provide anything for them because we will have them all moved into these special areas." An easy way to solve the problem. That is what the "Feds" wanted.

Yes, we had sending communities all right and they were listed. I was prepared to name them. The only reason that I did not name them was because (The Premier at that time did not mention a word to me about sending communities, but he spoke to me about something else) in the process of making that speech it suddenly occurred to me that if the people of Newfoundland living in those communities were told that their communities were destined to be eliminated, can one imagine the fear that would have hovered over this province. Can one imagine the fear that would have hovered over this province if they knew this during the reign of the Liberal Administration.

I know it was a well guarded secret but it was a secret which was very difficult for me to contain because I felt the responsibility I had on my shoulders. In the process of making that speech it suddenly occurred to me that if I should make this announcement, if I should mention these communities, that the people living in these communities would be very upset.

Yes, Sir, the morale in that department may have been

low and I may have been the cause of it but today, Sir, although I am not the minister of that department - and I am not ashamed of it - it is also a fact that all the people who are responsible for these programmes are gone as well.

So, the only worth-while thing that I have seen done, to encourage and help the people of rural Newfoundland to develop their communities, has come up for some of the heaviest criticism in this honourable House. Why? Because, I believe the opposition feel that we are getting tremendous political mileage out of this Rural Development Authority and the Rural Development Programme that we have. We are not doing it for that purpose but I am sure that if we continue to make a contribution to rural Newfoundland, if we continue to have faith in the people of Newfoundland they are going to reward us. They are going to have faith and have confidence in us. That is not our prime motive for doing it. We are doing it because we believe in rural Newfoundland.

Take the City of St. John's: I have nothing at all against the City of St. John's. The City of St. John's grew up as a service center for the rest of this province. It was dependent for its very existence on the lifeblood of rural Newfoundland and the contribution and the money earned by the people of rural Newfoundland. It did nothing but provide services and products for the people of the rest of Newfoundland. So, we are going to move the people from the rural communities into these larger centers and these larger centers are going to survive and they are going to make Newfoundland prosper and grow? I do not believe it.

I believe in the Rural Development Programme. I think it could be improved. I think there are some areas maybe where we could have better qualified people. We could have more money to spend. Maybe the programme itself could be refined and improved. Maybe there are other areas that we could get involved in in developing rural Newfoundland but I think we have made a start. We have not had that much time to work on it but I am sure, with

the ideas and with the concern that our government has had and has demonstrated for the people of Newfoundland, that the Rural Development Department will continue to provide and make a contribution to the people of this province.

MR. ROBERTS: Let me first of all congratulate the gentleman from Grand Falls on his talk. I think he was speaking from the heart and I think that he made a very sensible speech and one in which all members would join in applauding.

It is too bad, Sir, that the member who made the speech, the gentleman from Grand Falls, was not permitted to implement his ideas because -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: It does not matter.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, it does matter, Sir because the fact of the matter is that a man who espouses these ideas - and we assume that the ideas which he has espoused this night in this House, in the committee, he advanced in the cabinet and espoused. This is not a conversion. The member is not supporting a thesis or is not taking a position that he did not take when he was in the cabinet. No, Sir. He is not like Saul on the road to Damascus. The gentleman from Grand Falls is standing by the same position that he took when he was in the cabinet. This is what he tells us. He boasts of it, and well he might because most of what he says, Sir, is a very well-reasoned statement of faith in rural Newfoundland.

I represent a rural constituency, the Member for Grand Falls

does not. Grand Falls is not a rural constituency. There are one or two small communities in it but by no stretch of the imagination could the district be called rural. I represent a rural constituency. I will not claim to know everything about White Bay North, far from it. I claim to know a little of the problems these people face. I would agree that the needs of the people of rural Newfoundland must be paramount. Their needs are greater.

The only difficulty, Mr. Chairman, is that the minister who espouses these views got flung from the cabinet. We can only assume. No reason was ever given for his dismissal, his humiliating dismissal from the cabinet, and so it was. The only reason he was dismissed from the cabinet was that his policies were not the policies of the administration.

Mr. Chairman, if you look at the record of this administration you will see that that is so. The gentleman from Grand Falls has, shall we say, put the best light on things. He spoke with great emotion, as well he might, of Port Elizabeth down in the schoolboy debator's constituency of Placentia West. The community of Port Elizabeth, Sir, the people decided to leave there. They did not want to move to Marystown nor did they move to Marystown. They are now living. I do not know if all of them are, I have not done a sociological study nor a census.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Some may be anywhere. Some are in effect in a number of places but the community of Port Elizabeth itself as a community resettled to Red Harbour, a new community linked by roads to Marystown, to the provincial network, a community in which the much maligned Liberal Administration provided power and electricity and public services. I say, Sir, that the Minister of Energy today is engaged in a deliberate plot to drive people from at least one community in my district, the community of St. Carols.

I say the Minister of Fisheries is engaged in a deliberate plot -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Untrue.

MR. ROBERTS: No, Sir. That is an unparliamentary expression, and he shall withdraw it. I say the minister is engaged in a deliberate plot to drive people from at least one community in my district, St. Carols. I say that the Minister of Fisheries -

MR. CHAIRMAN (Stagg): Order, please! Before honourable members engage further in this what appears to be a familiar vein, I would suggest that honourable members observe the time-honoured but oft maligned rule that the member speaking has the right to be heard in silence.

MR. ROBERTS: On a point of order, Sir. The gentleman from Placentia West has referred to certain statements which I made as untrue. Would Your Honour -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Rubbish!

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, the honourable gentleman's comment was rubbish. Would Your Honour please rule on whether these are parliamentary or not.

MR. BARRY: To that point of order, Mr. Chairman: As I understand the rules, and of course I will withdraw anything that I say that is unparliamentary but as I understand the rules it would be unparliamentary for me to call the gentleman a liar. It would be unparliamentary for me to say that he was deliberately misleading the House but it is not unparliamentary for me to say that what he is saying is untrue and I repeat. "It is untrue."

Further, Mr. Chairman, I would submit that what the honourable gentleman is doing is impugning my motives as Minister of Mines and Energy when he says that I am engaged in a deliberate plot to destroy the community of St. Carols. That, Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman opposite to withdraw.

