

PRELIMINARY

UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

10:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.

FRIDAY, JUNE 10, 1977

The House met at 10.00 a.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon Minister of Mines and Energy rises on a point of personal privilege.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I want to address myself to an article that appeared on the front page of the Daily News this morning in which it is implied that a bill to regulate Newfoundland Hydro which is the intention that government has given over several months and the fact that I as minister responsible gave notice of that bill two days ago. The article here sort of indicates that the government will not be in a position to introduce this bill and I want to correct this article to the extent that the bill will be introduced as notice was given of it a couple of days ago and also to correct an editorial given by CJON radio this morning which indicated pretty definitively that their information was that the bill would not be introduced and I want to set it on the record that it is the intention of this administration, this government to introduce that bill. Hopefully it will be done on Monday or Tuesday of next week.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I think the Chair would be inclined to accept that statement as one of explanation and clarification unless the hon minister wishes to bring in some definitive motion arising out of a point of privilege.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER: Hon Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise the House that Honourable Mr. Justice John William Mahoney of the Supreme Court of Newfoundland Trial Division has agreed to conduct the enquiry into the matters raised in this hon House on Monday. The Honourable Mr. Justice James -

SOME HON MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

- John William Mahoney says the terms of reference are being drawn up and may be submitted to Mr. Justice Mahoney for his input before submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council and he too has been asked to find suitable council.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, let me say for our part that we on this side welcome the announcement for two reasons. First of all we welcome the announcement that the government have acted as they undertook to do under some considerable pressure particularly from my colleague from Burgeo - Bay D'Espoir and I believe the gentleman from LaPoile was very vocal and outspoken on the issue as well

MR. ROBERTS: Oh well, yes, and I said a few words as well here two or three months ago which also were related to it.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, we welcome the news that Mr. Justice Mahoney has agreed to accept this commission. Mr. Justice Mahoney is well known to all members of the House. He had a distinguished career at the bar and his career as a member of the bench has been equally distinguished, and he has, I think, won himself a very great reputation as a member of the bench equal to that he had won as a member of the bar. We are very delighted with that.

I would hope, Sir, that the Minister of Justice in drafting the terms would do my colleagues on the Public Accounts Committee the courtesy to ask their views on it. I think that would be right. I think it would be appropriate and I think it would be proper. And I venture to suggest, Sir, it would also be desirable given the way in which the administration restricted the terms of an earlier inquiry, the one being carried out by the Chief Justice, Mr. Furlong - the hon. R. S. Furlong. And I would suggest to the minister most earnestly that the draft terms of reference as well as being submitted to the Commissioner, Mr. Justice Mahoney, should also be submitted to the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee for his comments thereon. It is the government's duty to enact the terms of reference. The Commissioner does not set them, the House does not set them - it is the Cabinet, it is a political decision by the Cabinet. I would suggest that in view of the seriousness of this situation - and I think the evidence which has been exposed to date shows that the situation is serious - that it would be desirable in every sense of the word to ask for the comments of the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, my colleague from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir, (Mr. Simmons) who has done an admirable job of exposing a situation which needs to be exposed.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: And so, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to

MR. ROBERTS: the minister that he do this. I think he would save himself a considerable degree of possible controversy and I think that he would certainly enhance the terms of reference. We have seen too many narrowly restricted terms of reference in these commissions of inquiry. I think it is important this one not only be carried out - it will be carried out superbly by Mr. Justice Mahoney - but I think, that the government make sure there is no cover up. I think that is important, Sir, and the only way to do that is to have the terms of reference vetted by at least the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, because then we will have an open inquiry, not the sort of narrowly restrictive one which the Premier has blundered into with Mr. Justice Furlong.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER MOORES: That was a narrow accusation.

MR. HICKMAN: That is right.

MR. ROBERTS: But a truthful accusation.

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

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to present -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to present to the House at this time a new policy with respect to the processing of applications for agricultural land leases. And the approach that I am taking is to classify different types of agriculture enterprises and set appropriate criteria for a land lease for each of the classifications. This criteria will permit useful resource management and an early objective screening of the various applications that are made. Under the present system an application for an agricultural land lease is normally recommended for approval by agriculture representatives if the soil resources are suitable for the agriculture purpose stated on the application, and no other criteria are considered. The application goes to other departments and a central Crown Lands Committee, and finally the minister, who either approves or

MR. MAYNARD: rejects the application. Now some qualifying criteria will be established to assist applicants and the agriculture representatives to make judgement in the first instance. If this proves successful, the next step will be to refine the criteria so that recommendations can be made directly from the department's regional office, and that will bring service closer to the people. Many Crown lands applications have been received for home gardening, but up to this time no policy existed.

Mr. Maynard:

The value of producing fresh food for the family is recognized and consequently the new policy provides for this. Our garden allotment programme in larger urban centres of the Province has exemplified the need for this type of policy.

Pressures for the wise use of soil resources are increasing because of higher food production costs, loss of productive farm land to other uses and a restrictive amount of suitable land remaining. Therefore, government must ensure the proper use of the remaining Crown land suitable for agriculture if the Province is to have the opportunity of producing a significant portion of its food requirements.

The classification of agriculture enterprises in the new policy includes (a) the full time commercial farm, (b) the part time farm, and (c) the home garden.

First the commercial farm. A commercial farm is one from which the owner derives the major portion of his income and spends the greatest portion of his working time and capital to develop. The land requirement will remain flexible so that it can be tailored to the specific requirements of the individual farm.

Future commercial farming development will be concentrated in designated areas identified through soil surveys as possessing the highest potential for profitable agriculture production. General development areas have been identified and will be refined as soil surveying and land use planning projects progress.

Land leases for commercial agriculture production will normally be located in these designated areas. And these leases will meet the following criteria:

- (1) The present land base owned by the applicant and suitable for agriculture is to be fully utilized at an acceptable level of productivity and management.
- (2) The applicant must have the financial resources to develop the land or be eligible for financial assistance through loans and/or capital grants. In other words if an applicant gets a lease for

Mr. Maynard:

a commercial farming operation he should have the financial resources to develop it successfully.

(3) A five year development plan must accompany the application.

The type of farming enterprise in the proposal must bear a relationship to the amount of land needed for a viable operation.

(4) The proposed additional produce from the land must be capable of being transported economically to major markets or be absorbed by local markets.

(5) The land applied for must have access to utility services.

(6) In the case of new entrants to agriculture the applicant must demonstrate an adequate agricultural knowledge and financial ability to develop the land resource within the five years.

(7) These leases will be short or long term, renewable, and the normal terms, conditions, and rentals for agriculture leases will apply.

Next is the part time farm. A part time farm is one which operates on a part time basis only and does not supply the major portion of the family's income. Hobby farms are included in that classification. For part time farms the following criteria will apply:

(1) the leases will normally be in areas designated as rural zones some may be permitted in the commercial agriculture zones to utilize small areas which are complimentary to a total land use plan.

(2) The present land base owned by the applicant and suitable for agriculture must be fully utilized in an acceptable manner.

(3) Applications for this type of lease must be accompanied by a five year development plan.

(4) The land requirement will normally be in the range from two to twenty-five acres.

(5) No buildings will be allowed except small buildings for the purpose of storing implements, fertilizer, and other farming supplies. The applicant may ask to have this condition reviewed after five years.



(6) This type of lease will be short term, (fifteen years), renewable and normal terms, conditions will again apply.

The third one is the home gardening. Now home gardening means simply the supplying of the needs of the home only and therefore does not require a large amount of land or capital investment. There are several possibilities available to fulfill the need.

(1) The present system for leasing residential lots in rural areas provides for lots of one-half acre. In most cases this amount of land is sufficient for growing produce for the family.

(2) For families with residence located on small lots with no adequate soil resources, areas for garden plots may be leased to municipal governments, horticultural societies, or similar registered groups who wish to sponsor home gardening areas.

Mr. Maynard.

to sponsor home gardening areas. The department will issue the leases and make subsequent inspections to see that the terms and conditions are being fulfilled. The municipality or society to which the land is leased will be responsible for the administration and renting of the garden plots to the individual families. The leases to the councils or societies will be normally for fifteen years with the normal terms and conditions applying. These leases will not normally be in designated agricultural zones.

The third option for home gardening is where there is no sponsoring group available, permission may be given to an applicant to occupy Crown land for the purpose of home gardening. In this case the applicant must demonstrate that he has no land base for home gardening available to him. A permit to occupy Crown land will be for three years only and, therefore, it does not have the permanency associated with land leases. For instance, if the natural resource is required for a more permanent enterprise then the permit to occupy will not be renewed.

In summary, I have outlined the basis of a new land leasing policy for agriculture. It should not be considered final as experience will show where more refinements can be made. However, I submit, that the policy will more effectively and efficiently utilize our soil resources for the various demands of the agriculture sector.

PRESENTING REPORTS OF STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: I table the annual report of the Newfoundland Industrial Development Corporation, NIDC.

NOTICES OF MOTION:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Repeal The Refinery Agreement Act, 1973." It does not have anything to do with the present refinery. That is the agreement for the so-called second refinery which never materialized.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Manpower.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Shop Closing Act."

MR. NEARY: You are going to close down the shops. You got everything else closed down.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. House Leader.

MR. HICKMAN: I am being harassed.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. HICKMAN: That is right, it is. That must have been a tremendous party the hon. Leader of the Opposition had on Wednesday. His colleagues have not gotten over it yet.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKMAN: I would hope, Mr. Speaker, and I say this without prejudice, that this is the end of legislation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no!

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act Respecting The Preparation And Revision Of The Statutes And Subordinate Legislation Of The Province." And on behalf of my colleague, the hon. Minister of Fisheries, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Fishing And Coastal Vessels Rebuilding And Repairs ( Bounties) Act."

ORAL QUESTIONS:

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Finance in his capacity as the minister responsible for the negotiations with the Waterford Hospital or the workers at the Waterford Hospital, I should say, can the minister bring us up to date on what is happening? I gather from news reports there was another 'incident' overnight on the picket lines. Apparently six of the picketers were arrested. I am not sure whether charges were laid or if so what those charges were. Could the minister bring us up to date please, Mr. Speaker, and tell us what has happened? And could he also perhaps indicate if he has any idea of where we go from here? The union, of course, have rejected the

Mr. Roberts.

mediators report. The government have accepted it as the minister told us last week. Where do we go from here? Do we just have to sit back now and wait for things to deteriorate further? To what end I do not know. Can the minister tell us

Mr. Roberts:

to what end I do not know, Can the minister tell us, you know, what has happened and where he sees we are going from here.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, I think the first part of the hon. gentleman's question was directed at an incidence on the picket line last night. My understanding of the event was that as the shifts were chaning or some workers were trying to gain entrance to the building and they were obstructed by the pickets, I understand that six people were arrested. I think four have been charged with obstructing the movement of the people into the hospital, and two were charged with obstructing the police.

As to the current status of the negotiations with the union. We have been in touch or at least the officials of the bargaining team on both sides were in contact yesterday. The union came in with some further proposals, in effect their past position that they offered us on the pensions, that is to say all those people who were on strike, and as of that date in 1977 should be pensionable. That was, you know, unacceptable to management at that time. It was not recommended by the mediator and it would hardly be appropriate for management to accept it now. And I think that this has been indicated to the union in that they have gone back to give it some further thought and hopefully they will back to us again with some further suggestions.

As I have said and indicated on behalf of government to the House and to the public that the mediator's report although far from satisfactory to government, particularly in terms of the step progression and in terms of other benefits that he has suggested which were not made available to the other hospitals in the previous packages that have been negotiated were accepted by government, and by management very reluctantly because of the precedent setting nature of them, but in the interest of getting the strike settled. But since they were all rejected in toto by the union at that time, you know, we felt that is as far as we could go at that particular

Mr. Doody:

that report could very well have been the grounds for a settlement. As I say the legislation does not seem like a reasonable solution at this point. There is no national or provincial emergency, the hospital is functioning, and patient care as I have been informed by the health authorities is adequate. The patients in there are being looked after. The security in there is in good shape, the police. The number of constabulary have been reduced from the thirteen

MR. DOODY: per shift to nine per shift, plus the sergeant and so at this point in time there is a hiatus and you know we would hope that the unit will get back to us again with some further ideas as to how to resolve it. Certainly all the concessions that have been made to date have been made by government and I think that in the interest of collective bargaining and in the interest of getting that particular strike finished it would be - you know the union should certainly make a gesture to getting the thing resolved.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications, Sir, has been very quiet about the meetings over in Nova Scotia I think it was the other day in connection with the cost sharing project for upgrading the Trans Canada Highway, is the minister in a position now to tell the House whether it is ninety - ten, seventy-five - twenty-five, or fifty - fifty. Give us the results of the meeting with the other ministers in the Atlantic Provinces.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, first of all last Wednesday of last week all the ministers responsible for highways and transportation in the four Atlantic Provinces met in Halifax and we discussed the announcement by Mr. Laing and at that time we were informed by the federal minister that the \$100 million was now allocated in the form of a grant really from Ottawa to the region and the provinces would now have to decide among themselves how to divide up the \$100 million. That was last week's meeting. Of course that automatically warranted a second meeting which was held Wednesday of this week in Fredericton and I must say there was very intense discussion on the matter because when the federal government said to us, "Here is \$100 million, now you decide among yourselves and reach an agreement. How are you going to divide the money up? And that is how it was done.

MR. NEARY: Each one just like a vulture.

MR. MORGAN: So, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to at least have reached an agreement. The agreement is now being finalized as of Wednesday

MR. MORGAN: evening of this week and our Province's share of the \$100 million will be \$30 million. Prince Edward Island will be now only \$7 million and Nova Scotia \$32 million and New Brunswick \$31 million. The hon. Leader of the Opposition said it was earlier agreed upon. There was no agreement reached until Wednesday of this week. We thought as ministers in the region that the federal government would show leadership and indicate how they felt that it should be divided but instead of doing that they passed it along to the provinces and said that -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, if the question could be answered in a -

MR. SIMMONS: If it could because -

MR. MORGAN: The hon. gentleman did not ask a question.

