

PRELIMINARY

UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

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

THURSDAY, JUNE 9, 1977

The House met at 10:00 A.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that my colleagues have approved a programme which enables senior citizens to have free use of provincial parks. The concept of providing free use of parks to senior citizens is as a result of a number of requests in recent months from the executive of the pensioners and senior citizens of Newfoundland and Labrador. The procedure to be followed requires senior citizens age sixty-five and over to present upon entry to any provincial park their senior citizens' identification card. Upon presenting this card the holder will be offered free entry to any provincial park. Administering the programme in this way ensures the senior citizens, and senior citizens only, benefit from the free use of parks.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out that this is in keeping with government's policy to improve the lot of our senior citizens all of whom have made a worth-while contribution to the Province.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of all of us, I just want to welcome the announcement by the Minister of Tourism that senior citizens are going to be given free access to all the provincial parks in the Province. It is certainly a good gesture, and I hope that senior citizens throughout Newfoundland participate in this worth-while event, because the provincial parks are quite nice and the senior citizens would find them quite enjoyable. I would like to point out to the minister something he should do and that is to make sure that everybody in the Province, all the senior citizens are aware of this new programme so that they can write in and get their identification cards if that is the process

Mr. White.

they have to go through. For my own self, Mr. Speaker, I feel that all Newfoundlanders should seek free access to provincial parks and maybe that is down the road yet to come.

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

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to report on the last meeting of the Rural Development Authority which was just held. At the meeting we had thirty-five loans considered by the board of which twenty-three of these loans were approved for an expenditure of \$229,000 creating forty-two full-time and twenty-six seasonal jobs. The following breakdown exists: - and for the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) I have indicated to the member a dozen times that if he wants the list of projects for his riding any given time, the names and the individuals, he can come down to the department, and he can get them. That goes for any member of the present House.

We had four agricultural projects approved for \$46,000. We had two tourist based projects for \$38,000; one book publishing project for \$11,000.- that one should be able to be identified; two fish processing projects for \$26,000; one miscellaneous serving for \$15,000; two wood-working for \$20,000; two metal manufacturing for \$27,000; one miscellaneous manufacturing for \$2,000; one mechanical servicing for \$10,000; one handicraft for \$2,400 and six sawmills for \$28,000. And that

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

is a total of \$229,000.

Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet I would like to make reference to the handicraft exhibition which is presently taking place at Queen's College in the great hall. We have had a tremendous response from the public. In a word, the handicraft exhibition is the total result of the Regional Development Associations' handicraft contests that were held throughout the Province in the last several months, representing the handicraft work of five or six hundred communities in our Province. Almost the entire Province, as a matter of fact.

As a result of that contest we have the selection, which is taking place throughout the Province, of the first, second and third place winners. If I can get the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and the Premier to quieten down a little we will carry on. Mr. Speaker, we have had these contests judged. We have had the selection of the handicraft work of the people of the Province. The member for Fogo (Capt. Winsor) has indicated that he has been there and seen it. It is an unbelievable demonstration of quality work done throughout the entire Province. It is double what we had a year ago.

We have seen in the last three or four years a continuous growth in the identification by a lot of our people. Not only the elderly people, but more importantly, in many ways, the skills are being simulated by a lot of the young people as well. It is one of the best displays of handicraft, I have been advised, that has been seen anywhere in the Province and maybe in the country.

Now we have had a very good turnout from the public and I would like to invite each and every member, if they would, to take five minutes

MR. LUNDRIGAN: sometime throughout the day and drop by Queen's College and see the results of the handicraft from the entire Province. It is only a very short distance from here and I would think it would be sort of a lift for all the people who participated if members of the legislature would reinforce what they preach as their philosophy, that we should encourage this kind of development in this Province.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, it is nice to hear about a number of projects being approved and so on. The minister in his statement did not indicate how many new jobs this would mean. Does the minister have that there or not?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Yes, forty-two full-time and twenty-six seasonal.

MR. CALLAN: Seasonal? Forty-two -

MR. PECKFORD: Forty-two full-time, is it not?

MR. CALLAN: Forty-two full-time. Of course, when we say full-time we are assuming that that is if the projects are viable.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: That is right.

MR. CALLAN: Unfortunately quite often a lot of projects that are started are not viable and they fold up.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: That is right.

MR. CALLAN: It is interesting, as I say, but with an expenditure of well over \$200,000, unless the jobs are permanent, and unless that money is put to good use, there is a question mark there of whether or not the department is, as it has been used to doing, or has been doing, giving out money that is never spent wisely.

MR. CALLAN: and we do not get the returns that we expect to get. And quite often the money is never repaid to the government.

Now with regard to the handicrafts, there is no question about it. I have been associated with handicraft work for a long number of years myself through the 4H Clubs of this Province and the skills that people develop there are passed along from the young to the old.

Mr. Speaker, we are glad to hear about the forty-two permanent jobs - we hope they are permanent - and the seasonal jobs as well, but the question still remains whether or not these projects are viable and whether or not we will get returns on the hundreds of thousands of dollars that we are putting into it. For my part I hope that they are viable and I hope that it is another step in the direction of developing the rural areas of this Province.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I have a further statement.