MR. ROBERTS: I am not impugning the honourable gentleman's motives. I am impugning his actions.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Stagg): Both honourable gentlemen used phrases that are not complimentary to one another. However uncomplimentary phrases are not necessarily unparliamentary. Quoting from Beauchesne, the gentleman at the table immediately provides me with the citation. "It is not unparliamentary to say that a statement is untrue but it is

unparliamentary to say that it was untrue to the knowledge of the member addressing the House, in this case the committee.

Consequently the point of order raised by the Leader of the Opposition is dispensed with. However it is certainly something that should be brought to the attention of members of the committee. As far as the expression that the Minister of Mines and Energy drew the Chair's attention to, the allegation of a deliberate plot, that expression has to be taken in the context in which it was used. I must admit that at the time it was used by the Leader of the Opposition I felt constrained to rise and then felt constrained to sit and remain seated.

However, it is an expression that once analysed in the context in which it was used can quite often be unparliamentary.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Now, as I was saying, I say that the Minister of Energy is part of a deliberate plot to drive the people out of St. Carols. I say that the Minister of Fisheries who unfortunately is not in the committee at this point is engaged in a deliberate plot to drive the people from another community in my constituency.

MR. BARRY: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I do not want to waste the time of the committee on rising on points of order but I do think that it is highly insulting for the gentleman opposite to be alleging that I am engaged in a deliberate plot to destroy the community of St. Carols. I ask the Chairman to give me as a member protection that any member of this honourable committee is entitled to and to ask the gentleman opposite to withdraw that statement.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Stagg): The Chair cannot sit idly by while this phrase is used continually. Maybe an honourable member might be excused for using it once and then slipping it through as it were. However it is not going to become enshrined in the annals of this House as a parliamentary expression. I refer to Beauchesne again, page 130, article 154, "The imputation of bad motives is unparliamentary."

Certainly the expression of the Leader of the Opposition that the Minister of Mines and Energy was engaging in a deliberate plot can

only be interpreted as the imputation of bad motives. I would suggest maybe that the honourable Leader of the Opposition might be able to use, to get the same import using different words. Certainly I do not think that the literal import of his words is what he actually means.

MR. ROBERTS: Your Honour, let me try it another way. The Minister of Energy is engaged in a course of action which can have but one effect, the destruction of the rural community of St. Carols in my constituency just as the Minister of Fisheries is engaged in a course of action which could have but one result. Be it intended or deliberate or non-deliberate and unintentional, that, Mr. Chairman, that policy, that course of action which both ministers are engaged in can have but the results of destroying two communities in White Bay North.

Mr. Chairman, I invite Your Honour to be as quick to defend our liberties as you are to defend the other side's liberties. I have the right to be heard in silence. Let the honourable gentleman reply when he is granted the floor. For the time being I have the floor.

Now, Sir, we have had a state of honourable gentleman opposite leaping to their feet to defend a noticeably silent minister, a minister who obviously cannot defend himself. I shall return to that. I shall return to the sad spectacle of a minister bringing estimates before a committee who was asked three or four hours ago three or four simple questions of fact about the policy being administered in the subhead in respect of which the debate was being conducted. That minister, Sir has not answered those questions. Indeed I think it is fair to say he is not able to answer those questions, because he has none. He has spoken once or twice since then. Instead we have had speaker after speaker leaping to his feet to talk about everything under the sun

culminating in mea culpa of the gentleman from Grand Falls.

Well I could only say that I could only wish that the policy espoused by the gentleman from Grand Falls was in fact the policy of the Tory administration but it is not. That is maybe the reason why the honourable gentleman now sits as a backbencher. I hope it is because that is an honourable reason not to be part of a cabinet. I say, Sir, that this administration has shown no concern for rural Newfoundland and I refer as other honourable gentlemen of this side will refer to communities, to their knowledge.

The member from White Bay South has already referred to Jackson's Arm, to Wild Cove. Let me refer to two communities in my district where the ministry now has taken decisions that can have but one effect, to destroy these communities. Let me start first at St. Carols. St Carols, Sir, a small community a mile or so from St. Anthony Bight, just to the north of St. Anthony, to the north of the bay on the southside of which the St. Anthony Harbour is located. It has, I believe, about fourteen customers for electric power. The Chairman of the Power Commission told me a week or ten days past that he was not certain but he thought it was fourteen, he thought it was under fifteen. That is the magic figure, under fifteen.

Well, I now say

I will now say to the minister that I will become a customer in St. Anthony Bight, I am sorry, in St. Carols. I hereby agree to pay the demand rate for the rest of my life, if need be. I say to him now that since only one customer is needed in St. Carols, as he says, I agree to become a customer. He can send me or have the Power Commission send me the bill for the demand rates. I will pay it and I will make it a charge upon my estate.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Well that is what my banker says too.

Now, Sir, what are they doing in St. Carols? St. Carols, Sir, has no government-provided electricity. Any electricity that is provided in St. Carols comes from delcos or from small private units of some sort. Well we can go to Big Brook or Barr'd Harbour or Fischot but just let me talk about St. Carols.

There is in effect a policy dating back to our years in the administration of providing electricity only to communities of fifteen customers or more.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Honoured in the breach though, I can tell you that.

MR. ROBERTS: Much more honoured in the breach. Sure. But the policy is there. I have no doubt it was established when the Liberal Administration was in office.

But, Sir, this government have been in office now for two years; they have not changed that policy. The Member for Grand Falls can score us, if he wish. What we did, we did. What we did not do, we did not do. I have no objection to telling the truth. That is what I am doing. I said the honourable gentleman can score us if he wish. What we did when we were in office, we did. What we did not do, we did not do and we answer for each. But the party which he supports, Sir, have been in office for two years and has not changed that. But, are they being inconsistent?

Well, Mr. Chairman, last year they agreed to spend, after considerably nagging I may add by me and by the people of that community, they agreed to spend and they did spend \$30,000 or \$40,000 to put a road to St. Carols. So there is now a road into St. Carols or nearly into the community, at

the edge of the community. We are sure it will be finished this summer. But will they provide the power? No! I say that the result of that can have but one affect, that is to drive the people from the Community of St. Carols. The Minister of Energy, Sir, will then have, if Mary Queen of Scots had Calais written on her heart, the Minister of Energy is entitled to have St. Carols engraved upon his. The people of that community, Sir, have been condemned as surely as if the cabinet passed an order-in-council saying, St. Carols be damned and doomed, that is it!