MR. SIMMONS: I was listening, I was trying but the gentleman -

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, so the provinces, by some very meaningful discussion and negotiation among the ministers concerned reached agreement and of course now we have asked the federal minister to meet with us as soon as possible to finalize the agreement, to sign in with Ottawa each respective province so we can get the tenders called and the actual work moving. I was hoping this morning to be able to say that the federal minister has confirmed the meeting. However, yesterday a meeting was really set up for Ottawa on Monday and however late last evening we got word that that meeting is now being postponed so we now have not got a definite date for a meeting in Ottawa with the federal minister but we are hoping it will be the early part of next week, at least next week so as we can get the agreement signed with Ottawa and we have taken a position as well, not only dividing up the money in the region, that has been reached, an agreement there among the provinces, but also we have reached an agreement as to how we are going to put forward our position to Ottawa with regards to the cost sharing formula. But of course before we meet with Ottawa and put forward that position I cannot make it public.

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



MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Do I understand the minister correctly, Sir, that the Government of Canada tossed \$100 million at the four Atlantic Provinces like you would toss a bone to a dog, and then a vicious fight started over it.

MR. DOODY:

MR. NEARY: But the minister also said that it was a grant. Now does this mean that there is no cost sharing involved, that it is an outright grants, in other words a gift to the Atlantic Provinces, is that what the minister means?

MR. MORGAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the federal government have been looking at it as a grant as far as they are concerned because the money has been approved by the Treasury Board and by Federal Cabinet.

MR. NEARY: But are there any strings attached to it?

MR. MORGAN: What they are saying to the Province is you have to now reach agreement with us with regards to cost sharing. What they say in cost sharing is what each Province is going to add on to the \$100 million and they do want the Provinces to cost share the necessary work to be carried out in upgrading the TCH in the Atlantic region, or the primary highway system. So therefore we have to reach an agreement with the federal minister along these lines. But the \$100 million has been approved by the Federal Cabinet and therefore we have now to sit down and negotiate with them an agreement indicating the formula of cost sharing the provinces will be involved as well and carry out the necessary work. But the provinces, as I said early in the House of Assembly, the submission made or the

MR. MORGAN: the provinces. I said earlier in the House of Assembly, the application made for this money in the beginning was along the lines of 90 per cent - 10 per cent cost-sharing formula. Before I indicate what decision we made or reached among the four provinces with regard to our upcoming meeting with Mr. Lang next week - I cannot very well indicate publicly what that position is until we meet Mr. Lang.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (COLLINS): A considerable number of members have indicated they wish to ask questions so I will permit one further supplementary at this time, without prejudice, and we will have later supplementaries if time permits.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, this seems to be a most irregular procedure that the Government of Canada are using, and it is delaying the calling of public tenders and the awarding of the contracts. We are now almost half way through the season and not a tender has been called or a contract awarded. If there are any further delays would the minister indicate what damage it is going to do to getting the work done that needs to be done on the Trans-Canada Highway this year? Is it going to put us behind schedule? And we still have no guarantee whether it is going to 90/10, 75/25 or 50/50. If it is not 90/10, will there be any work done at all this year?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman in essence is right in what he is saying. Any further delay in finalizing an agreement will, of course, automatically delay the work being carried out on our highway in our Province, the T.C.H. That is the reason why we have stressed to the federal minister in our correspondence -

MR. MORGAN: and when I say us, the ministers in the region - that we feel it almost of an urgent nature to meet as soon as possible with the federal minister and to finalize the agreements so that we can get the tenders called. If Mr. Lang and the federal government cannot reach agreements with us the Provinces - and when I say us now, we are looking at one position - if they cannot agree with us as a region and get the agreement signed, it will mean delay in getting the work done and this will be very unfortunate.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture. It relates to the statement he made last night that the reason for the problems with Ralland Forest Products mill in Milltown was a lack of good management.

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. SIMMONS: Unfortunately he said that, Mr. Speaker, even if it were true, but I will debate that with him at the appropriate time. What I want to know now is, in view of the minister's publicly stated view that poor management is the problem, and as he said later, the major problem in his view with the mill operation at Milltown, does this mean that his department will refuse to further give assistance to the mill while it is under present management?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, let me first say that I made the statement last night, and it is my view that that is the major problem. I will not back down on that statement. I will stick by it and I can demonstrate it. However, as to the question as to whether we will give any further assistance, obviously the hon. member is not

MR. MAYNARD: asking me whether our department is giving any further financial assistance to that business? But we are, and we will continue to give assistance to supply or to find a supply of wood for the mill. We have demonstrated at this time that there is sufficient wood for another year and we have good options to supply wood for a number of years to come.

I cannot guarantee anyone that there is going to be a fifteen or twenty year supply but there is wood in the area that is available. The harvesting techniques have to be straightened out. The wood that is there has to be utilized to the maximum possible extent. But yes, we will work. We have a team of people who are working on the Bay d'Espoir area and we will continue to do so to keep the Ralland Forest Products operation in operation.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister for the information. I am not sure he addressed himself to the question so I will put it another way. Has the minister in view of his stated concern, which he says he can document, has he advised the ownership of the mill of his views concerning poor management particularly has he advised them of the necessity - in his view the necessity obviously - to change management in the interest of continued operation of the mill?

MR. MAYNARD: We have told the management and expressed to them, Mr. Speaker, that under the present harvesting techniques - and we talk about the extent of the operation, the skidder operation only as opposed to a skidder, plus mixed type of harvesting operation - that there is just not sufficient wood in the whole central Newfoundland area to keep the mill going based on a large skidder operation, whether you take Bowaters wood, Price or whatever. But with revised harvesting techniques and the production of some pulpwood that the wood can be found to keep the mill viable. And we will find the wood, and we will continue to assist the people in every way possible to keep their operations viable if they desire to keep on operating.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications if he wishes to get back to his seat. We have a crisis situation in Cartwright on two accounts, but on the first one, Could the minister indicate whether he is prepared to approach CN on the Ambrose Shea which is now on the Lewisporte to Goose Bay run, it will not be calling into St. John's, it will be the Lewisporte to Goose Bay run, and apparently will not be calling into the community of Cartwright which means that the community is without any passenger service whatsoever? The Petite Forte and the Tavener are generally choc-a-block, filled up by the time they reach Cartwright on both runs so with the result the Ambrose Shea will not be calling into Cartwright, and the people who have booked to go on to there cannot move nor can the community travel by vessel on

Mr. Strachan.

to Goose Bay or to ports on the Island. So could he state whether he is prepared to look into that situation?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, yes, I will look into it, but I understand from CN's announcements that the Ambrose Shea is on a temporary measure of approximately two weeks, and then they intend to put the, I think, Marine Cruiser on that service. Now I do not know if that is possible - maybe there is a problem with the landing facilities with regard to the Ambrose Shea. What I will do is that I will make contact today with the CN Marine officials to determine what the situation is and what can be done. But I know from the recent announcements that the Ambrose Shea is only temporary for approximately two weeks and then the Marine Cruiser goes into service.

AN HON. MEMBER: Because of the ice conditions.

MR. MORGAN: Because of the ice conditions, yes.

MR. STRACHAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: One supplementary.

MR. STRACHAN: I should indicate that the Marine Cruiser will be a smaller vessel and will be making two trips a week, and because two trips a week is also discussed - whether it will go into Cartwright as well. So possibly you could take note of that. Again on the community of Cartwright, I wonder if the minister - and again it is not supplementary to the CN question, but to the community of Cartwright, because there is controversy, and they have been calling on national radio - could indicate the road situation in the community of Cartwright as well?

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, in that regard the telegrams that came in recently, both to myself and my colleague the Minister of Municipal Affairs regarding the bad road conditions on roads under the jurisdiction of the municipality of Cartwright, realizing that Cartwright does have some financial difficulties in finding necessary funds to carry out the necessary improvements, what I have

Mr. Morgan.

done as minister responsible for roads, in co-ordination with my colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, I have arranged to have engineers go into Cartwright this week or the early part of next week. They will be going in and associated with the construction of the Cartwright airstrip to determine an estimate of cost to carry out the necessary improvements on the roads and when a report comes in I will again be meeting with my colleague; the Minister of Municipal Affairs in the hope that we can arrange some kind of a cost-sharing situation between the two departments and get the work done this Summer.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Mines and Energy. I would presume that that is the appropriate minister. Would the minister confirm the overnight stories in the Daily News that the government subsidized ERCO by \$7 million last year in electrical rates? Is that a factual figure? Did it actually cost \$7 million to subsidize that operation?

MR. PECKFORD:

The exact figure, Mr. Speaker, I am getting checked out but it is approximately \$7 million which is an agreement signed by the previous administration with the present company who operates the industry.

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (Dr. Collins) Yes, go ahead.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, are there any negotiations going on in any shape or form that will increase the price of electricity per kilowatt to ERCO so as to cut into that subsidy?

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, myself and the hon. Minister of Industrial Development have been working on this problem for a number of months and I am sure he would also have something to say about it right now.

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

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I will just add to that to give the member a more definitive answer, there is a committee which has been struck to look into the ERCO situation not to force anybody's hand but to look at the whole contract of trust deeds, the existing agreements, and to give some direction to Cabinet on the procedures if procedures can be established to renegotiate. That committee is a multi-department committee and we should have a report some time later in the summer.

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: One final supplementary.

MR. FLIGHT: I wonder if the minister would care -  
It is not a case of forcing anybody's hand, Mr. Speaker. The \$7 million subsidy is getting into the area where it is going to start to be questionable whether the Province can afford that kind of a subsidy -

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. FLIGHT: - and I am wondering if the minister would care to tell the House as to what ERCO's or the people representing ERCO's attitude is with accepting that kind of an increase, or an increase that would do away with that side of the subsidy.



MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, on several occasions in the last year we have had informal discussions with the principals of ERCO and we have indicated to them our concern about the power contract - naturally we are concerned. Naturally it is unacceptable to us and we have made our general feelings known, and I believe that at a given point in time the principals would be satisfied to discuss with government the future of that entire agreement.

MR. SPEAKER: (Dr. Collins) The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. Is it the intention of government to take over the distribution of beer in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Finance. Would the minister agree, confirm or deny that a study has been carried out, you know, with the view to having government take over the distribution of beer from the breweries, has the study been carried out, and is that study complete?

MR. DOODY: The study has been carried out on the distribution of beer in the Province to check the efficiencies, the costs, and the whole structure. It was never the intention of government to get involved in the distribution of beer and that was not the object of the study.

MR. CALLAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member may come back for a supplementary if time permits.

The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Mines and Energy. I wonder if the minister is in a position to inform the House just what is the status with respect to legislation that would bring Newfoundland Hydro under the control of the Public Utilities Board.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I wish the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) would check with his colleagues when he comes into the House each day because this morning on a point of privilege I indicated to the House just exactly what the status of that was. So I would like to ask and request of the hon. member for Terra Nova that he consult with these other hon. members on the opposite side for the information that was given this morning in this hon. House.

MR. SPEAKER: (Dr. Collins) The hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay followed by the hon. member for St. George's.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health. In view of the fact that the minister's colleague, the Government House Leader, indicated earlier this morning that he appeared to be at the end of the legislation to be introduced this session, could the minister tell us what is happening with regards to the proposed denturist legislation that I do believe commitments were given some months ago that that would be brought before the House this session?

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, meetings are continuing with the Denturist Society. I had a meeting with their legal counsel and the President and two or three members last week. There are also meetings continuing with the Dentists' Association and the Medical Association, because we are dealing in an oral health problem and of course those associations must be brought in. Whether we will be able to get the legislation in this session remains to be seen - I am still hopeful, but as the days go by it concerns me that they might not be able to make it.

MR. RIDEOUT: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: One supplementary.

MR. RIDEOUT: Could the minister tell us then whether or not - and from his answer maybe not - but could the minister tell us for sure whether or not legislation has been drafted to this effect or is it still that there are meetings going on and the legislation has yet to be drafted?

MR. RIDEOUT: and the legislation has yet to be drafted.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, over the past year there has been several drafts put on paper but they are only drafts for discussion purposes. There has been no draft in terms of legislation which would be proposed to be brought to the House. It has been draft positions for discussion purposes.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon member for St. George's.

MRS MacISAAC: Mr. Speaker, my question for the Minister of Social Services. I wonder if the minister would tell us the number of children available for adoption now in the Province and the number of people who are waiting for adoption?

MR. BRETT: No, Mr. Speaker, I do not have that kind of information. That is statistical stuff that I would not necessarily have with me. I can tell the hon member though that there are a very small number of children available now and the number of applications are growing to the point where we find that we may have to refuse accepting applications for short periods. Because what is happening is that we are getting applications, our workers are processing applications knowing that there are no children available. so we are creating a lot of work for nothing really. So we are looking into the possibility of delaying applications for periods and then as children become available then accept them again.

I do not know the exact number.

MR. ROBERTS: Are there a number of children in care who are not available for adoption?

MR. BRETT: Yes there are always a number of children who are not available and there are also a number of children available whom we find difficult to place. And I have said this many times, I think children with minor physical or minor mental defects that people will not adopt - most adopting applicants prefer the blond blue-eyed child, sometimes children that they think look like themselves, so children with defects we find hard to place. And then of course

MR. BRETT: we have -

AN HON MEMBER: Like the minister.

MR. BRETT: Yes, like me. And then we have cases where we have a brother and a sister probably in a foster home and we would not separate them. If somebody would take the two of them we would go along with the adoption but we would not separate the family. So I do not have the exact figures. If the hon member wants them I can get them at a later date. But it is not something that you would normally carry with you.

MRS MacISAAC: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: One supplementary.

MRS MacISAAC: My supplementary, Mr. Speaker, would be for the Minister of Health if that is in order. You know on the same subject.

MR. SPEAKER: If it rises out of the minister's question.

MRS MacISAAC: I wonder if the Minister of Health could tell me how many children were born in the Province last year? Also I would like to know how many children were born in the Province last year - Is that a good question?

MR. FLIGHT: Of course it is a good question.

MRS MacISAAC: Also the number of abortions performed in the Province last year?

MR. FLIGHT: Yes, that is a good question.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon Minister of Health.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon member would not expect me to carry that sort of information around in my head but I will certainly undertake to get the information.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: A question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications arising out of an experience I had this week on driving over what is undoubtedly the worst public road in this Province. I thought I had been over them all and that I have seen some -

AN HON MEMBER: What one is that? The Trans Canada.

MR. ROBERTS: No, the Trans Canada is the largest worse public road but this is the road, the Croque which is not a road. It is an astonishing experience and I had the experience of driving over it something which I would recommend to the minister on one of his personal ministerial official visits. Could the minister tell us whether he is going to take any steps this year to improve the road to Croque. Croque is a community of several hundred people which depends upon the road. The road is not even wide enough for a car. It twists and turns like a piece of spaghetti that has been over boiled, and it is a manace in every way. There have been a couple of bad accidents but fortunately there have been no fatal accidents as yet. But I fear we are asking for that sort of difficulty. Would the minister tell us if he would be prepared to have some work done on that road this year. I am told that \$50,000--and this figure comes from his officials, but \$50,000 would make significant improvements. Can he assure us that the work accordingly will be done?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon minister.