I have asked the member about it in the House, I have written letters to him. He comes back and he says they are not doing any of it in fifteen communities. I am sorry, the Minister of Energy. The Chairman of the Power Commission, Mr. Reid, told me that, a week or two past, and not a privileged conversation, I inquired of him as a member for a constituency about a problem in my constituency. He said; "we are not doing Wiltendale and we are not doing St. Carols. There is no money in my budget for either."

Then the administration announced, through the lips of the gentleman for St. Tarbe South, that Wiltendale is being done.

MP. BARRY: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, it is out of public funds.

MP. BARRY: Inaudible.

MP. ROBERTS: Well then, I do not care who - under the St. Anthony - under the Grenfell Mission. I do not care how it is done, as long as it is legal. I just suggested a method, do it under the Grenfell Mission, as a work of mercy or do it under Confederation Celebrations. Instead of flinging out \$140, for dinner and about \$10.00 each on a liquor bill on top of that at St. Anthony last week, why not take that money and put it towards St. Carols' life. The people at that dinner would have voted for that.

AN HON. MEMBER: He was there.

MP. ROBERTS: I was there.

Everybody in St. Anthony appreciated it. The Minister of Justice shows how far out of touch he is. The honourable gentleman may think he is

in touch. The honourable gentleman may think he is in touch. Sir, but if he -

MP. CHAIRMAN: (STAGG): Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CHAIRMAN (STAGG): Order, please!

The rule of relevancy is one that is certainly more honoured in the breach than in the observance. I suggest now that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is into an irrelevant debate, certainly being assisted quite ably by, drawn into irrelevancy by honourable members to my left. However, I feel that he can now resume debate that is relevant.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Sir, I am talking about Community Consolidation. I am talking about one of the aspects of Community Consolidation and the provision of electricity and I am suggesting - the minister invited me to say from whence the money might come. I tell him, Sir, it might come from that. I suggest that is very bit as appropriate a Confederation Celebration as getting out 140 people. They could not even get the 200 people they asked, to show how much affection there is for it. They asked 200 and when they heard that the Minister of Justice, not the Minister of Energy was coming, they got 140 out. If the Minister of Energy had come, there might have been forty.

Now, Sir, the Community of St. Carols is suffering because of the Tory programme. Let me make another point.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is not correct.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, Sir. The honourable gentleman for Grand Falls talked with great eloquence of Hermitage. Let me remind him of something. Recently, Sir, the people of the Community of Hermitage and the people of Sandyville and the people of Furby's Cove and the people of Seal Cove, the four communities located together in that part of the Connaigre Peninsula, had the opportunity, the people of those four communities, to express how they felt, in a democratic, open ballot. They did. What happened? Well, Sir, in Seal Cove the Tory vote went down and the Liberal vote went up. That may have been because of the campaigning of the Minister of Justice.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CHAIRMAN (STAGG): Order, please.

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition was drawn to the rule of relevancy earlier. He has gone on. It is certainly not being relevant at the present time.

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. CHAIRMAN (STAGG): The arguments advanced by the Minister of Mines and Energy -

MR. ROBERTS: No, no, the gentleman for Grand Falls.

MR. CHAIRMAN (STAGG): Well, if the -

MR. ROBERTS: Very relevant.

MR. CHAIRMAN (STAGG): If the honourable member is replying to arguments advanced by the Member for Grand Falls, then it is quite probable that these remarks by the Member for Grand Falls were out of order at the time.

MR. ROBERTS: We raised points of order and Your Honour ruled us down.

MR. CHAIRMAN (STAGG): I was not in the Chair at the time.

MR. ROBERTS: Well I mean I am not responsible for you or your deputy.

MR. CHAIRMAN (STAGG): However, the Chair still feels that the Leader of the Opposition must be relevant to 1603-01.

MR. ROBERTS: I am trying to be relevant. I am speaking on the subject of Community Consolidation, I would have thought that the Chair would extend the same courtesy to both sides of this committee. The gentleman for Grand Falls made some points and I am merely pointing out -

MR. SENIOR: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

The gentleman for White Bay North is speaking about the election in Hermitage, which in my opinion is not relevant to the subject.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, to that point of order; The honourable gentleman for Grand Falls made some remarks about the Community of Hermitage and consolidation. I am talking about how the people of these communities feel about it. Now if the honourable gentleman is scared of the truth, because the truth is, Sir, that in each one, no not in each one, I shall give the facts, as always. The Community of Hermitage, Sir, the Tory vote went down. That shows what they thought of community consolidation.

The Liberal vote went up in the Community of Seal Cove, where the Minister of Justice campaigned and spoke of community consolidation; a very eloquent speech by the Minister of Justice, outlining the Tory Administration policy, in this respect. That was the major theme and burden of the minister's speech in that community.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: In that community, Sir - Mr. Chairman- the Hon. Minister of Justice may make his speech in due course. I hope it serves the same good purpose as did the speech to which I am referring in Seal Cove because the Tory vote went down and the Liberal vote came up.

AN HON. MEMBER: Fifty/fifty.

MR. ROBERTS: But now what happened in Sandyville? In Sandyville, Whv, Lo and behold, the same thing happened. The Tory vote went down. On community consolidation the community consolidation area referred to by the gentleman for Grand Falls, the Liberal vote came up but, Sir, there was one community that stood out against the trend, one community that was impressed, obviously, by the Community Consolidation Programme so ably implemented by the gentleman for Grand Falls. The gentleman for Placentia West might as well rest, I have a few points to make yet. He does not need to spring into action.

MR. ROWE, W.N. He is a white-knuckled parliamentarian.

MR. ROBERTS: One community stood out against the trend, Sir, one community approved of the community consolidation programme in Hermitage. This was the issue, the Tories made it the issue. One community, Furby's Cove, stood against the tide and the Tory vote in Furby's Cove, Sir, rose by fifty per cent. It rose by fifty per cent. The first need of the Rural Development Authority got fifty per cent more votes than did Mr. Row Cheeseman, and Mr. Bert Meade got three votes- from two to three. That was the affect of the Rural Development Community Consolidation Programme in Hermitage, with the gentleman for Grand Falls. Is it any wonder the Premier gave the gentleman a flick?