MR. MORGAN: The answer is no, Mr. Speaker.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Motion, the hon. Minister of Education to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Local School Tax Act". (Bill No. 103)

On motion Bill No. 103, read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Companies Act." (Bill No. 112).

On motion Bill No. 112, read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Registration Of Deeds Act". (Bill No. 113).

On motion Bill No. 113, read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. HICKMAN: Bill No. 39, "An Act To Amend The Department Of Rural Development Act, 1973."

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): A bill, "An Act To Amend The Department Of Rural Development Act, 1973."

The hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I began last night to have a few words to say on this particular amendment, and my colleague said then and I say now once again that I believe that this is a very dangerous amendment. I believe that the Minister of Rural Development is asking for an unusual and unnecessary grant of power from this House to have vested in himself the ultimate authority and the ultimate decision when it comes to loans made under the Rural Development Authority Act. I do not believe it is necessary. At least when the Lieutenant-Governor in Council had to give their approval to this, you could believe there would be a sobering second thought by somebody. There would be fifteen or sixteen other ministers sitting around the table. You would at least like to believe that some of them will probably question and scrutinize some of the applications that the minister was recognizing for approval. Now, Mr. Speaker, those fifteen or sixteen other probing minds and men have now disappeared or will

Mr. Rideout:

disappear under this particular Act, under this legislation. I think that is wrong. The minister will sit down now on the approval or with or without the approval of his Rural Development Authority and he is going to pass out loans. He is going to pass out grants, he is going to pass out public money. And, Mr. Speaker, the thing that hits the heart is that this Legislature cannot even find out what that money is spent for. There was no list ever tabled in this House. The great debate went on last year, and I assume the years before asking for the Rural Development Authority list, but it has never been tabled in this House, or it was tabled once, excuse me, but the present minister refuses to even consider tabling it. And yet now the minister wants to make the shelter a little tighter around this God-given in power he has got down in his department.

MR. ROBERTS: After we see what they are doing in Public Works maybe they are doing the same thing here.

MR. RIDEOUT: The minister wants to seal it a little tighter down there, Mr. Speaker, he wants to make the Rural Development Authority a little bit more removed from the scurtiny of anybody by now putting it directly and absolutely answerable to nobody only himself. Well I say, Mr. Speaker, that this House, this Opposition is not about to grant that type of authority to this minister or any other minister.

Mr. Rideout.

I think it is an abuse for the minister to even consider coming in and asking this House to give him that type of power. It will leave the Rural Development Authority wide open to abuse by anything or anybody. I am not suggesting that the minister would be party to that, but there will be nobody else to have a look at it. At least when it had to go before the Lieutenant-Governor in Council fifteen or sixteen other people could question it. That will now be put down the drain, thrown out the window as not necessary by this particular amendment. Mr. Speaker, it is a very dangerous amendment. I hope that some of the more conscious bound members on the other side of the House will stand up and speak on this amendment. I am sure that the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) would not like to see this go through. He seems to be conscientious and objects to anything of that nature. I would hope he would stand in his place today and do it with this particular amendment, because, Mr. Speaker, it is dangerous beyond words. The Rural Development Authority and with this particular amendment added on to it only goes further, Mr. Speaker, to erode the authority of this House. We have no say and cannot find any evidence of what is happening with the Rural Development Authority. We cannot get a list of grants or loans approved or disapproved. Like I told the House last night, Mr. Speaker, we find it out by accident. If there happened to be a Rural Development loan approved in your district, you would find it out by accident. If you happened to go in the woods and run across an operator operating a mill. And he may say, Well, I got a loan the other day, or I got a grant a couple of months ago.

Nobody knows what is going on down there.

And to make the empire a little tighter nobody in the Cabinet is going to know what is going on down there. Now, Mr. Speaker, I say that that is an abuse of power. It is an abuse, an affront, for the minister to come before this House and ask for that type of power. Now there were all kinds of justifications made last night. The Minister of Municipal Affairs



Mr. Rideout.

said, Oh, you do not table the names of people who seek social assistance. But, Mr. Speaker, let me tell the minister that if anybody is seeking help from the Department of Social Services above a certain ceiling it has to go to the Cabinet to be approved, building materials and that type of thing.

MR. ROBERTS: And there are rules that govern who may get social assistance. There are no rules that govern Rural Development loans.

MR. RIDEOUT: Exactly . And it will have to go to Cabinet. The minister will have to sit in approval or disapproval of the requests brought in on behalf of that recipient by his colleague, the Minister of Social Services. Now that is going to disappear in this bill. And, of course, as my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, there are rules and guidelines attached to the social service situation. There is nothing to this. When the minister gets this ultimate authority, if he ever gets it, he could disapprove an application because he does not like the colour of your eyes. That is about what it will boil down to, Mr. Speaker, and the little dilly situations that we saw out around Botwood last year where the little political dart can be waved around under somebody's nose, will become more so. And I will say that, Mr. Speaker, if there is one piece of legislation on this Order Paper today that we should dig in our toes and fight for is this particular amendment to the Rural Development Authority. There is no way it should be allowed to pass this House. The minister should take it off the Order Paper. I suggest that he should be ashamed for bringing it in. And the Rural Development Authority, Mr. Speaker, is so controversial by its very nature and by the activity or lack thereof that it has been involved in, it is so controversial you would think that the minister for his own protection would want to at least consult his colleagues in Cabinet. But no, not this minister. Mr. Speaker, there will be more than one ski-doo trail cut in Grand Falls if this is approved, and when the unemployment rates down around the rural parts of the Province are so high. Mr. Speaker, I cannot

Mr. Rideout.

in conscience give my support to this amendment. The only thing I can do is fight it to the end under the rules, and I can assure Your Honour and the minister that we on this side are prepared to do that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear;

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a number of my colleagues have spoken with respect to this bill, Bill No. 39, and they have made some arguments that were both eloquent and forceful, and I do not propose to add to those arguments, because I do not think there is a great deal more that can be said, but I would like to say a few words about this bill, and about the principle which it sponsors or which it espouses, because I believe, Sir, that this particular bill, the Act To Amend The Department Of Rural Development Act is not only offensive, I think it is indicative of a deliberate trend on the part of this administration

MR. ROBERTS: on the part of this administration. Now, Sir, the bill itself is a very innocuous looking piece of legislation. But it is like a lot of innocuous looking legislation, it is like a lot of things which look innocuous, it is a very, very dangerous piece of legislation, a possible potential statute law. It is a little like a little dog or a little cat, Sir, which seems to be a very pleasant little animal until it bites you and it turns out it is hydrophobic and it turns out then that the resulting disease is poison.

Mr. Speaker, I think we should begin, Sir, with a quorum call. Two, four, five, six, seven, eight members in this House, the rules say there must be fourteen, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: I will ask the Clerk to count the House.

We have a quorum.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would hope we will continue to have fourteen government members present throughout the morning or if not there will probably be more quorum calls. We are debating government legislation, Sir. We are debating legislation that is of importance because if carried this bill will confer upon the minister a power which potentially could be abused. I do not know whether the present minister would abuse it. I do not think he would. But we have no guarantee that the present minister will be minister for any length of time. His successor may or may not be as dedicated to the public interest as is the gentleman from Grand Falls.

The point I was making, Sir, is that this bill seems to be an innocuous one. The minister again is sufficiently interested in the debates of the House of Assembly that a piece of legislation that he is sponsoring he cannot even stand around and listen to the debate. That shows the contempt in which the minister holds the House.

So the bill is innocuous but it contains in it a very real and a very dangerous harmful principle. All the bill does,

MR. ROBERTS: Sir, is strike out the words, "Lieutenant-Governor in Council".

The effect of it, as I understand it, would be to allow the minister himself to lend public money without getting any approval or any sanction, either prior sanction or retroactive sanction from the Cabinet. So what the minister is asking is the authority, the power, to lend public money on security which he determines to be adequate for purposes which he determines to be adequate to people whom he considers to be adequate and without any accounting to the Cabinet, Sir, or to the House of Assembly.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing I submit, that could be more offensive to the whole principle of parliamentary government than this particular bill. It is a bureaucrat's dream. It is a dream of the ideal of the kind of public servant, unfortunately we do not have too many of these but we have some, the kind of public servants who regard the whole process of the House of Assembly and even the Cabinet as just a nuisance. It gets in the way of efficient administration. Well why do we have to go up to Cabinet with that? Why do we have to get those politicians involved? Let us get on with the job down here in the Public Service. They do not answer to anybody. All they want is money, money to spend and they want us to raise the taxes and they want then the public servants to go ahead and be able to spend it without any approval or any consultation or any check at all.

Well, Sir, if ever this House of Assembly should oppose a bill it should oppose this bill. If ever a bill should be withdraw by a government it is this particular bill. It is offensive, Sir, in every way it can be. It is wrong in principle. Let us look at the PDA. It was a good idea. It was like a lot of ideas which the hon. gentlemen opposite had when they were a newly formed government. It was a great sounding idea. It was an idea that until it had been analyzed and tested appeared to have great promise. It has turned into

MR. ROBERTS:           one of the great boondoggles of all time.

I could cite twenty or thirty or forty instances from my personal knowledge where the Rural Development Authority has been perverted, where its loans have been used for low and partisan political purposes. I could cite just as many more where it has been used foolishly.

                  The gentleman from Exploits (Dr. Twomey) and I know of a case out in Leading Tickle in his constituency. I think I read some details of it in an earlier debate in the House and I believe the hon. gentleman from Exploits

Mr. Roberts:

(Dr. Twomey) asked me for the details of the case because he was interested, and I gave him the details, and he will corroborate I am sure that that was the case where a loan of \$10,000 or \$15,000 of public money was made to a man who ought not to have got that loan. He had no need for it, no justification for it, and no hope of paying it back. All it did was put that man in trouble, it did not help him to break out of the social assistance jungle, it did not help him to become self-supporting, it did not help to create work, it simply put that man \$10,000 or \$15,000 in debt, and it ended up in a loss of \$10,000 or \$15,000 to the Province. The gentleman for Exploits I know will support what I say in that sense. I showed him the correspondence which I had. And that is an accurate description. And I say now to the gentleman for Exploits, Mr. Speaker, and to the House that there are many other cases, many other cases, a man in Phillips Head who told me during the by-election campaign last year, he said, I always voted Liberal, I was campaigning there with Mr. Mulrooney, the gentleman who ran against the gentleman for Exploits - Mr. Mulrooney was not elected, the gentleman for Exploits was. The gentleman for Exploits was not party to the sort of thing I am talking about now. But the gentleman in Phillips Head said, or maybe it was Point of Bay, I could take the hon. gentleman to the House, it is a yellow painted house by the lefthand side of the road going out to Leading Tickles, going out the bay. The man said, "I have always voted Liberal, Sir." And I said, "Well that is fine. I hope you will give our man Mr. Mulrooney here with me, I hope you will give him a vote this time." "Well, Sir, I cannot!" "Why not", I said? "Well, he said, " I have applied now" He said, "I have got a heart condition, but I want a J-5, that is a kind of tractor. And I have applied to the Rural Development Authority, and he said a minister, and he named the minister, was by here last day or two campaigning for the P.C.'s and he said, he made it clear to me that if I wanted to get my loan I would have to vote P.C. And I said, "Well that is

Mr. Roberts:

foolishness, if you are entitled to a loan you will get the loan. Nobody knows how you vote anyway. Oh, he says, "They will know." I said, "That is foolishness, Sir". Nobody will know how you vote unless you tell anybody. It is your own secret. Nobody can ever find out, the ballot is a sacred and a secret thing. He said, "Oh no they will know, Sir." I do not know how the man voted. It is his own privilege how he votes. But examples such as that can be found all over this Province. And, of course, that is the reason, that is the only reason why the list of borrowers under the Rural Development Authority is not made public. There is no need for any question or doubt about that. That is the reason the list of loans is not made public. That is the reason there is no registration. There is no access by the public to where public money has gone. Now that is the way the Rural Development Authority operates. It is made up of political appointments. I do not even know who the current members are. Who are the members of the RDA? I am now even sure, there were three ministers and three private citizens who were known public supporters -

AN HON. MEMBER: What about the DREE men?

MR. ROBERTS: There were no DREE men on RDA. On RDA, Rural Development Authority? There were no DREE people on Rural Development Authority. I do not think they are. There were formerly three men on it whose chief qualification or chief recommendation, I am sure it was support of the party opposite. It is a political body. That is fine. There is nothing wrong with - the minister is now returned, could he tell us who us who were the members of the Rural Development Authority at present? Who are the present members of the Rural Development Authority?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The present members of the Board?

MR. ROBERTS: The Board. The RDA is the corporate name of it.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The Minister of Fisheries, the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, a representative from Harbour Grace, and there are

Mr. Lundrigan:

two vacancies at the moment.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Archibald from Harbour Grace.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Yes.

MR. ROBERTS: And Mr. Meades position is vacant.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Meade's position is vacant and Mr. Pratt is vacant and these are being -

MR. ROBERTS: How long have they being vacant?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Oh recently. Mr. Meade, of course, is a little longer.



MR. ROBERTS: I thank the minister. That just underlines what I was saying that the board is made up of political people. The ministers are overtly and properly political. The other three gentlemen are estimable gentlemen but their main qualification of course was their political affiliation. So we have a board, Mr. Speaker, that is a political board. It is not a public service board. It is not made up of officials. It is a political board that lends money and they lend it in secret and refuse to account for it. And now we want the minister coming and asking power to make those loans without even going to Cabinet. The next thing he will not even to go to himself, the next thing it will just be anybody who wanders in if he has a ticket from the PC Party, a script from the PC Party will be given the loan. That is what is coming with this PDA. And you know we have seen this session, this administration, exposed as at least bunglers and possibly more when it comes to administration. There are no less than three judicial enquiries now underway and when I say judicial enquiries, enquiries carried out by judges. They are not judicial proceedings as lawyers would use the term. They are not sub judice as the Minister of Public Works is going to find out in his attempt to cover up, in his attempt to prevent officials answering questions. They are not sub judice.