MR. ROWE, W. N. The Minister of Justice never went to Furby's Cove.

MR. ROBERTS: No. It is too bad the Minister of Justice did not go to Furby's Cove.

MR. DOVE, U.N. He would have gone down too.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Sir, the honourable gentleman tries to pretend that Hermitage was doomed. Why then did the Liberal Administration here and at Ottawa spend hundreds of thousands of dollars to build a road to Hermitage and to Seal Cove and to Furby's Cove and to Sandville? Why?

The honourable gentleman for Grand Falls, Sir, is presenting the facts as he sees them. I do not doubt that he is telling the truth as he sees it. I do not doubt that.

MR. DOVE, U.N. A great new school in Hermitage.

MR. ROBERTS: A great new school in Hermitage, named after the Reverend John Watkins. A great new school, the construction of which was done under the Liberal Administration, by the Integrated School Board for that area.

AN UN. MEMBER: Sending communities.

MR. ROBERTS: I do not know. I do not know whether they are sending communities or not.

I do not know whether it is any good to them or not. I know that the Liberal government put thousands and hundreds of thousands and millions of dollars into the community which is thousands and hundreds of thousands and millions of dollars more than the Tory government has put into it.

Under their Community Consolidation Programme, Sir, speaking to that head, they spoke of that great community last fall as having a fishery plant. It was announced by the Minister of Fisheries in between snatching posters. Well said. Headed so ably by "Poster Peckford" the man who started as campaign manager and ended up as assistant driver.

Now, Sir, let me come back to the other community in White Bay North.

MR. PECKFORD: I never had my license.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I cannot help it if they have standards in the Highways Department. The honourable gentleman will have to take that up with the Minister of Transportation.

Now, Sir, the other community which I refer to in my district is the community of St. Julien's and Grandois which is really one community. Now, Sir, in St. Julien's and Grandois these are fishing communities. They have no other means of making an income except the fishery.

Now, let me talk about the Tory Rural Development Programme and Community Consolidation as it affects St. Julien's. I am glad to see the Minister of Industrial Development here. He is one of the men who I hope will do something about this because I am quite genuine in making a plea on behalf of this community.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: There are always exceptions.

MR. ROBERTS: St. Julien's and Grandois.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, they are one community. Some people call them St. Julien's. Some call them Grandois but they are one community.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: All right. S-t, J-u-l-i-e-n-'s.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: With a point.

MR. ROBERTS: No, I would put a comma. St. Julien's, White Bay North. The 's' is the one that has the little swiggles on it and the 't' goes up and down with a cross. All right. The minister is right on tonight. He has obviously dined not only wisely but very well.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Now, now.

MR. ROBERTS: Has the minister not dined wisely or well? Oh, boys, let us take up a collection for him. I mean, if things are that bad.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Is this relevant, Mr. Chairman?

MR. ROBERTS: It is part of Community Consolidation. The Minister of Energy and his mentors are the ones who dine unwisely.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, the guy who cannot even get elected a director of the Human Rights Association is now lecturing us.

MR. W. ROWE: Ousted for the director.

MR. ROBERTS: Imagine, Sir, a one year plot to get elected president failed.

MR. W. ROWE: He does not even get elected director.

MR. ROBERTS: I mean, even Nixon had to have a Watergate. I mean, the honourable gentleman from Bonavista South, Sir, when he cannot even get elected a director with thirty-five people there, what is going to happen to him in Bonavista South? Your Honour is going to say this is irrelevant.

Now, Sir, to come back to the story of St. Julien's. I am deadly serious. In St. Julien's, Mr. Chairman, there are maybe sixty people - I am sorry sixty adults. There may be 120 or 130 people, a very small community. The Minister of Transportation met a delegation from St. Julien's. I took them to see him - I am sorry from Croque but the same thing applies because the people from Croque were seeking a road to Croque. I think the Minister of Industrial Development probably knows about it. It is an extension of a woods road that will then carry on out

to St. Julien's and to Grandois. That is the plan and it is a good one.

Sir, there is going to be nobody in St. Julien's and Grandois with the opportunity to earn any money this summer. Why? Because the Tory government in its Community Consolidation Programme, will not give them about \$10,000. What for? Now, \$10,000, Sir, is less than an executive assistant. It is about the amount the Premier spends on dinners and entertaining in a year. It is less than any one department is budgeting for Confederation Celebrations. It is not a great deal of money in the scale of government expenditures.

St. Julien's, Sir, is a fishing community and most of the fish from the community goes into salt fish, most of it. The men have fished from stages there, Sir.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: No. St. Julien's under the last administration grew.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Just hold on now. Let me finish it, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you. The people of St. Julien's -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: What does the honourable Leader of the Opposition want?

MR. ROBERTS: I want the Minister of Fisheries to do what I have asked him to do and what he is too stunned to do.

They went in there, Sir, the LIP went in and the people of St. Julien's applied - I am going to knock Ottawa too on the way through.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: I will tell Don.

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman can tell Don anything he wants.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Don is his buddy now.

MR. ROBERTS: He can tell Don anything he wants. 'Dau-t-de-don-de-dau!

MR. W. ROWE: He has gone down ten per cent in the yellow folder.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, "Poster Peckford", he has been over there nursing

it for the last twenty minutes trying to get even with me. That is his effort. He had better try again, baby. The honourable gentleman better go back to snatching posters. That is more his speed.

MR. PECKFORD: Inaudible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order!

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, let us have some order. Have I the right to be heard in silence? Right. Agreed. Not to speak in silence but to be heard in silence.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Mr. Jamieson is the potential candidate for the leadership.

MR. ROBERTS: I hope so. I certainly hope so. As a matter of fact, the only thing, Mr. Chairman, which has more potential candidates than the Liberal Leadership Race is the race for the Liberal nomination in Placentia West.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: They are having a lot of difficulty getting somebody in here.

MR. ROBERTS: What does he mean? There is certainly difficulty in selecting somebody because the last count there were 622 people who had sent word to us that they wanted the chance to destroy the minister politically.

MR. CHAIRMAN (MR. STACE): Order, please!

All honourable gentlemen are drawn to the rule of relevancy. Again I feel like invoking the new rule of needless repetition here myself, having had to bring this to honourable gentlemen's attention on many occasions.

So, I suggest that we might be able to get on to relevant debate.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Your Honour. As I was saying before, they are awfully tender on this question of Community Consolidation and leadership. It makes one think. They are concerned about it? Well, that is good.

To come back to St. Julien's, the point I am trying to make.

MR. W. ROWE: The honourable Leader of the Opposition is not going to speak to an empty committee is he?

MR. ROBERTS: Two, four, six, eight, nine, ten, eleven, twelve, thirteen, fourteen. We are still on the verge; fourteen, counting the Chairman. I am not sure if the honourable gentleman from Labrador West is in the committee or not. He has apparently found his true role in life by sitting in the door and smoking a cigarette.

Now, Sir, the community of St. Julien's. Cardinal Newman said, "... one step enough for me." One step at a time.

The community of St. Julien's, Sir - they seem to want to not talk about St. Julien's. Well, I want to talk about it. The LJP people, bless their pointy heads, went in there and approved a grant of \$32,000 for a community stage. It would have cost \$50,000, \$60,000 to build that community stage. Well, Ottawa gave them \$32,000 and that was grand. It was just grand, just enough to get them into trouble. So, now, Sir, today in St. Julien's there is a half-completed community stage. I wrote the Minister of Fisheries in connection with the Community Consolidation Programme and said, 'Could we have some assistance to complete that stage? It is half done.'

The minister wrote back. I gathered from the pained tone of his letter that he had written similar letters before, to say that in effect he was not going to finish it, that Ottawa had started it. Let Ottawa finish it! Well, that is fine. I cannot argue that as a line of argument except it does not help the people in St. Julien's.

I have written back to the minister again to remind him of something that I said in my first letter. The reason why I said in opening these few remarks on this point that the result of the action by the Minister of Fisheries was going to be to drive those people from that community by depriving them of their livelihood - this just is not the usual where LJP have half-funded a programme or a project.

On March 25, Sir, a great storm came into St. Julien's and destroyed the stages there and tonight there is not a stage in St. Julien's.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Is the part that is unfinished still there?

MR. ROBERTS: That is still there because all that has happened is the trees have been cut. The honourable gentleman, if he stopped to think for a minute - there is a lot of ice down there,

a lot of ice down north yet. There have been no piles driven in the water and that sort of thing. Well that is the figure I am given. I do not -

MR. BARRY: Did they apply to Rural Development for a grant?

MR. ROBERTS: Did they apply to Rural Development for a grant?

They have not even heard - the last person who applied from White Bay North is still waiting for an answer. To my knowledge they have not and if I get an assurance they will get a grant, I can assure the Chairman, Sir, of that.

MR. BARRY: They will not get it unless they ask for it.

MR. ROBERTS: I can assure there will be a telegram in by tomorrow night - there will be a telegram in by tomorrow night. I also -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: No. No. Maybe I am. The point is, Mr. Chairman, the point is Mr. Chairman, the point is that the community -

MR. BARRY: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: The point is that the community has not received - The Minister of Fisheries wrote them, the Minister of Fisheries, part of the Cabinet, wrote them and said, "We can do nothing, absolutely nothing." That is the answer they got from the Cabinet of which the gentleman from Placentia West is a member. That is the answer they got.

Now meanwhile over in Port au Choix, the Fisheries Department is sending \$7,000 to help to finish a LIP project down there. I have the correspondence on my desk. I ask, Sir, why they were told no and why they were not told to seek a grant from this or that? The letter was sent to Mr. Ralph Keefe, I believe it was, I do not have it in front of me, it is on my table. I was given it the other day by a friend and I say that the government have obviously decided not to help St. Julian's and I say the government obviously have done so. There can be only one reason that they do not want those men to fish this summer because unless this government - they can blame Ottawa if that makes them feel good, let them. They can blame me. I do not care who they blame. All I want is the fishermen

of St. Julian's to have access to facilities.

Sir, if this crowd cared -

MR. DODDY: Honourable crowd.

MR. ROBERTS: Well if they say they are honourable I will take their word for it. There are thousands in Newfoundland who differ. If these gentlemen, I am sorry, the gentleman from Bonavista South burped -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I cannot answer for Ottawa, Sir, I have been in public life for eight or ten years and many things mystify me, many things mystify me, Sir, the attitude of Ottawa mystifies me. The honourable gentleman from Bonavista South mystifies me. You know there are many things that pass human understanding. Of course it is beyond my comprehension. I have only the normal range of comprehension and nobody would include the gentleman from Bonavista South in that range.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I am being perfectly relevant, Sir. I am dealing with the points raised by the honourable gentleman. Now, Sir -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: The Salt Cod Fish Corporation do not provide facilities. I have one hundred letters from Aiden Maloney saying that they would not provide them in Raleigh. What they are doing in Lawn I do not know. They are buying fish in Lawn on their own hook. But Lawn is an unusual situation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! Order please!. This discussion although it may be very useful in terms of finding some solution to the problem broached by the Leader of the Opposition is irrelevant to 1603-01 - Community Consolidation. I do not think, stretching the bounds of relevancy to their utmost, I think we have gone beyond it and certainly honourable members, if they have no other relevant debate, we could pass this head or certainly have relevant debate.

MR. ROBERTS: Sir, I am talking about whether or not committee should approve, on 1603-01 - \$104,500, salaries, I am talking about the policy that the men now have devised, are administering, the men whose salaries

we are talking of. I ask for an assurance, not that St. Julian's will get the money, I cannot ask for that assurance here, it has already been turned down by the Minister of Fisheries, indeed not only in a letter to me, in a letter to St. Julian's.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Well I do not know whether it is \$10,000 or \$12,000. It is less than George McLean gets in a week and if this honourable crowd can fling out thousands of dollars on the George McLeans and state banquets and sort of things like that, Sir, they can fling out a few thousand to give a few fishermen.