What we have are enquiries carried out under the Public Enquiries Act by a gentleman who happened to be Her Majesty's judges, impartial and superbly competent men. But in each case, Sir, and look at the pattern, these enquiries are being raised as a result of questions raised by members in the Opposition. And in each case, Sir, serious matters in the administration of government are under investigation. We have the television set enquiry. We have the enquiry of Judge Cummings. Judge H. H. Cummings of the District Court is carrying out on the West Coast into the way in which land was acquired in the Bonne Bay Park. And then we have the biggest enquiry to date, now there will be more, because the administration, Sir, their ineptitude, it is only bungling and it

MR. ROBERTS: may well now come to that. It may well be more than bungling. I suspect that when we get to the bottom of this Public Works thing, Sir, there is going to be more than some red faces. I suspect that. The pattern of events is such that one cannot come to any other conclusion.

And in each case, Sir, the government are being investigated, publicly for their conduct. And here now we have a minister coming in and demanding more power. He should be coming in and saying, "Here is what we have done. Here are the names. Here are the purposes. We have nothing to be ashamed of. We are proud of it." DREE revealed names, loans made by the Rural Development Department under the ARDA III agreement are revealed.

MR. MURPHY: They are not public information.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes. Yes.

MR. MURPHY: Does the hon. Leader feel that everybody that does borrow a couple of thousand his name should be made public?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes. Yes. I think it should be tabled here in the House, the same as the Loan and Guarantee Act is now before the House, an amendment to the Loan and Guarantee Act is now before the House and it reveals, I do not know there are only two or three companies there this year.

MR. DOODY: Two.

MR. ROBERTS: Two my friend the Minister of Finance tells me and I congratulate him because I know what pressure there is to get people in under that particular rubric of government. But it is brought here in the House. It has been done I guess as long as there have been loan and guarantee acts. I am not suggesting we need a bill every year for the RDA but the minister should be required to file a report. He did it one year, Mr. Jim Reid, was then the minister before he had an unfortunate accident in the election and retired from public life, at least temporarily. I would think permanently. And what happened? The only controversy, there

MR. ROBERTS:           was no controversy about individuals. It was mentioned that three people got loans who happened to be PC candidates and there was some question and rightly so. One of them, a gentleman I believe on Bell Island, got a loan for a bulldozer for Bell Island -

AN HON. MEMBER:       The hockey player.

MR. ROBERTS:       The hockey player. You know, but there was no personal involvement. Similarly, Mr. Speaker, there was some considerable questions about such Rural Development Authority loans as hairdressers, and morticians. There was some question as to whether this was rural development in the true sense of the word. But other agencies make it public. The Liquor Licencing Board each year publishes a list. It is made public here in this House. It is tabled showing the name of every licensee of a liquor establishment in this Province. And I think that is a good thing to have. I am not sure that was always done but it is done now.

                          Down in the Registry of Deeds and Companies every mortgage I will wager is registered. It is not required to be so by law but in fact every mortgage is now registered, but not the Rural Development Authority. It operates in secrecy. We do not know, Sir, whether there is \$1 million or \$10 million in loans. And I would suggest to my friend from Lewisporte (Mr. White) who is on the Public Accounts Committee

MR. ROBERTS: Public Accounts Committee that a very fertile subject for the kind of hard hitting investigation. Once they finish with Public Works and the Fisheries Department where we have a scandal we have not even begun to get into yet for which the Minister of Health is politically responsible. He was the minister during the period of this scandal and that has not come out yet. So the record of this government is not such that they can come to this House and ask for a further grant of power. Department after department it now stands exposed that there are serious questions, so serious I do not know what the results of these enquiries will be. Commissioners will file their reports and they will be made public and then we will see. But the questions were so serious that enquiries under the Public Enquiry Act had to be set up.

Consider it again, the land issue over in Bonne Bay. Forget the television set issue, that is immensely serious but it is not so much the administration the government accepts insofar as it is inextricably linked up by the presence of one gentleman, Mr. A.B. Walsh to the scandals in the Public Works Department. And let me say now that the Minister of Public Works is politically responsible but I do not think he in any way had any hand in whatever has gone on down in that department. I think it was before he got to be got to be the minister and there is ministerial involvement of course because these lists, these patronage lists are approved by the minister and that is why the minister will not let his officials give the answer. That is why - what is the gentleman, Mr. White is it? The inspector deferred last week. and then this week we got this nonsense about sub-judice, nothing sub-judice about anything going on. The most there is is a police investigation and a police investigation is not sub-judice, it is not sub anything. And the Minister of Public Works, Sir -

MR. ROUSSEAU: If I may on a point of information? If I may Mr. Speaker?

MR. ROBERTS: Sure.

MR. ROUSSEAU: The Deputy Minister of Public Works never said anything was sub-judice. All he said was that he was advised by the Deputy Minister of Justice not to answer any questions until the details surrounding the investigation were pointed out. Nobody used the word sub-judice, the press used it but the Deputy Minister in his statement did not use that term.

MR. ROBERTS: I thank the minister, Mr. Speaker, and I would then say to him that I hope he will instruct his officials immediately to answer the questions put to them by my colleague from Lewisporte - they are in the transcript, the very central question. And the question was who approved the patronage list, the one with Mr. Walsh's firm's name at the head of the list? And my answer is it was a minister. I do not know which minister but it was ministerial and the directions came from the minister and that minister according to whoever it was - and I do not know who it was, you will have to look up the times, but that minister must bear the responsibility for it.

My point, Sir, my point is that this administration have no moral right to come before this House to ask for any greater grant of power. They have abused the powers which they have, they have not acted properly. Judicial investigation after judicial investigation and more to come, We are not through with the Fisheries scandal yet and far from it because it will be revealed in due course when it is investigated that the Minister of Fisheries was told by his officials that the system which he had set up and instituted was wide open to just the sort of abuses which came. He was told that, memorandums were sent to him and when we come to it, when the charges before the courts are disposed of then we will let the Minister of Health defend himself if he can. And I hope we will get the truth out of the whole situation. Because I say, Mr. Speaker, I say that what we see in the Public Works Department

MR. ROBERTS: is but the tip of the iceberg. And now this government comes - the government has refused to make public the list of Rural Development Authority applicants, refused giving them public money. And if it is justified to give it to them why not? There is going to be no savaging of any individual and there never has been and never will be anymore than there is any savaging of the people who are given liqueur licenses or the people who get loans from any other bank. You can go down and look it up but these mortgages are not registered, there are no instruments registered at any of the public registries in this Province. The money is lent in secret. We do not know on what terms it is lent. We do not know to whom it is lent or for what purpose it is lent. We do not know if we are going to get it back. We do not even see an annual report. The RDA does not even file annual reports here in this House. All we are left are poor dumb animals to pony up the cash and maybe to express the pious hope that everything is okay. Just to pony up like poor blind, dumb animals. Well that is not the rule of this House, Mr Speaker nor have this government any authority or any right to ask for it not

Mr. Roberts.

on their record. If ever there was a crowd of bunglers and incompetence and maybe more than that. We will find out in due course whether there was more or not. But at the very least on the facts on the record now the present administration have shown themselves to be bunglers and incompetent, flinging public money away. And I am not even talking about things like the Lower Churchill. I could go on on the \$80 million that have been wasted on that on a mad folly of a dream. And they would not even listen a year ago when we told that it was mad folly. But I am talking of the day to day administration, the short of administration that led the Public Works department - and I believe deliberately - to breach the Public Tenders Act - that is what I believe - deliberately and consciously with ministerial approval to try to breach the Public Tenders Act to favour a few specific contractors. And we will find out why. Eventually we will find out where all those other television sets went to and the rifles and all the other things that have not come out yet. We will find out where they went.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do not be ridiculous.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, so the minister is ridiculous. It damn well is ridiculous. It is public money. Millions of dollars flung away, 200 work orders - was it? - for \$600,000. And if that was not a deliberate attempt, first of all to get around the law, and secondly to favour one individual contractor, if that was not a deliberate and a conscious knowing attempt what was? What could it have been. It was not accidental. Two hundred work orders for a \$600,000 job. I am told that there are twelve strings of lights - is it? - out in that hangar in Torbay with nine lights in each, and there were eleven work orders issued in respect of it. Now what could that have been except a deliberate, a knowing, a conscious, blatant attempt to get around the law, the law of which this administration used to boast, the Public Tenders Act, and to get around it for the benefit of one company, because is it not interesting that this one company keeps showing up. Oh, there were fifteen or sixteen companies on the list. In Corner Brook yesterday I spoke with one of the principals

Mr. Roberts.

in another of the companies. He told me that he got \$1,000 work last year, and he said that is all it ought to have been. It was an emergency and we did the job and we were paid the \$1,000, and that was two separate work orders. One, for \$100 and one for \$800 or \$900 - a company in Western Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, this administration have forfeited the right to ask for the confidence of the House in this sort of programme. They should be coming in and amending the bill by saying we are going to accept a requirement that we present to the House each year a list of where the money went, and how much we are getting back. There is not even an annual report. Where is the annual report of the RDA? The minister gets up and makes a speech, well and good, more power to him, but he only gives us what he wants to give us. He puts the best gloss he can on it. That is his job. We expect that. It does it well, and more power to him. But where is the list; where is the accounting to the public; where is the dedication to the principle that the House rules; where is the tender concern for the way in which public money was spent? I have long felt that the RDA was a great patronage, and was being used by the administration for low partisan reasons. And everything which I have heard over the last three or four years has confirmed that, and this bill just puts the caps stone on it. The administration are not acting as men who have nothing to hide. They are acting in every sense like men who have something to hide, and they are hiding it, and they are now bringing in this bill which is as offensive and as abusive of the powers of this House as any piece of legislation could be. I suppose the minister will give us his reason for it. I regret I was not here last evening to hear him move second reading. I suppose he will give as his reason administrative convenience. It is easier for him to approve it. Well, that is the sort of reason, you know. - I could use a very offensive analogy, I will not, because it is not -

MR. NEARY:

It would be out of character.



MR. ROBERTS: No, it would not be out of character.

It would be offensive to the minister - of course, not. The minister is offensive by his very presence. If we had a minister who showed some concern or some courage or some compassion we would be much more interested in him. The Minister of Health, Sir, has made a disaster of every department he has ever turned his hand to. He is now ruining what was a first-class Department of Health. And the health services in this Province, Sir, are showing the effects of it.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to get side-tracked into minor gain. This bill, Sir, this act, this line of administrative convenience, Sir, that is when the House should stand up and be cautioned, whenever you are told to do it for administrative convenience. The most administratively convenient thing would be to dispense with the

MR. ROBERTS: House of Assembly. Administratively a dictatorship is by far and away the most convenient system. Why bother with all this nonsense of Cabinet? Why bother with elections? They are inconvenient, they are loose, they are sloppy, they are imprecise, they sometimes do not get settled quickly, they are not predictable. All the things the bureaucratic mind does not like are represented here in this House. And that is the reason we have a House of Assembly. Administrative convenience - for a couple of hundred loans a year - Cabinet are not that busy - nothing Cabinet are doing that would prevent them from hearing the Minister of Rural Development saying, 'Boys we have another list of recommendations here. They seem in order to me and they have been cleared by the RDA, and they all seem to be straightforward, they are within the rules, they have been checked by the officials,' and then somebody will look at it and say, 'Very well, let us make an order of approving them.' And that is just what happens. But now that will not be necessary. The minister could do it in the dark of night. He has got his friends on the RDA, his political friends - two of his Cabinet colleagues, and Mr. Lloyd Archibald, an estimable gentleman - runs a grand hotel in Harbour Grace in which I have often had the pleasure of staying and taking a meal, and I recommend it highly - well known to Your Honour I am sure - but also a man who is an extremely close personal friend of the Premier and of course that is why he is on the RDA today. And I do not hold that against him, but let us recognize the situation for what it is - and there will be two other appointments in due course - probably gentlemen of the same calibre and for the same reason.

So, Mr. Speaker, the minister comes in now and wants power so that he and his friends can make loans of public money without accounting to anybody, without even revealing the names - he could lend it to his wife if he wanted to and we would never find out about it unless something shows up in the mail which things

MR. ROBERTS: do from time to time. It is amazing how often my post office box produces tidbits in plain brown envelopes from Confederation Building. The gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) as well has much the same experience. It is amazing how often the 'phone calls come from somebody that - 'I cannot give you my name, but look at something - look at this - ask some questions.' How the television set thing came out - whatever the inquiry result is I do not know. What the Chief Justice will say we will find out, but that is how it came about - nothing secret - just anonymous tips from public servants who are fed up with the way this government is running it, who see the abuses, who see the patronage, who see the waste and the inefficiency - the sort of thing that went on in Bonne Bay, the sort of thing that has gone on in the Public Works Department, the sort of thing that went on in the Fisheries Department. And we have not started on some other departments yet. And now the Rural Development Authority asks for more money, more power. The minister wants more power. He should be asking for less. He should be accounting for what he has and he has not. My colleagues, Sir, have stated our position - we oppose it. I will oppose it, we will all oppose it as strongly as we can. It is not a minor piece of legislation. It seems innocuous, it seems innocent, but, Sir, it contains within it very dangerous seeds. It is very offensive, it is very wrong. And I would say to private members opposite who are not bound by the Cabinet, men like the gentleman from Exploits (Dr. Twomey) I hope he will speak on this. I have not said a word against the principle of rural development - I am all for that, but what I do speak against is the way in which this government carries it out, the way in which this government administers public funds, the way in which they are wasting our money. They are driving our taxes up. I could go on the aircraft. Oh, we could talk about the way in which aircraft are used. By the way, it was not Star Lake, it was Partridge Lake that the famous hunting trip was on. There were three helicopters there. There was a private camp that was made available.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS:

Pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Stag Ridge.

MR. ROBERTS:

Stag Ridge is it? And the slaughter that went on and was paid for out of public funds - and of course it was. It is the helicopters that we referred to last week - there were three. I have the registration numbers. If we want a public inquiry let us have one. The gentleman from Exploits (Dr. Twomey) would agree with me on that.