MR. NEARY: He knows because he masterminded the Tory election.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, that is right. He did mastermind the Tory election. If you want to talk about community consolidation, Sir, he masterminded the Tory election in Prince Edward Island.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Going halves on George McLean's fees would take the provincial budget and all the tax increases in it.

Now, Sir, the point of this debate has been lost because of the deliberate delaying tactics.

AN HON. MEMBER: Harrassments.

MR. ROBERTS: No, not harrassments. Harrassment takes intelligence, integrity, so the deliberate delaying tactics by the gentlemen opposite may not be harrassment. The minister who has throughout the piece been conspicuous by his absence and is again absent from the committee, I never heard of it, Sir, before in my years in the House. There are thirteen men in the committee, Sir.

MR. NEARY: Not a quorum.

MR. ROBERTS: Not a quorum. Now there are fourteen and here comes the minister. Hallelujah! The minister has deigned to appear in the committee and it is his estimates. Now, Sir, about 4:30 P.M. 5:00 P.M. this afternoon my colleague, the gentleman from White Bay South, asked the minister a few simple questions about the community consolidation programme. The minister has not yet answered those questions. He has not. He has twisted and dodged and darted

here and darted there, done everything he could think of except answer the questions. He has not even shown the committee the courtesy to be here. He is drifting back in now, nonchalantly, as if he had not a care in the world and maybe he does not. He is asking the committee to vote \$300,000 or \$400,000 net expenditure for a programme and he has yet to say what is in the programme.

Now this afternoon he made some remarks. I noted them down at the time. They have probably gone yellow with age, it has been that long since the minister spoke in this committee. I do not want to do him the discourtesy of misquoting him, if I cannot find—there we are, there are my notes. He said and I think I am quoting him word accurate, "There are no more sending communities in Newfoundland," and then he went on Sir, "If we have to move people," and then he had visions of a civil servant or more than one going to a community and somehow saying, "We shall move you or not. The minister has still not answered the question of who and on what basis it is decided that a person shall get help to move. He has not. Are there any standards? Are there any criteria? He has talked about the federal manpower scheme and has shown an abysmal ignorance of that scheme.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order: The honourable Leader of the Opposition is demanding all sorts of information, which is quite within his right, I support him in his attempt to get information but he will not give the honourable the minister a chance to get a word in edgewise.

MR. ROBERTS: Every time, Sir, the gentleman from St. John's North sneaks it is easy to understand why the Premier flung him out of the Cabinet, and the Premier's wisdom is confirmed. Now, Sir, the gentleman from Trinity South, the minister, has been so tongue-tied, you would think that a crowd of them got together and muzzled him. They did?

MR. WM. ROWE: The Premier did.

MR. ROBERTS: The Premier did. Is that what the Premier is saying to him? The minister has been invited by everyone here present to get up and speak and he has yet to answer that question so I put it to him again.

MR. CARTER: Give him a chance.

MR. ROBERTS: I do not want to give him a chance, I want to give the people of Newfoundland a chance. The minister has had all the opportunities in the world to speak and instead we have had the gentleman from Placentia - no, he has not spoken, he has just been irrelevant. The gentleman from Grand Falls has spoken, the gentleman from Bonavista South has honoured us by speaking. The senior member from Harbour Main spoke -

AN HON. MEMBER: More to come.

MR. ROBERTS: More to come, that is good. The gentleman from St. John's East, an expert on rural development and resettlement spoke -

MR. WM. ROWE: Has not been west of Manuels.

MR. ROBERTS: We have had any number of men speak but the minister has not even attempted to catch the eye of the chairman.

AN HON. MEMBER: Laryngitis.

MR. ROBERTS: The minister may have laryngitis, Sir.

MR. WM. ROWE: Laryngitis of the brain.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, that is closer to it. The minister, Sir, has had every opportunity to speak and he will have every opportunity to speak. We are not trying to delay this committee but we are going to get information if the minister can give it. The minister has not given it. I want to know, Sir, he said there were no more sending communities and then he went on and said, "If we have to move people," not if people wish to move, "If we have to move them." Now I want to know who decides that and what standards. It is a simple question to ask, is it not? It should be simple for the minister to answer it but it has been asked eighteen times. The minister has seventeen times dodged the point.

MR. WM. ROWE: He admits St. John's is not a sending community.

April 30, 1974

Tape No. 1434

NM - 6

MR. ROBERTS: He has agreed that St. John's is not a sending community and he might enlarge that to the other communities in his rural development programme, Gander and Windsor and Grand Falls and Corner Brook and Labrador West.

MR. WM. ROWE: "These are not sending communities," he says.

MR. ROBERTS: I want to know, Sir, I want to know

MR. ROBERTS: I want to know who can qualify to get help for moving. I want to know who decides it. The Minister said nothing. He has been very silent. In his own defence he has had to turn to his colleagues. That is fair enough. Let them hang together.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, to a further point of order: How often do we have to request the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to give someone else a chance to speak, namely: the minister. He has repeated himself more times now than if he were a congenial stutterer.

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

AN HON. MEMBER: Does Your Honour wish seriously to make a ruling on that?

MR. CHAIRMAN (STAGG): No honourable member is under any obligation to yield the floor. The usual rule - the forty-five minute rule has not been invoked to date; an interesting one to consider. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition has a ninety minute rule. That is apparently well entrained in the rules as well. I think it is just a matter of courtesy between members then if one honourable member wish to yield the floor to get answers which he is requesting while he has the floor.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, the gentleman for Rural Development, the minister, I have been looking at him and he has given no indication that he wants to speak, if he wants to speak, I shall yield the floor to him. The gentleman for Bonavista South, having recovered from his trouncing at the hands of the electoral last night -

AN HON. MEMBER: Who is even getting nominated?

MR. ROBERTS: I interject again. I say again if the Minister of Rural Development wishes to deal with these questions, I shall be happy to yield the floor to him at any moment. As for the gentleman for Bonavista South, Sir, I suggest his own civil rights have been trampled upon and he should look at a community consolidation programme of his own.

Now, Sir, they consolidated him last night in the community of interest. Is it true that he did not even get elected to the Board of Directors? Nobody would nominate him.

MR. W. N. ROWE: He could not even get nominated.

MR. ROBERTS: He could not even get nominated.