Mr. Speaker, the bill is wrong, it is offensive, it should be withdrawn. We will oppose it. We have given our reasons and our reasons are founded in principle, Sir, and they are also founded in the way in which this government are handling the administration of the affairs of this Province. They are inept, incompetent, bungling and possibly, Sir, more than that - possibly more. When these inquiry reports come in that is one way to get to the bottom of it. We will find out just what the story is. It is not all ministers, not all departments. I do not say it is a conscious thing. There have been some conscious things. The Public Works thing is conscious and deliberate. No doubt in my mind on the evidence which has come out now before the Public Accounts Committee and in the Auditor-General's Report that the course of events there was a deliberate and well thought out attack on the principle of public tenders. It was trying to get around it to benefit one or two specific - I think there is really one firm or one corporate group of firms that obviously raises the question, Why, Who got what? Somebody got something. Somebody got something - there is no doubt about that. There can be no doubt. The course of events is suggestive only of one conclusion and when we get the report of the Commission of Inquiry - the Royal Commission - then we will know. But, Sir, this administration have made no case in support of this bill. In fact, Sir, everything that they have done and said - everything that they have done and said is supportive of only one conclusion, supports only

MR. ROBERTS: one result and that is that this bill should not be adopted by this House, Sir. We will vote against it and we ask the government, Sir, to withdraw it, to take it back. The Rural Development Authority if it is functioning properly, can function without this, and if it is not functioning properly it ought not to be allowed to function in the dead of night in secrecy and everything else. The bill goes against everything that we on all sides in this House should hold dear. And we will oppose it, Sir. It is our duty and we will do it with a heart and a half. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I think I should have a few words to say on this particular bill. I cannot seem to find it there among everything that is on my desk. I guess it was distributed - some members have it. But I did get a chance to glance through it

Mr. Callan:

there this morning, and I concur with what the Leader of the Opposition just had to say about the bill. Of course, before that we heard from the member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) and his objections to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat what I had to say in earlier speeches regarding the Department of Rural Development. In earlier speeches I condemned the department for taking so long the period from the time that somebody applied for a loan until they got the word back that it was either rejected or approved, in some instances it took months. And the reason for that, one of the reasons at least is because the Department of Rural Development had to, if it involved the sawmill, for example, the loan for a sawmill, then the Department of Rural Development had to go to the Department of Forestry and ask the people there to do some studies and so on, and then provide them with some facts and figures. If a Rural Development loan had something to do with a fisheries project then the Department of Rural Development had to go to the Department of Fisheries and get some facts and figures, sometimes taking months as I said to get the information back. This is one of the things that - as I indicated earlier I do not think that the Department of Rural Development, Mr. Speaker, is doing anything, I do not think that that department is doing anything that could not be done just as effectively and perhaps more effectively by the existing departments.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if we are going to bring in a bill here, we bring in a bill to abolish the Department of Rural Development, because as I said it is not developed in the rural areas of this Province -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN: That is my opinion.

MR. MORGAN: Abolish Rural Development.

MR. CALLAN: Abolish it, and farm out to the department which can easily handle it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Simmer down 'Jim'. Simmer down, 'Jim'.

- MR. MORGAN: Unbelievable!
- MR. CALLAN: Money that is being provided now by the Department of Rural Development to finance -
- MR. MORGAN: Let us tell all Newfoundlanders that.
- MR. CALLAN: To finance the small fisheries projects -
- SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!
- MR. CALLAN: - could just as easily be carried out and handled by the Department of Fisheries. The money that is now being handled and being handed out by the Department of Rural Development for small farm projects could just as easily, and perhaps more efficiently -
- SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!
- MR. CALLAN: - be handled by the Department of Agriculture.
- SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!
- MR. CALLAN: Money that is being channelled into sawmills in this Province could just as easily be channelled from the Department of Forestry, Forestry and Agriculture.
- MR. MORGAN: Does your colleague agree with you?
- MR. FLIGHT: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.
- MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): A point of order has been raised.
- MR. FLIGHT: My hon. colleague here has the right to be heard in silence. Would you please ask the Minister of Transportation to be quiet and accord him that courtesy?
- MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): To my knowledge the hon. member has not requested that courtesy.
- MR. FLIGHT: No I request it on his behalf, Sir. I could not hear what he was saying.
- CAPT. E. WINSOR: Well that is your personal opinion then.
- MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, -
- MR. MORGAN: Would the hon. member allow a question? Would you allow a question?
- MR. CALLAN: I hope it is about the Southwest Arm Road.
- AN HON. MEMBER: Or Markland.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to have seen the hon. gentleman as the official spokesman on rural development for his party, and for the Opposition in the House of Assembly. A clear understanding now that the official position of the party and the Opposition is that they would introduce a bill, like to introduce a bill to abolish the Department of Rural Development altogether.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister is trying to trap me, and I will not be trapped. Obviously what I am doing here this morning is standing up without any notes, without even having the bill in front of me because as I said I cannot find a copy of it, but in my opinion, and I stated this before in the House, this is not something new that I am saying this morning, I said it in a speech about a month ago when the estimates were going through for the Department of Rural Development, I simply said, and I repeat again this morning especially that the minister is asking for more powers. What I am saying and I repeat it again is that I do not think there is anything happening in the Department of Rural Development that could not already being happening and was not already happening -

MR. MORGAN: You are retracting it now. You are thinking -

MR. CALLAN: No I am not retracting it. I am repeating it.

MR. MORGAN: You would like to see the department abolished, you said.

MR. CALLAN: I am repeating it.

AN HON. MEMBER: The minister abolished.

MR. MORGAN: No the department, not the minister, the department.

MR. CALLAN: If this department, Mr. Speaker, were functioning in an imaginative manner which it should be, if it were functioning in an imaginative manner, if there were some imagination shown, but what imagination does it take to dish out money for a beauty parlor and all of the other silly nonsense. Money that has never been paid back, and it will never be paid back. The money that is being dished out for sawmills as I am saying, and I repeat it, could just as easily be



June 10, 1977

Tape 4141 (Morning)

PK - 4

Mr. Callan:

dished out to

Mr. Callan.

the Department of Forestry and Agriculture. Money for farming projects could just as easily be channelled through the Department of Forestry and Agriculture. Money for the small fish filleting plants and so on could just as easily be channelled through the Department of Provincial Fisheries. That is simply what I am saying, and I repeat it in case the Minister of Transportation and Communications does not understand what I am saying.

Mr. Speaker, in an earlier debate, while the estimates were going through on the Department of Rural Development, a motion was brought in that the minister's salary be reduced to \$1. I did not bring it in. But it just shows how hon. members feel about this department that seems to have so much secrecy surrounding it. I asked on numerous occasions if the minister would table information showing how many repossessions there were in the Department of Rural Development last year, how many repossessions this year? How do they line up? Are the number of repossessions getting larger? Why? What is the reason for these repossessions? Have the loans been made erratically? Have they been not based on good sound business ideas? These are the questions that I have asked, and these are the questions that I would like to see answers to. Mr. Speaker, this bill, An Act To Amend The Department Of Rural Development Act, as I said, I disagree with this sort of a bill giving the minister so much power. The requirement of approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council for loans, grants, etc., under Section 7 would be removed by this amendment. The relevant provision at present reads as follows: The powers, functions and duties of the minister extend to and include the supervision, control and direction, without duplicating or controlling the functions of other departments and agencies of the government of all matters relating to, notwithstanding the provisions of the Crown Guarantee and Loan Act, 1973, but subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council and to such terms and conditions if any. That they are asking to be changed. And as I said earlier,

Mr. Callan.

Mr. Speaker, I think that it is giving too much power to the minister. I think again, of course, as I said yesterday when I spoke on a bill there regarding another matter, that these bills are trying to be rushed through. The government is trying to rush them through hoping that everybody is so sick and tired of looking at each other after four months in this House -

MR. RIDEOUT: Close her down, 'Frank'.

MR. CALLAN: - they want to close her up and shove the bills through. And I repeat again, Mr. Speaker, what I said yesterday afternoon that I look on these bills as white papers. To me they should be considered as white papers, proposed legislation, that we can have a chance to look at and study and get some input over the Summer, call the House back into session in the Fall, and then when everybody has had a chance to study these bills, and if the bill concerns teachers and education, during the Summer we can get a chance to get some input from our constituents who are in the education field. And in the case of this particular bill, we can get some input from people who have had some connection, some dealings with the Department of Rural Development, and they can tell us, as some people said last year, as they told us last year. During the by-election, the Minister of Rural Development out on the districts of Bonavista North and Ferryland and Exploits, saying to some people, If you vote for us, if you vote for the P. C. candidate, then I will see to it that you get a Rural Development loan. Unless you vote that way, the chance of getting it is slim indeed. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, whether these things happened. We have been told that they happen. We have been told. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, it probably does not have too much to do with this bill, but I have been told that that very same minister sat on federal wharves, government wharves in the various districts and convinced some of the older people that they talked to there, that government had a way of knowing how

Mr. Callan.

the man voted in a secret ballot. Whether it has happened or not, I do not know. But where there is smoke there is fire, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to delay the proceedings of the House, but I am against this bill

MR. CALLAN: and as I said just now, and I say it once more before I sit down, that I think that most members of this House are to the point now we are sick and tired of looking at each other after four months. I think this House should - we should be given an opportunity to study these bills to get some input to ask some questions of our constituents. What do you think of this bill? And then come back in the Fall. Come back in the Fall and debate them and where we can debate them more intelligently. We have to look at them now as white papers, like the snowmobile regulations, that the public were asked to have some input into before final legislation was drafted and presented before this House.

Mr. Speaker, it is quite simple to pass these bill. It just a matter of adding an amendment if something there about that particular bill or this particular bill does not seem right and we can have arguments for and against it, then the bill can be amended as it goes through Committee.

So I look upon them as white papers. I think that the government should consider this seriously, the idea of giving us an opportunity to study them, not hand them out one day and ask us to vote on them the next. But give us an opportunity to study them over the Summer, come back in the Fall when we can talk about them more intelligently with some input from the public that are concerned about these bills just as we are, then we can talk about them, and we can vote on them intelligently.

Mr. Speaker, I am against the bill and I am against the way the government is trying to rush this bill and others through this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, before making my remarks, let us be clear and let us make it abundantly clear what we are talking about and what this bill is asking us to do. I think it is very important that we are all very, very clear on the bill. The bill is very short, probably one of the shortest bills that has come before this Legislature in this present session. And all it is asking, very, very simple, very straightforward, very plain, all it is asking, Mr. Speaker, is that the words, "approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council" and that is it, be removed from the bill, the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council be removed from the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few comments on this because I have probably been more closely associated with Rural Development, probably not but I think I have anyway, than a lot of other members. I have made it my business to get involved, to try and promote Rural Development loans and grants in my district and in a good many cases in co-operation with the minister we have been successful.

I also want to make it clear, Mr. Speaker, and I make no bones about making it clear, that I want to get out of the House of Assembly as quick as I can, like a lot of other members. I want to get home to my district and to start doing some work in my district. I feel that since we have been here in February we have been here long enough. I am staying in a hotel like a lot of other members here and it is costing us an arm and a leg to even exist in St. John's when we have homes in our own district so I want to make it very clear that I want to get home as quick as I can.

But, Mr. Speaker, we on this side are going to be here until Christmas to stop this bill. We will be here the whole Summer and it does not bother us one single bit. We will stay here until Christmas if necessary. Mr. Speaker, we have not been involved in obstruction tactics since legislation came before this House. There has been only one or two pieces of legislation that we have taken objection to and spoken about. In most cases,

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, we have been very, very co-operative, made our few remarks and gone along with legislation and in a lot of cases only the Opposition spokesman on this side has gotten involved in the various pieces of legislation coming before the House. Yesterday morning a prime example, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing brought in three or four bills, I spoke for only a few minutes on each bill, and the bills went ahead

Mr. White.

with our approval, and that has been the case for just about every single piece of legislation or every single amendment that has come before this House so far. But, Mr. Speaker, we made a calculated decision to oppose this bill. We are now doing it. Some of my colleagues have spoken. Others intend to speak, Mr. Speaker, and we are going to keep objecting and opposing this bill until it is withdrawn by the government, because it is totally unnecessary and totally irrelevant to the operations of the Department of Rural Development. If the bill were relevant, if it were going to do something to expedite rural development in this Province, then fine and dandy we would go along with it. But in this case all it does is give additional power, total supreme power to the minister, and we do not want that, and we are not going to go along with it. It is against every principle, Mr. Speaker, that this Legislative Assembly stands for. It is against the principles of democracy. It is against the principles of parliamentary government. You have a Cabinet who hold total responsibility for what goes on with respect to government activity. It has long been the principle, Mr. Speaker, that when a Cabinet Minister takes an oath, he agrees that he will go along with collective decisions of the Cabinet. The ministers sit in session in the Cabinet Room, they argue, they debate, they disagree, and they agree. But after they emerge from that Cabinet meeting, Mr. Speaker, they have to all go along with the collective decision that the Cabinet has made. And if any member, as we have seen down through the years, down through history, if any disagrees with the collective decision taken by the Cabinet, then he must write out his resignation and pass it in to the Premier. That is the system of parliamentary government that we have in this Province, Mr. Speaker, and I am here to uphold it, and I will supposing it takes me the whole Summer to do that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: Now, Mr. Speaker, I have been after the Minister of Rural Development on a number of occasions to speed up the



Mr. White.

process of Rural Development grants and loans, and only a few days ago I was after him again to speed up a particular Rural Development grant and loan programme for a company in my district that is going to result in at least another five jobs coming into play right off the bat. I talked to the minister about it, and I thank him for his co-operation, and he is going to try and expedite the approval or disapproval, whatever the case might be, of that particular application. The same has been with a number of other applications that I have had from my own district, Mr. Speaker. I have gone to the minister or his officials to try and get the system speeded up and so on.

And, Mr. Speaker, I would vote for this bill if I knew that it was going to speed up the process, but I cannot now, Mr. Speaker. It gives too much power to the minister. You cannot give a Minister of the Crown this kind of power. It has to be a collective decision. If a decision is made to make a loan, what are the other ministers of the Cabinet going to say about it. How do they feel about loans being made without their knowing about it? I mean it is crazy, Mr. Speaker, and it is a crazy system, and it is a crazy piece of legislation, and we have to stop it, and we are determined to stop it.

Mr. Speaker, I have had - I do not know - the minister read out last year how many Rural Development loans and grants had gone to my particular district in one year, the year previous. I think it was something - I do not know - fifty or sixty. I am not sure how many it was. But let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, not one single person or group who have received Rural Development loans and grants have ever said to me, Look, is my name going to be made public? Not one has ever said that to Mr. Speaker. The thought here and the rationale being given out by the minister and by others is that if the names were being made public, it would slow down the Rural Development process in this Province. It would retard development in rural Newfoundland. That is not so, Mr. Speaker. I do not think there is a single person who has received a Rural Development

Mr. White.

grant or loan who would mind a single bit having his name made public. Every other thing that we have asked for here, Mr. Speaker, in this House or just about every other thing has been made public. All the estimates went through. And the only real trouble we had in the estimates, Mr. Speaker, was in this particular department. The names of people who are receiving grants and loans from the government from Rural Development are not being made public. We do not know what they are, and we want to know what they are. I mean what kind of a stage have we reached in this Province where that kind of information can be hidden away? What kind of development is going on here today? Why must it be that a person who comes to the government to get a loan wants to keep his name secret? I do not think there are very many. So if none of the people who are getting loans and grants want to have their names kept secret,

MR. WHITE: then who does? Does the minister? Does the Cabinet want those names kept secret? If so, why? There must be a reason. If there is nothing to hide, Mr. Speaker, if there is nothing to hide and if the people involved do not want to keep their name secret then what is the rationale for keeping those names from the public forum. I do not think they should be kept from the public forum and I do not think that they should be kept from the public forum, and I think, Mr. Speaker, it is going to get to the stage where this is going to create such a bug on the back of the government they are going to eventually break down and start giving out the names of people who are receiving grants and loans from Rural Development.

In this House this year the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) tabled the list of the people who had received grants or loans from the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation which are far greater and far bigger loans and grants. That list was tabled here. On that list were names that we had not known about before but there were no repercussions from the tabling of that list, not a single repercussion. There are just as many people today trying to get grants and loans from Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation as there were before that list was made public and I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, the same thing would apply if the names of people who are getting grants and loans from Rural Development were made public.

Mr. Speaker, this is a new period of political history making if you will, in this Province. I think the people of Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, are looking for clean government. The people of Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, are looking for clean politicians. The people of Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, are looking for hon. politicians. They want everything above board. It is a new era of politics in Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, if there is one thing that members have to make sure they do while they are members of this House is

MR. WHITE: to keep their noses absolutely, totally clean.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. WHITE: Because that is what the people are asking for and that is what the people are demanding. The stage of decline in the image of politicians I think, Mr. Speaker, is turning around. It is turning around because we are now seeing in places like Ontario where the Liberal Party spent less than \$300,000 to get elected, or not get elected but become the official Opposition yesterday, it is a milestone in political campaigning and the most populous province in Canada and those are the kinds of things that are happening everywhere, Mr. Speaker.

In the United States, Congress has put stringent controls on all members of Congress. They are now not allowed to make any more than \$1,000 besides what they make from their congressional salaries.

So, Mr. Speaker, the people of Newfoundland are demanding decency in politics. They are demanding cleanliness in politics and they are demanding that everything be above board and that everything be open to public scrutiny and that is why there is an opposition here and that is what we are doing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me make one thing clear and that is we on this side are totally in favour of rural development in Newfoundland. We want to see as much of it as we can. And goodness knows if I should not be the one saying that because if there has been a successful rural development then it has been in my own district. There are two or three cases that are fantastic examples of where the Rural Development Department have done good things and it is working. But not one single place, not one of those cases would the people involved care one single bit if their names came before this Legislature because they are honourable people. They made honourable applications and they are carrying on honourable jobs. So I cannot for the life of me understand or see why the government sees fit to bring in this kind of legislation, asking us to

MR. WHITE: give the Minister of Rural Development total power for the loaning of money in this Province, collectively as a Cabinet. That is hard enough to take when we are not getting the names. That is difficult enough to accept in the swallow when we are not getting the names. But, Mr. Speaker, we are being asked to give total authority to the Minister of Rural Development for loaning money to people throughout this Province. We are not going to do it, Mr. Speaker. Not for a moment are we even going to consider giving the minister this kind of authority. We have fifteen or sixteen ministers of the Crown. They should take collective decision for what loans are made to people throughout this Province. The Minister of Finance does not mind getting up and telling us about the loans or showing in the Public Accounts that are tabled in this House, the loans that are made by his department. There are a number kicking around the Province. We all know what they are. There is no need for me to bring them up, loans that are made. They are here. We can talk about them. We debate them. But we use discretion, Mr. Speaker. We do not stand up and rip somebody apart just because they got a loan from the government. That is not the way we like to act and like to do things. We like to see ourselves as people who have some degree of responsibility, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. White:

responsibility, Mr. Speaker. And we will only ask questions and bring up matters before this House if we feel they should be.

Now we think, Mr. Speaker, we think that this bill should be withdrawn, should be taken back. There is no emergency in this Province at the moment to require this kind of legislation. We feel that the government should give second thoughts to this and pull it back right away. There is absolutely no need for it to go through. If they want they can use their majority to bully this through the House over our dead bodies, Mr. Speaker, because we are going to be against this one I can assure you. And we do not care if we are here for the rest of the Summer in Committee or however long it takes for us to stop this then we are going to do it. We have made that decision. We are going to stick by that decision. And not a single other piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker, that has come before this House so far this year were we as determined on as we are on this one.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it would not be a loosing face for the government to withdraw this particular bill. Let me give you an example. Earlier in this session the government brought in a Statistics Bill, Newfoundland and Labrador Statistics Agency was set up, that was earlier in this session, and one of the powers or one of the clauses in that particular bill, Mr. Speaker, was that the minister shall carry on such investigations to obtain statistical information as he shall see fit. And that was one of the clauses. I remember it very distinctly and very plainly, Clause 2 (b) of that Statistics Bill that came before the House. And that clause as I said gave power to the minister to carry on such other statistical surveys as he deemed necessary. I stood here, Mr. Speaker, and I said I was opposed to that. And in Committee I moved the motion that that particular clause be stricken out, be taken out, and that the minister not be given any more power than was outlined in the legislation.

Mr. White:

Now we were offered a compromise. The Minister of Justice said, Okay, the House Leader said, Okay we will take out the word 'minister' and we will put in Clause 2 (b) that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council will carry on such other surveys for statistical information as is required. And we said, No. Take it out. We do not even want the Cabinet to be able to start finding out things about Newfoundlanders that is not required in the legislation that was brought in. And eventually a day or so later the Government House Leader, the Minister of Justice withdrew that clause completely. He took it out of the bill completely. And that is what we are asking now to have this bill withdrawn, take it back, we do not want to see it come before the House any more, throw it out, tear it up, burn it, because we do not want to see it here. We are not going to support it. We are going to object to it. We are going to filibuster if that is what you call it, and I do not mind saying it, Mr. Speaker, or Madam Speaker, that is a new one on me.

So, Mr. Speaker, as I said we want the government to withdraw this bill, and I will emphasize once again that we have not been obstructing here in this House since legislation has been going through. We have not been getting up on every single piece of legislation saying we are not going to go for it. All our members have not been speaking on every single piece of legislation. Usually it is only the spokesman that has been dealing with legislation unless there was a particularly important or controversial bill. So, Mr. Speaker, although this is a small bill in terms of its length and in terms of the amount of paper it contains, it is only one paragraph, three and a half lines, it is asking us, Mr. Speaker, to take away the words "the Lieutenant-Governor in Council" and leave the minister with total responsibility for giving out grants and loans in this Province.

Mr. White:

No, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to go forth, we are going to fight it, we are going to filibuster, we are going to speak, we are going to talk, we are going to talk about it publicly until this bill is withdrawn by the Government House Leader. And I say to the Minister of Justice, the Government House Leader, my good friend that if he wants to expedite and to get the legislation proceeding through the House on a systematic regular basis, and get it all through, and get it debated within the next four or five or six days and get it all passed then I say to him now do not be so stubborn, take this bill out, tear it up, and then the House can proceed with its work as we have been doing for the last two or three weeks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I am only going to speak very briefly on this particular bill.

AN HON. MEMBER: Filibuster.

MR. FLIGHT: It is not on the bill itself. We will filibuster in Committee. Wait for Committee. And it is not on the bill itself, Mr. Speaker, it is on the principle of the bill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, here is the minister coming into this House and asking that we give, the House give up the right, the Cabinet give up the right of deciding as to whether or not programmes are going to cost this Province money.



MR. FLIGHT: Give up the right and put that right into the hands of the minister. Well where do we stop, Mr. Speaker? Why does not the Minister of Highways or the Minister of Municipal Affairs come in with an amendment or with a bill and say that for expediency sake I want the right to decide what town councils will get water supplies or I want the right to decide what monies will be spent in this Province in my department. Why does the Minister of Highways not come in with an amendment and suggest for expediency sake let me decide what roads we will pave this year.

Mr. Speaker, the principals of this bill are frightening. We are moving faster - it is the fastest thing that we have ever seen in this House that would move us to a dictatorship. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have heard over the last year and a half the Minister of Rural Development criticized for the way his programmes have been administered. I have not been one of the people who stood up and demanded names. I do not care who gets Rural Development loans as long as we believe, as long as we have enough faith in the administration to know that Rural Development is not being used for gross pork barreling, for gross political patronage. I am aware of some project that has been approved by Rural Development that is exactly the opposite, that is good programmes created employment and done the thing that the department was set up to do. And, Mr. Speaker, let me say from the very outset that I am totally in agreement with the - and I support the Rural Development concept. It is probably the salvation for Rural Newfoundland. In years to come it will probably be the route that we will have to go to maintain a viable and prosperous economy.

But the thought of the minister coming in and suggesting and asking for the approval of this House to give him the sole, absolute, complete right to decide what programmes to fund is unbelievable, the power grab is unbelievable. I am surprised that the ministers and we have five, six, seven ministers sitting there, I am surprised that they would be prepared to have a member of their

MR. FLIGHT: Cabinet have that type of power, have that type of right to make that type of decision. What are they there for? Simply to administer to their own departments or are they there to collectively govern Newfoundland? What the minister is asking for is that the ministers will suddenly lose the voice in the administration of this Province in this particular programme, in this particular division. It is unbelievable, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister also bring in the amendment later on to have the same right with the Newfoundland Development Corporation? That he will decide what programmes the Newfoundland Development Corporation will fund? Will he bring an amendment in later on suggesting that he would have to complete and sole right to decide how the repossessions under Rural Development will be disposed off?

Mr. Speaker, I have had on a few occasions the occasion to stand up and criticize the administration of Rural Development. I spend a few minutes when the minister's estimates were going through the House criticizing the way the repossessions under the Rural Development Authority, under the Rural Development Act are administered, how they are disposed off, the repossessions are disposed off? And the minister came back - he was out of the House obviously listening, and he came back and he was very annoyed and he said some very unkind things and indicated that - I think he said something like a schoolboy debate or we should have better sense.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have not made a point of continuing demanding that we name the people who get the loans, that we justify. And there are areas in this Province where the disposition of reassessment should be justified and the method used should be justified. When we are talking about \$10,000, \$12,000 or \$15,000 be it pieces of equipment sitting in - one person can have it for three years and not pay a cent and another person six months and it is repossessed. And then that piece of equipment, something as

MR. FLIGHT: delicate as a sawmill and a planner is thrown out in the Highways Depot yard and allowed to rust for six months. And then we find it changes hands in very mysterious ways, and , Mr. Speaker I think that could stand scrutiny.

I am looking forward to hearing the minister say, to expedite, to expedite the administration, to expedite the efficiency of the department. Well why does not every minister stand up and admit that by having to clear something through Cabinet it is blown down. What does the Minister of Public Works - what gives the Minister of Public Works the same power? Why does he not bring in a bill and ask for the same rights and the same power and then he would not have to worry about what he has been listening to here this past two weeks about the abuse in the public tendering system. He would have the absolute, supreme power answerable to nobody. Of course the danger in this kind of a debate or this kind of an argument is that the minister concerned would take a personal offence and that is the last thing I would want.

MR. FLIGHT: I have a great deal of respect for the Minister of Industrial Development, a great deal of respect for his integrity, a great deal of respect for his approach to Newfoundland and to rural Newfoundland and I have no desire at all to - in stating my arguments - no desire at all to indicate or to have the minister believe that I would want to criticize him personally for his personal administration.

But from the minister's point of view, from the point of view of a minister of this Crown it is unbelievable that we would have come so far so fast in asking for what amounts to nothing short of dictatorial rights. And, Mr. Chairman, I think that is enough on the principle of the bill. It is not a case of filibustering at this stage. But I assure the hon. minister sitting opposite that this bill will not pass this House. We will filibuster it until September. So either withdraw it, there has been jokes gone back and forth, there has been minor threats and threats of "We will do this, we will do that," but it is decided and if the press wants to take the attitude and report it, it is decided that this bill will not see the light of day. We will sit here until September and it will be at great personal sacrifice, like the member for Lewisporte (Mr. White) pointed out, it will be at great personal sacrifice but we believe enough in the principle involved here where we will deny any minister the supreme right to decide what programmes or what projects in this Province get funded, without even being responsible to Cabinet.

I am amazed that the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Social Assistance, the Minister of Environment, the Minister of Forestry, is prepared to give any colleague that kind of right.

I understood that Cabinet collectively decided what happened in this Province and if any one Cabinet minister disagreed with approach that at least he had the right to argue and there is such a thing as Cabinet solidarity and I know ministers that have had to be associated with a programme

MR. FLIGHT: that they disagreed with. But at least they had the right to come out with that disagreement, to fight the decision in Cabinet and then of course they were hon. men and stood by the decision. Now they are not even going to have a chance to decide to have any input to suggest it is wrong. The minister is going to have the complete and absolute right, and I would suggest that if we are going to go that way then let every minister in the department, the fifteen ministers, bring in amendments. Why should the Minister of Municipal Affairs have to go to Cabinet to fund a programme if the Minister of Industrial Development has got that right? Why should he?

AN HON. MEMBER:

MR. FLIGHT: You are talking about per capita rights already under legislation. But why should the minister have the right to decide which community will be funded this year, which community or town in Newfoundland will millions of dollars be spent without consulting with Cabinet Ministers?

MR. DINN: I should not. They are major projects.

MR. FLIGHT: No but if the minister was smart he would bring in an amendment like the Minister of Industrial Development is bringing in. Why should the Minister of Forestry, why should he have to come to Cabinet and ask Cabinet for the amount of money to be spent on access roads or approve the amount of money that would be spent for experimental spraying? Why should he? Why should he not bring in a bill and say, "Gentlemen, for the purpose of expediting the operation of my department I want the sole right to decide what funds and what programmes will be funded?"

MR. DINN: If I may.

MR. FLIGHT: It had better be short.

MR. DINN: With respect to special grants in the department. You know that is up to, I do not know what the budget says this year for it, but

MR. DINN: \$1 million or \$2 million. You know they are done to different municipalities across the Province.

MR. FLIGHT: All right that is special grants, there is legislation already covering special grants.