MR. ROWE, W.N. Not to say elected.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Sir, -

AN HON. MEMBER: Alma Badcock -

MR. ROWE, W.N. Alma Badcock.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Sir, to come back - if the Minister of Rural Development wish to deal with these questions, I should be happy at any moment to yield the floor to him, to have him do it. Does the minister wish? I would be happy to yield.

MR. REID: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Okay then. The gentleman for St. John's North -

AN HON. MEMBER: Apologizes.

MR. ROBERTS: No apologies, he does not have the sense of shame.

The gentleman for St. John's North hopefully has an answer. He will get another answer when the election is called. We will wait for that.

Well that is a Tory. They are going to dump him, have you not heard?

Now, Sir, to come back to the Community Consolidation Programme: The minister has come in here - Sir, can the gentleman for Bonavista South be asked to try and pay some attention to the rules of debate? The Chair is getting to - we are punch-drunk, punchy. There are only how many hours left to go? Thirty-four left? Have we passed the halfway mark yet? We have passed the halfway mark. We still have not got any information. We still may be on this subhead when the seventy-fifth hour expires, if the minister should not give us some information.

MR. REID: I will when he says what is on his mind.

MR. ROBERTS: We are waiting for the minister to tell us he has something on his mind.

MR. ROWE, W.N. Ask the Premier to unuzzle him.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, would the Premier allow the minister to speak?

MR. REID: I do not have to ask the Premier.

MR. ROBERTS: Well will the minister speak then?

MR. REID: I will speak when I am ready.

MR. ROBERTS: Well then will the minister get ready? He can be ready now.

MR. REID: No; I am not ready.

MR. ROBERTS: All right.

MR. PEID: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Let the minister be quiet.

MR. PEID: I am being quiet but he is asking me.

MR. ROBERTS: The only man I know of, Your Honour, who can be quiet with his mouth open, making a noise.

MR. PEID: Just now he said, "let us be quiet."

MR. ROBERTS: Any time the honourable gentleman wishes the floor to answer these questions, I should be happy to yield it to him. Any time!

MR. POPE, W.M.: Let the Premier let him speak.

MR. ROBERTS: Any time that the Minister of Rural Development wants to answer the points that we have raised, I should be happy. Does the minister wish to speak to these points?

MR. PEID: I am waiting for the clock to run through the night.

MR. BARRY: The honourable Ring Leader is entitled to ask questions and is entitled to make comments on the estimates but he is not entitled to demand that anybody on this side of the House answer them.

MR. CHAIRMAN (STAGG): Order, please.

I must take issue with one of the comments made by the Minister of Mines and Energy. The honourable members are described in various ways, the honourable member, the honourable minister, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, the Honourable the Premier and items of that nature but I do believe the Honourable Ring Leader is, while very descriptive and certainly shows ingenuity - it has a certain ingenuity on the part of the honourable minister, I would like that the honourable minister might withdraw or rephrase that.

MR. BARRY: I will rephrase that, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Leader of the Ring Opposite -

MR. ROBERTS: I would like to thank the schoolboy debate, Sir, for his willing compliance. He is now up to about Grade IV debating level.

Now let me come back to the Community Consolidation Programme. The minister has not outlined what the government hope to achieve with this programme. The minister has not outlined the philosophy, if any,

which underlies the programme. He has not outlined the objectives of the programme for which he proposes to spend on a net expenditure a little under \$300,000. The minister has not outlined the standards which apply. I want to know whether a person - how small a community can get help to move. Is there a size of a community? No, there is no size of a community. Then I want to know whether a person - what are the standards? Can a person get help to move from a community only if that community is not incorporated? That is a standard that could be applied.

Can a person get help to move from a community only if he can show an employment opportunity elsewhere? Can a person get help to move from a community if that community does not have electric light provided by public sources? Most people in Newfoundland who have no access to public electricity do have delcos. Can a person get help to move if he is in a community that does not have a road link? Can a person get help to move if he lives in a community that does not have schooling beyond a certain grade? Can a person get help to move if he lived in a community that does not have access to adequate medical facilities? And what are adequate medical facilities? A doctor within so much reach, a hospital within so much reach, a nurse within so much reach? These are all relevant questions that could be asked and should be asked and could be used as guidelines.

Can a person get help to move if he lives in a community that does not have water and sewerage provided by a public authority? Or just water? Can a person get help to move from a community that does not have access to the normal range of community facilities? What are the standards?

The minister proposes to spend on grants this year \$300,000. At \$1,000 per a head of a family, and let us take an average size family of six - the male adult or the head of the family and five children, that is \$2,000 a family. The minister proposed to move 150 families this year at that \$2,000 per family amount. From whence will these families come? To where may they go?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

April 30, 1974

Tape 1435 (Night)

PV - 5

MR. ROBERTS: Well \$2,000 into \$300,000 is 150. If the minister were working for Jamieson he would get it quick enough - 150 into \$300,000 as divided by \$2,000 a grant, into \$300,000 is 150. It is subhead 1603-03. It is on page 90. It is in the little blue column. The minister should not have much trouble finding it. The minister found it? Head XVI - Rural Development, Subhead 1603-03.

MR. ROWE. W.N: Give him the year.

MR. ROBERTS: It is a grant that will be expended by the people whose salaries we are trying to decide whether to give or not.

Where are these families coming from? From where? By what standard? Who decides? Is it the Director of Community Consolidation? Is it the minister? Is it the Cabinet? Is it an Order-in-Council? Is it this House? Is it the Planning and Priorities Secretariat? Is it the Rural Development Authority? Who decides?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Federal-Provincial, is it?

MR. REID: I will give the honourable gentleman all the answers.

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman can answer us. He can answer us whatever he wishes subject to the rules of the committee. I am merely asking a few of the questions which he has not answered and has conspicuously evaded answering. He talks about Federal-Provincial. He may be referring to a Federal-Provincial agreement. Unless the honourable gentleman tables the agreement then, a relevant public document, let him talk about it. He has been damning Ottawa all day for not negotiating an agreement and telling us with great pain of his difficulty, of the hundreds of letters and communications which he sent winging to Don Jameison. If he should have them there, table them.

MR. REID: Does the honourable gentleman want me to read them out?