MR. DINN: You cannot do it like buying a horse.

MR. FLIGHT: There is legislation already covering special grants, Mr. Speaker, in Municipal Affairs. We could take every minister who is responsible for spending the public money and there is no reason, it would be no different that if every minister brought in an amendment asking for the right and the ultimate power to decide what programmes under his department are funded, what monies are spent, and then why would we need a Cabinet, Mr. Speaker. We would have fifteen dictators. Why would we need this House of Assembly?

No, Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with the principle of this bill nor does anyone on this side of the House and I am serving notice on the government that we will filibuster this bill until there is no breath left in us. It is not right. I am sure the hon. ministers and the backbenchers alike on the government side must oppose this. I do not see how they ever agreed to let it come before the Houe. It abrigates. It cuts into their authority, their rights as Ministers of the Crown. It is the first step to dictatorship in this Province. And, Mr. Speaker, we will not under any circumstances, under no circumstances can I conceive of that the Opposition will permit this bill to go through.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Rural Development over the years has been severely criticized for not publishing the names of people to whom they have lent money. Now I want to line up on the side of the people who are asking for publication. I agree with the member for Lewisporte (Mr. White).

Now, Mr. Speaker, when I stood I indicated that I only intended to speak on the principle of the bill and I reserve the right, Mr. Speaker, and I serve notice on my intention, to speak

MR. FLIGHT: in Committee until I am blue in the face, at the risk of having people say that he is talking and do not know what he is talking about, talking is not germane, saying things that are not germane to the bill, but we will talk and talk and talk. We disagree with the principle, Mr. Speaker. We would not be asking for that type of authority, for that type of power, and Mr. Speaker, this bill is against all principles of democratic parliamentary democracy and we will hold this bill up in Committee. So the ministers had better get back and huddle and make a decision. And, Mr. Speaker, having said that, having said that we will not permit this bill to see the light of day I will now move an amendment to the motion by deleting the word "now" and adding the words "six months hence", seconded by the member for Stephenville (Mr. McNeil).

MR. SPEAKER (MRS. MACISSAC): Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Your Honour may wish to consider the amendment, whether it is in order.

MR. SPEAKER (MRS. MACISSAC): I would like to be relieved from my position and would like the Speaker to return to the Chair to deal with the situation at hand. A five minute recess.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): Order, please! The amendment to the motion is in order, and it says "to delete the word 'now', and adding the words "six months hence".

MR. ROBERTS: The motion would then read, Mr. Speaker, that this bill would be read six months hence.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): Six months hence. Yes. Second reading.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, if that amendment accomplishes nothing else but to give the House of Assembly, the Cabinet and everybody concerned six months to consider the implications of such amendment it will have served the purpose, Mr. Speaker.

If I recall correctly, Mr. Speaker, last night the minister used the words "administrative convenience". In submitting this amendment, this bill, to give him administrative convenience in expediting the loans under the RDA, the Rural Development Authority. Mr. Speaker, it goes without saying that no public money should be expended length or otherwise without complete endorsement of Cabinet.

Mr. Speaker, I suspect and of course I know it will not happen but I suspect that there are ministers, members of Cabinet, and equally backbenchers on government side who are opposed to this particular bill. How they ever permitted their colleague to bring such a bill before the House, they must have know what they would run into , they must have known that it was against all parliamentary democracy, they must have known that the Opposition would oppose putting that kind of power, that kind of right into the minister's hands. They must have known that the people of Newfoundland would oppose having such power vested in the hands of any one minister. Mr. Speaker, we do not have to go very far down the road with this kind of legislation, when people will start asking, Why a Cabinet, Why a House of Assembly?

AN HON. MEMBER: Why an Executive Council?

MR. FLIGHT: Why an Executive Council? If every department of government - if this House is going to acede or to give every minister



Mr. Flight:

the right to determine the programmes that he will administer the right to determine the amounts of money that he will spend on given programmes, then we would assume there will be no more Cabinet meetings. It will not be necessary. The House will come in and vote \$200 million in a yearly budget, and the amount of money that is voted to each ministry will then be the private domain, and the private domain of the minister, and he will decide on how the money is spent, what companies get the contracts or do not get the contracts.

MR. RIDEOUT: You talk about Public Works.

MR. FLIGHT: You talk about Public Works. There will be no need of a Department of Public Works if this legislation is passed, Mr. Speaker, or if we take it to its justified end. There will be no need of Public Works. Each minister will decide what programmes will be funded.

No, Mr. Speaker, as I said when I stood, I stood up to talk against this bill, the principle of the bill, not the clauses or the amendments. I again say, Sir, that we have offered the government and the minister a way out of this dilemma, and it is a dilemma. We have proposed the tabling that bill for six months and let the minister if he so decides in his wisdom to bring it before the House six months hence, let then bring it before the House six months hence. At least by doing that every member of this House will have the ability to draw their own conclusions, to seek advice as to whether we should permit this type of thing to happen. Most important, I think, Mr. Speaker, that six months will give his colleagues, the ministers in Cabinet, and his backbenchers the time to impress on the minister that this is wrong. That they are not going to be party to it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: I doubt if this amendment passes, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure it should pass that this particular bill will ever see the light of day, because it will not be the Opposition who will talk it down it will be colleagues of the hon. minister that

Mr. Flight:

will say to him, Look you have made a mistake. We are not interested in this kind of dictatorship. We are not interested in this kind of abuse of the parliamentary system. Mr. Speaker, I think that this would probably be the force that would have the minister withdraw this bill, this nauseous bill, this frightening bill. And I would implore, Mr. Speaker, all members on the other side, Cabinet ministers, all men with consciences, who know they must answer to the people, who have some concerns for our system, for the democratic system that is not prepared to put into the hands of any one man that kind of power. I would hope that members of Caucus, and members of Cabinet

MR. FLIGHT: will impress on the minister that this was wrong. That bill should never have been drafted. I am amazed that the people in Justice, the people who drafted that bill, did not draw to the minister's attention the folly of such legislation. And, Mr. Speaker, I would assume, and I know the hon. members opposite well enough to believe that they are not in favour and they will not accept this kind of legislation. And now that they have had a chance to understand exactly what power or what this legislation would mean, the rights that it gives an individual Cabinet minister. And, Mr. Speaker, having said that I would support the amendment I would ask every hon. member in the House to support the amendment. And I believe in supporting this particular amendment we will have all had time to see the folly of such legislation and I would hope that the hon. members opposite would impress on their colleague, the hon. minister, the importance, the wisdom of opposing and not permitting such a piece of legislation to come before this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. McNEIL: Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my voice to my fellow colleagues in opposing this bill. I think the bill is dangerous in that it gives too much power to the minister without any accountability. The minister may be sanctimonious, but why does the minister hide information or refuse to bring information to this House? And on that grounds if we pass the bill as is stated, as is proposed, it will be giving the minister power and he does not need to account for it before this House. Now the way I see it the minister has two choices, one, to withdraw the bill completely or to make an amendment whereby -

AN HON. MEMBER: To support the amendment.

MR. McNEIL: - or to support our amendment, and give him time to think it over and to table the loans of his department before the estimates come before the House each year. The minister has refused time and time again to give any information to my fellow



MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker,

I would just like to have a word. I thank the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) for moving an amendment.- what is it called? - a dilatory motion or something of that nature, a six month hoist - to give me a chance to have a few remarks. I introduced the bill last evening, and did not take a long time to explain the bill, because the bill is quite simple. It is asking for the authority to make decisions on the monies allocated in the Department of Rural Development without necessarily having to have the Lieutenant-Governor in Council make an approval.

Mr. Speaker, I am of the feeling here that the members on the opposite side of the House are not aware of what the process is in the department right now in having a decision arrived at. Let me just give one illustration. This has got nothing to do directly with the loan programme. Right at the moment, for example, we have an RDA 3 programme. The programme is a federal/provincial programme where there is fifty cent dollars from the Province and fifty cent dollars from Ottawa. We have a board set up. A representative of DREE, Mr. McGee, a representative of the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation, Mr. Nolan, a representative of the Industrial Development department, Mr. Eric Patey and a representative of Rural Development, Mr. Fred Cook, the director, four people on the RDA board, two federal and two provincial in a sense. These four people sit down every three weeks or so and make a decision on the grants that will be accepted by that RDA board. It is a mini-DREE board, because the projects are for capital assistance to small industries which are smaller than the DREE assistance programmes. To qualify for a DREE grant, you have to have a capital expenditure of an excess of \$25,000. Now once the board has gone through a month of assessment with the balance sheets and all of the other rigmarole, and they finally arrive at a decision, the DREE board, if you want, the mini-DREE board, the RDA board, that is the end of the ball game with Ottawa. Nobody goes to Ottawa. I would even say that the minister is not even aware of the decisions. There is no departmental input on that decision whatsoever. In order for me to get the grant approved

Mr. Lundrigan.

for the individual I have got to take it and go to Cabinet with it. It has not got to go back to the Federal Cabinet even though that particular project is funded fifty per cent by the federal government, and the decision making is controlled fifty per cent by the federal government.

Another example, for example, we have got the community projects, fifty cent dollars again, federal/provincial dollars.- community projects. If somebody comes in today for a \$1,000 decision on a slipway, because there is some kind of a project that needs to be approved, before it can be approved and decided on, even though we have got a committee to decide on it, we have got professionals to assess it, it has to received the radification of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, not to be referred to Cabinet, not to be reported to Cabinet, which was the procedure which we were always following. I have been reminded, and a number of other departments reminded that in order to get these decisions to stick strictly to the letter of the act, that I have to have the approval of Cabinet, not to report to Cabinet on it. Consequently, the efficiency in the Department of Rural Development will go down dramatically, and it has. It is only because in the last six or seven months that I have been able to almost take on a level of detail and rigmarole on a daily basis to the point of taking half my time that we have kept the thing relatively efficient. It is a disaster for a Cabinet to have to make decisions this year by having a prepared paper. Once a decision is made on a capital grant that X company out in Traytown should get \$3,000 capital assistance, having had your professional field staff, then a board, which is again a level of red tape, but a necessary one - I adhere to that - the red tape, once all that is done, then I have got to, as the minister, even though I have had no input into the decision and I do not want to, I have got to draft out a Cabinet paper, Minute-in-Council: This is to request under authority of So-and-So that a grant to Mr. So-and-So out in such and such a town be approved. Totally a formality. I have got to take it up, we have got

Mr. Lundrigan.

to get it approved. Totally a formality. I have got to take it up, we have got to have it up two days before your Cabinet meeting to meet your deadlines. The clerk has to then bring it before Cabinet. We have got to have it referred. We have got to have then a Minute-in-Council drafted, which is another document, seven or eight or ten lines long, Then it has got to be referred to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. Then an order has to come back from the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, and then I am in a position to authorize that that individual gets his grant. Now that is decision making, the red tape. If I am incompetent, if I abuse my authority, if I am not trustworthy, then I am the wrong minister. No problem, get rid of him. You cannot make decisions in a government department and have that kind of red tape. If the federal government have to have the kind of process that we have got to have in our department they would bog down on LIP projects. They would have to do nothing else,

MR. LUNDRIGAN: no policy, no nothing. I am telling you right now, in 1977 I will be required to draft about 350 Orders-in-Council to be submitted to the Cabinet asking the authority, the formality of doing it. Nobody questions it. Cabinet has never said, We disagree with the loan you are recommending, we disagree with a project you are putting up, neither one. Not one has been ever rejected, but I have to go up and to through all of this process, right through the whole system.

Two weeks come this Summer members across the way - the bloody hypocrisy is what gets me - because some who stood up today, and I was listening while I was dealing with some businessmen in the offices back here, which I am doing all day long, telling about the dictatorship. The same members all day long are at my elbow saying, Can you get that decision made, can you quickly decide. Five jobs at stake up in Lewisporte. I dragged my director up yesterday because the member for Lewisporte (Mr. White) wants a quick decision made on a company that we want to go with. We are certain, absolutely, totally certain that the company is on the road, and five jobs are going to expand to five more. We are certain it is a good project, a good little company, on the way.

He grabs me in the corner and drags me into the back room and I am foolish enough, half foolish enough to say, Yes, member for Lewisporte and I drag my director up - I would hardly do it for the Premier - to get a decision. In order to get the decision I now have to go back through the whole system and it will take me two or three weeks.

If the House recesses next week and we do not have a Cabinet on the regular basis in the Summer period, it could mean that all of our decisions



MR. LUNDRIGAN: are gone by the board and that same member will get on the air and say, What is wrong with Rural Development, they are dragging their feet? What kind of hypocrisy? What kind of statesmanship? This is one of the reasons I regret that the hon. Joseph R. Smallwood is fone out of this House. At least he could keep these members on their toes a bit, make them aware of some realism about the system.

DREE: Hundreds of millions of dollars of DREE funds are appropriated annually by the federal treasury, decided on by the federal House, by the House of Commons, by the Parliament. Do members think that every time there is a DREE grant approved, or a DREE loan approved, or a small business loan approved under DREE that it goes back to the federal Cabinet? Do members think that?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: They publish it though.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: It is made public? We are making them public in the little list of -

MR. RIDEOUT: You are not making your lists public.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: If that is what the members are arguing about, a fuss about that? That is not what they are saying. Last night the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) - and I would tell you right now, if the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir ever got any authority in this Province other than the ego trip he is on because of his bit of press right now, I would rather live in Uganda. I would immediately move my family and I would ask for residence in Uganda. I would be a lot happier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: You were doing well.

MR. FLIGHT: You were doing well but now you are gone off on your -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, last night - as

MR. LUNDRIGAN: a matter of fact, I will tell members, this morning I have asked the department - once this debate is over I am going to get the results of the debate, and I appreciate members input. I appreciated the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) last evening. He got up and he said, The member is going to have too much authority. All right, he made that comment. Then he said, We want the loans. The member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. Rowe) and made some very nice points. He even had one of those quid pro quos, and I appreciated that. The member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) who does not like red tape, does not like the system being bogged down, got up and made some comments. I appreciated that. But I must admit listening to the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir and the Leader of the Opposition, I get a little bit sick of their attitude. There is something sick about it. Down deep inside there is something sick about it.

If the members of the Opposition want the system to bog down further in red tape, what are they interested in, destroying the system? This is what we need less of today, too much red tape in governments, too much red tape in decision making. People are used to instantaneousness in their lives. They can turn on their televisions and see what is going on around the whole world. They can get decisions from their business community instantaneously. Dealing with government is ponderous, impossible almost, red tape galore. This is the biggest complaint the people of the Western World have today.

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

MR. SPEAKER (YOUNG): A point of order.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: That foolish looking man is not back again, is he?

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): A point of order has been raised.

MR. SIMMONS: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. I was on my way up to the House and I heard the ravings of the minister responsible for the concealment of information. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of External Affairs, the member for Burin-Burgeo is not in this House to defend himself. I would therefore urge, Mr. Speaker, to have the minister withdraw the villainous remarks he made about the member for Burin-Burgeo a moment ago and made reference to, he would rather be in Uganda or something to that effect. Now I think that is most unkind of the member for Burin-Burgeo who is not here to defend himself. He should be asked to withdraw.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, that is why that little member is absolutely a disaster. I have made no reference.

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes you did.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I had a misnomer in referring to the hon. gentleman from Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir. I have got great admiration from the member Burin-Burgeo.

MR. SIMMONS: You better be - the member said -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: But the member for -

MR. SIMMONS: - Burin-Burgeo.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I did yes. A misnomer or a mis -

MR. SIMMONS: Another case of where the minister does not know -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Oh, Mr. Speaker, -

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

MR. LUNDRIGAN: - tell that little man to withdraw from the Chamber, not his remarks, his presence.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, to the point of order.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: His ugly presence.

MR. SIMMONS: There is still a point of order, Mr. Speaker, and I did distinctly without, and the minister has now confirmed it, that he did indeed make a vicious attack on the member for Burin-Burgeo, the hon. Don Jamieson in his absence. How low can you

Mr. Simmons:

get, Mr. Speaker, He should withdraw it, withdraw it humbly as he can. It is shocking again. It is another example of the nonsense that the member gets on with.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): Order, please! To that point of order I feel I can rule on it without going to the tapes because to my knowledge from listening to the hon. minister that he did say, Burin-Burgeo, but he did correct himself and said Burin-Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: No he did not.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): To my knowledge. I think so. It was my understanding he was not implicating the hon. Mr. Jamieson.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS: .... the minister.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): Order, please! I have given my ruling and I feel sure that that was the impression I got from the hon. minister.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): Order, please! I have given my ruling and I will ask the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir to adhere to my ruling.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege. I believe it is my right as a member of this House, Mr. Speaker, to be referred to particularly by Mr. Speaker, by my correct district designation which for the information, Mr. Speaker, is Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, on that question of privilege, I know Your Honour stands corrected, but I think it is an absolute insult for a member knowing full well that Your Honour again made a small little slip in the pronunciation to get up and correct it. What kind of lack of respect does that individual have for the system that he is living under, absolute disrespect, arrogance, -

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): Order, please! I have given my ruling and I do not feel there is any need of proceeding with this point of

Mr. Speaker (Mr. Young):

order or private privilege. And I will ask the hon. member to continue with his speech.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, first of all we have a situation in the department it is only because of a formality, the formality to adhere to the absolute letter of the law requires that I have to refer every decision not for reporting purposes which naturally every minister would want to do but for decision making purposes to my colleagues. If somebody comes in - I had a request today, and I will just keep the peoples names out of it - for a number of chain saws. The request was not a formal request yet, but quite a number of people are enquiring as to whether they could get some assistance under the rural development loans for a number of chain saws. Now I will not mention the number, but it is a significant number. In order for me to be able to give the individual, if he cannot afford to buy a chain saw, and there are people who cannot afford to buy a chain saw I presume, in order for me to give him a loan of \$100 or \$200 I have got to go through the procedures of having the field officer go down and visit him inquire into his circumstances, whether he has a contract and the like. That is fair ball.

The second thing is that that field officer has to come back to the department, and there is within the department a Committee at the divisional level that will assess his application, that will fill out about ten pages, ticking off all kinds of questions that were answered, and formally making a report to the board. The board is, you know, it is not a non political board in a sense that it has got representation from the church and the school boards and every body else. There are three ministers, and there will be three officials from outside of government. That board then makes the

MR. LUNDRIGAN: decision on the chain saw, in order for me to say, "Yes, go ahead with the chain saw," I have got to go as far as Her Majesty, the Lieutenant-Governor to get an order back to say, "Yes." Then I have got to go to my colleague in Finance following that by the way I neglected, I left out a step, I have got to then once I get the permission from Her Majesty, I have got to then go to my colleague in Finance and say to my colleague, "I request \$200 for Mr. So and So in Lewisporte to be appropriated in order for him to get a chain saw." And because there are hundreds of those requests a day that could take a number of days or even a number of weeks. Decision making.

Members across the way are trying to stymie development. They are not interested in efficiency in decision making.

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

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Stymie development.

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

MR. LUNDRIGAN: - development. Get rid of development.

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

MR. WHITE: Sit down.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Put the Province under. That is their philosophy.

MR. WHITE: A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes on rising on a point of order I would like and ask the hon. member for Lewisporte (Mr. Neary) to respect the Chair more when he rose on a point of order.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I rose on a point of order and I was shouted down by the Minister of Rural Development and I would appreciate the courtesy of his giving me the courtesy to state my point of order. He said that members on this side were trying to stifle development in this Province. I take very, very strong exception to that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WHITE: I have done everything in my power to further development in this Province but that does not mean I give undue power to the minister.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to make that clear and I want a withdrawal from the minister.

MR. SIMMONS: Withdraw.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: That is too foolish to submit a withdrawal on.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): Order, please! To that point of order I feel it is not a point of order but a difference of opinion or more or less an explanation on the part of the member.

MR. SIMMONS: Kangaroo court.

MR. WHITE: A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): Order, please! I would ask the hon. member for Burin - Bay d'Espoir to withdraw that remark.

MR. MORGAN: Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir, to withdraw that remark. I heard it from the Chair.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. MORGAN: Withdraw it or name him. Come on.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I am waiting for Mr. Speaker to clarify which member he invited to withdraw. Is it the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir? The member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir, Mr. Speaker?

MR. MORGAN: Yes, Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): I am sorry. Yes, Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: I withdraw, Mr. Speaker, that I said, I withdraw that I said kangaroo court. And I now rise, Mr. Speaker, on a point effecting the privileges of this House.

Mr. Speaker, a moment ago my colleague from Lewisporte (Mr. White) rose in this House as is his right, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking on a matter effecting the privileges of this House.

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

MR. MORGAN: Sit down you -

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): Order, please! I want no comments from the hon. members to my left. I will hear the point of privilege raised by the member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: The point of privilege is this, Mr. Speaker. I rose on a point of order to state that the Minister of Rural Development had said while speaking that members on this side of the House, and obviously that included myself, were stifling, not trying, were stifling development in this Province. And, Mr. Speaker, my privilege here is to state that I am not stifling development in this Province, not trying to stifle development in this Province, and Mr. Speaker, I want the minister to withdraw that remark.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): Order, please! I feel it is not a point of privilege, it is just that the hon. member is trying to appeal my ruling and there are ways to appeal that ruling.

MR. SIMMONS: A point of privilege -

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): A point of privilege.

MR. SIMMONS: - effecting the privileges of the House, Mr. Speaker. A few moments ago, just before we had the point of privilege from my colleague from Lewisporte (Mr. White), he raised a point of order or he tried to do so, Mr. Speaker. He rose as is his right in this House under the rules. He did the proper thing. He said, "Mr. Speaker, a point of order." He was obliged to say it I believe four or five times. He was obliged to do that, Mr. Speaker, because if the House will observe, during that period he was repeatedly out shouted by the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan).

I believe, Mr. Speaker, the rights of that member and indeed of the House have been affected, have been contravened by one, the action of the minister in shouting him down, in not allowing him to state his point of order and



MR. SIMMONS: secondly, Mr. Speaker, I have never fathomed, I have never fathomed how Mr. Speaker can receive advice before he hears the point of privilege.

Mr. Speaker, first of all his rights have been contravened by the interference of the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) and secondly, Mr. Speaker, contravened in that the Chair undertook to lecture him for raising the point of order and I find that most unusual, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WHITE: Right.

MR. SIMMONS: It is his right, his clear right.

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

MR. SIMMONS: It is the minister who should have been lectured.

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

MR. SIMMONS: The minister who should have been lectured.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. HICKMAN: I ask that the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) be named forthwith.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): Order, please! I find in the heat of debate that members have not been respecting the Chair when order is called, and I feel that I ruled on my statement to the member for Lewisporte (Mr. White) and I feel this is not a point of privilege and I will ask the hon. minister to continue.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. minister continue.

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I apologize for the set of circumstances that have precipitated this kind of outburst, Mr. Speaker, and on behalf of my colleagues apologize for the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir area (Mr. Simmons) for his attitude, and I hope that it does not manifest itself in a bad example to our public.

Mr. Speaker, the example that comes to mind, Last evening one of my colleagues came to me and said, 'I cannot understand the reason for the Opposition - well naturally they understand this little stuff we are talking about in Rural Development because it is all relatively small decisions and they can grasp it, they can fathom it, they can get their mental capacities around it and regurgitate it somewhat. They cannot understand the major things and the big stuff, so they can get their hands around a \$20,000 and a \$5,000, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. F. WHITE:

Be relevant.

MR. SIMMONS:

A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order has been raised.

MR. SIMMONS:

As I understand it now, Mr. Speaker, there is an amendment before the Chair. The amendment is to strike the words 'now' and insert 'six months from now' so that as I understand it now, Mr. Speaker, the question that is debatable is the propriety, the advisability, the feasibility of having this matter considered six months hence instead of now. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the minister is completely irrelevant to that point in discussing our mentality over here as great and common as it might be and as important a concern as it might be to the minister. I can understand he feels threatened by it. But, Mr. Speaker, that aside it is completely irrelevant to the point under discussion which is the propriety, the feasibility, the advisability of deferring debate on a question from now until some future point in time. And I believe the minister should be instructed by the Chair to address himself to the propriety of the question.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The wording of the motion would seem to suggest that the time element only is involved, but I am sure other members will understand that the particular form of this motion in effect if passed would kill the bill, would prevent the bill from being presented to the hon. House. Accordingly, this motion therefore does get to the principle of the bill, whether or not the bill should in actual fact be presented to the hon. House for decision, and the debate therefore on this amendment is in essence the same as debate on the principle of the bill.

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

Mr. Speaker, if the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) ever had any authority you would have to have permission here to go to church if he would give God permission beforehand.

Mr. Speaker, the members last evening were saying to me - Can you imagine out in the community of Lewisporte going into the bank where the bank manager, perhaps with two or three or four years experience, and a couple of his staff, had an application to give a loan, to have to refer that loan to the regional office, and that regional office have to refer that loan to the central bank - or not the central bank - the main office in Canada -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Yes.

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

- for a three or four thousand dollar loan. This programme that we are having all the fuss over has already placed on the minister - on the department - a \$20,000 ceiling. It is placed on the grants where the department has no say except that it is represented on the board - the RDA board, \$12,500 - The bulk of our projects that we decide, the total funding for projects for 1977 - the total monies is \$800,000 which would encompass fifty or sixty projects in the Province. And Cabinet have to decide. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the opportunity to speak to the 550,000 or 560,000 people in our Province today if I could via the House of Assembly

MR. LUNDRIGAN: - on television via the House of  
Assembly on this one - to get into the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The people of our Province do not want  
to take all of the authority away from the government.

MR. SIMMONS: Would the minister permit a question?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I would not listen to the member if  
he were -

MR. SIMMONS: I did not ask him to listen to me -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: - right now wanting to call an ambulance,  
Mr. Speaker. I would have reluctance to listen to the hon. member who  
- legislature with his - behaviour.

MR. SIMMONS: I did not ask him to listen to me.  
I asked would he let me ask a question. Will the minister let me ask  
a question?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order has been called. As was pointed  
out by the Speaker a short time ago, when the Chair calls order it is  
required for the orderly proceedings of the House that hon. members  
do await the order from the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! The proceedings are getting somewhat unduly heated. The Chair does not normally intervene of course when there are interjections back and forth but when they are getting to a state where the decorum of the House is endangered then it is required that the Chair do so intervene and I would now ask hon members if they would pay due respect to the business of the House and the decorum attached to it.

MR. SIMMONS: A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order has been raised.

MR. SIMMONS: I respect your admission and I shall try to abide by it. It is difficult, Mr. Speaker, to sit here idly in committee and hear wrong information being disbursed from the minister's lips.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: (Inaudible)

MR. SIMMONS: I am about to raise that the minister is not so impatient as to listen. Mr. Speaker, I am on a point of order, Mr. Speaker and this is the kind of example of why it is a bit rowdy today.

SOME HON MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I will ask the hon gentleman from Burgeo - Bay D'Espoir to state his point of order please.

MR. SIMMONS: A point of order, Mr. Speaker, they are really tender. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Rural Development has been saying this past ten minutes how we should run this place like a business. Now she is not a business and I would like to state my point of order. But, Mr. Speaker, it being one o'clock I would move the adjournment of the debate and then I could state my point of order on the next day of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. A point of order has been raised, and the Chair has to dispose of the point of order. I do not consider that the point of order, the case put forward, does constitute a point of order.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I did not complete my point of order. It being one o'clock I assumed Mr. Speaker was about to leave the Chair. I have a fairly extended point of order, and I probably used the inappropriate motion, but I interrupted my point of order, because it was one o'clock with the understanding that I would continue it next day, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

My understanding is that if a point of order has been raised, it is to be disposed of. I understood that when the hon. member had taken his seat, that he had finished speaking to the point of order. Up to the point of what I heard I would not consider that a point of order was before the Chair. If the hon. member feels that there is a point of order to be raised, of course, he would be quite at liberty to bring it up at the next sitting of the House.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I adjourn the debate, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved that the debate now be adjourned.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that the remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred and that this House on its rising do adjourn until Monday next at ten of the clock provided that if it appears to the satisfaction of Mr. Speaker, after consultation with the government that the public interest requires that this hon. House should meet at an earlier time, Mr. Speaker may give notice that he is so satisfied and that the House shall meet at the time stated in the notice and shall transact its business as if it had been duly adjourned to that time.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved and seconded that this House do now adjourn until Monday next at ten of the clock provided that it appears to the satisfaction of Mr. Speaker, after consultation

Mr. Speaker.

with the government, that the public interest requires that the House shall meet at an earlier time, Mr. Speaker may give notice that he is so satisfied and that the House shall meet at the time stated in the notice and shall transact its business as if it had been duly adjourned to that time.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Those in favour "aye." Contrary "nay". Carried.

This House stands adjourned until tomorrow Monday at ten of the clock.