MR. ROBERTS: Sure if the honourable gentleman when his turn should come want to read them out, let him read them out.

MR. REID: Okay. I will make sure of that.

MR. ROBERTS: Sure, sure, read them out.

MR. REID: See how hard it is to get hold of Don Jameison. I will let the honourable member know.

MR. ROBERTS: The Minister of Industrial Development apparently is every day communicating. The Minister of Energy is in the most intimate communion with the Minister of DREE, the Premier practically on an hourly basis. The Premier told us he spent four hours early Sunday morning. I mean I cannot help it if the minister has no - the gentleman from St. Barbe South, the newspaper today had the most gorgeous picture (Inaudible).

MR. REID: Six months to get in touch with him.

MR. ROBERTS: Six months to get in touch with him?

MR. REID: Yes.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, then I could only suggest, Sir, that the gentleman from Trinity South is lacking in perspicacity, influence and the means to get in touch with all of these. Everybody else on that side seem to be able to get in touch with it, they say the most attractive picture, I was thinking of having a large copy made and having it sent throughout my constituency as a little cheer because the days are long and the days are long now and the weather is not good. The picture of the gentleman from St. Barbe South together with the Minister for DREE, Mr. Jameison, signing an agreement, a very good agreement, one which will pop a lot of money into Newfoundland, and a very good thing it is.

The Minister of Rural Development, Sir, is speaking twaddle and balderdash when he says he cannot get in touch with Jameison on this.

MR. REID: The Resettlement Programme was not good enough.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, absolute nonsense. Let the minister, Sir, let him speak. I have said I will yield the floor to him.

MR. REID: I will speak.

MR. ROBERTS: About all he does is caterwaul and object. Let him table the Federal-Provincial Agreement. I want to know who decides it. Is it some committee of civil servants be they paid by here or paid by Ottawa or paid by both? On what standards? Instead of that, for the minister to say a committee of civil servants decides this be the case. He is responsible. The minister yesterday tried to weasel out of it. He said; "Oh! Let us be official." He has now come around on that point. He now realizes that in responsible government he is responsible, that a minister is responsible for any happenings, within the official bounds, by any of his officials. That is the way it works. So let him not be heard to say, Mr. Chairman, that the committee of Federal-Provincial officials does it. They are acting within powers granted them by the minister.

So let him deal with that point. Let him then say, Sir, from whence

these families are coming. Are they all going to come from a communities or from many communities? One hundred and fifty persons, one hundred and fifty families are going to move this year, about the same number as last year. Last year on the same basis one hundred and sixty-five families moved. From whence did they come? To whence did they go? On what standards? Are they all employed?

The minister boasts, I am sorry, he does not, Sir, he is tongue-tied. He is muzzled. His colleague boasts of the great new programme.

MR. B. ROWE: Could they have gotten Manpower Mobility grants?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, could they have gotten - the minister did not seem to know the difference between a manpower mobility grant and a grant under the community - He waggles his head. Oh! he waggles his head -

MR. REID: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: One would think he was calculating sums for James G. Reid and Sons Limited he is that enthusiastic. Could they have gotten assistance under the Manpower Mobility Programme? If the test be employment they could have. The minister, Sir, has not given any information. He has not told us what these people are doing. He talks about community amenities, \$40,000 and the gentlemen whose salaries we are voting, Sir, are being asked, will be asked to administer that vote. What is that for? On what standard? \$30,000 was spent last year, twenty-five per cent increase: Equipment is up from \$65,000 to \$115,000. Are we hiring James Reid and Sons Limited equipment this summer?

MR. REID: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: No, no, no. Being nasty? I am being perfectly truthful. Let us hope he did make a good speech. It is too bad he got flung out of the cabinet. The minister, Sir, has not dealt with any of these questions. Let the minister, Charlie has his own nastiness problem in his constituency. The minister has not dealt -

MR. REID: One thing I do object to, certainly do not interfere, let the opposition member go ahead. Let the Leader of the Opposition go ahead. I would love to listen to him. Let him go ahead.

MR. ROBERTS: I thank the minister. That is the most sensible statement he has made all day.

Now let me ask him one or two more questions. On what basis are people selected? Supposing 200 apply?

MR. REID: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry?

MR. REID: Selected for -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: May I ask a question?

MR. ROBERTS: No, no, I have the floor and I do not propose to yield it to the honourable gentleman. We go to eleven and the Chairman leaves the Chair automatically. Okay!

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, sure. What about the gentleman who went on Mrs. Morrissey's programme this morning? The honourable gentleman was not up early enough this morning. Mr. Norman Sylvia worked as hard as could be to get the member from Port de Grave elected and now went on television this morning in an act of courage and said, "I regret it. I will work just as hard to put him out." How many more do we want? How many more do we want? If the honourable gentleman only knew how many of his constituents have come and said those words to us, that they regret having put him in.

MR. REID: Who is that? The man from Port de Grave?

MR. ROBERTS: If he should want to make the test, let us have an election tomorrow and let us test it.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Sure we tested it, the civil rights. We tested it in Hermitage and they got their answer in Hermitage and they got their answer in Bonavista, Trinity-Conception. They got their answer in Grand Falls, White Bay, Labrador and in Gander, Twillingate and all over the Island and they will get it again. The Minister of Justice got his answer in Seal Cove. He will be a long time living that one down.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Sure, St. Anthony. Does the honourable gentleman want to have an election in St. Anthony? I only got eighty per cent last time.

Maybe I will not get any this time. I am in real trouble now; that is right. I am certainly in real trouble but I will put it to the test tomorrow. Anytime the honourable member wants to have a general election, the people of White Bay North are quite capable of choosing who their member is to be.

Now, Sir, is Your Honour calling it eleven of the clock? It is eleven of the clock, one minute shy. Do you want to call it eleven of the clock, Sir?

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Stagg) It is moved and seconded that the committee rise -

MR. ROBERTS: No, no, there is no motion. At eleven of the clock Your Honour leaves the Chair, as the Standing Orders go. Your Honour, we are getting so very involved in the rules.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Stagg): It is now definitely eleven of the clock. I leave the Chair. Presumably the House will resume its normal sitting at three of the clock tomorrow.