I wish to make a statement in connection with the concern which has been expressed over a potential problem in regards to accommodations during the Canada Summer Games. Members of the House are aware that during a normal season accommodations in St. John's can be a problem. With the Canada Summer Games we can expect a marked increase in the number of visitors to the Province and in particular to St. John's. There has been concern expressed over the provision and control of private accommodations. Many people are willing to open their homes to the public, of course, for a fee or a rate. Here lies the area of concern. I have provided an exemption from the tourist establishment regulations with the understanding that the city has accepted the responsibility for ensuring that an acceptable standard is met. My department will, of course, assist in seeing that this standard is maintained. By this action I am confident that visitors to the city will, first of all, find adequate accommodation and, second, will not be charged unfair rates for the type of accommodation that they have acquired.

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that, as I say, this is a potential problem, but hopefully by taking this action as indicated, we have found a solution before the situation has been allowed to develop.

MR. SIMMONS: Would the minister elaborate for a moment? I did not quite get what exemption it was that had been decided on. What was the exemption?

MR. HICKEY: We have exempted the tourist establishment regulations. We have exempted the private homes that people may open up and offer to take people in; in other words, to rent a room, to provide meals and what have you. If we were to strictly apply the tourist establishment regulations, of course, many of them would not necessarily meet the standards that are required. But we have exempted them from the regulations as a one-shot deal because

Mr. Hickey.

of the potential problem that might arise. But we have done so with the assurance that the city will see to it that some policing is done initially before approval is given to anyone to have their names listed to provide this kind of accommodations. And my own inspection staff will assist the city officials in seeing that the standard is maintained.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES:

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I have with me here the report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts. This is for the period ending February 5. To say it another way, it relates to our findings in respect of the Auditor General's Report for the year ended March 31, 1975. By way of explanation to the House, the Committee completed its deliberations on that report some time ago, actually on the fifth day of February, and we have had a couple of in camera meetings since then for the purpose of considering our report. The report looks very thick and impressive. Let me put all members at rest by saying it is a two page report containing five recommendations from the Committee, and there is an appendix which contains the transcripts of the Committee's proceedings from November of last year until February 5 of this year.

It is my pleasure to present this, the first such report, I believe, Mr. Speaker, since Confederation to be presented to the House of Assembly, and I do so with a degree of pride on my own behalf and on behalf of the other six members of the Committee. And in so doing I would just like to say that the Committee has been functioning extremely well and the fact that we have been able to reach unanimity on the recommendations, I believe, is testimony to my statement that the Committee has been working quite well, and the atmosphere has been quite non-partisan, generally speaking.

Mr. Simmons.

We would like to acknowledge in particular our thanks to the Clerk of the Committee, Mr. Penny, and to you, Mr. Speaker, for your kind co-operation and to the Hansard staff for their co-operation in getting the reports to us fairly expeditiously. There are copies, of course, for all members of the House.

NOTICES OF MOTION:

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Local School Tax Act."

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following bills; a bill, "An Act To Amend The Registration of Deeds Act", a bill, "An Act To Amend The Companies Act."

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. R. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier who was absent on other business on Monday when we discussed the matter of the need for a public enquiry into the spending practices of the Department of Public Works. I understand from the Minister of Finance that the Premier was apprised of the situation, indeed consulted on it. I wonder now would the Premier indicate whether the terms of reference for the announced public enquiry have been drafted or if they are in process at the present time?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, yes, we have been in consultation, obviously when I was away and since I came back, and the Department of Justice are working on the terms of reference now, and equally the commissioner. And hopefully it will be done before the House adjourns within the next couple of days, not the House adjourns but the terms of reference.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Premier.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: The Premier has indicated I believe that the terms of reference will be public within a couple of days, I understood him to say. Would he indicate when the commissioner may be named? Has he any idea or are there names being considered at the present time?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: I would think, Mr. Speaker, at the same time as the terms of reference. And I can refer it to the Minister of

Premier Moores:

Justice who is more closely involved in the specific detail of it than myself.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary to the Premier.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: I wonder would the Premier indicate whether the necessary, enabling decisions have been taken. I understand that perhaps an Order-in-Council would be needed in this instance. Has the necessary Order-in-Council been issued at this point in time? Or of course the Minister of Justice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Well obviously, Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the hon. gentleman is aware of the procedure that has to be followed. The Order-in-Council is passed when the commissioner has been appointed. I would prefer to say nothing further about a commissioner now because you always get into the difficulty if you ask a person, and that person is considering it, and he says, no, and then you go to another person, that person knows he is second choice. that you will be here until Christmas before you finally pass it. So all I can say is that the officials in my department are working very assiduously at a review of the issues so that the necessary broad terms of reference can be prepared, and I will do my utmost on behalf of government to find a suitable commissioner at the earliest opportunity.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, can we assume from what the minister has indicated in his last remarks that a person has been approached with a view to taking on the job as commissioner of the enquiry?

MR. HICKMAN: It is the very thing I said I do not want to comment on.

MR. WHITE: Well, you should know if you have asked anybody.

MR. SIMMONS: No. Just to clarify, I am not particularly asking for any degree of comment, but I am just wanting to

Mr. Simmons:

know at what stage the proposed enquiry is? Whether government is to the stage where it has actually approached a person? I mean, the answer is yes or no. Has the government yet approached any person to be commissioner of this enquiry?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, if some one had been approached and said no, then we contacted the second person who knew that some person had been approached then he would know even by that that he was the second choice and that is why he has not been approached.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile followed by the hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I do not know, I will have to give a little introduction to my question that I have to put to the hon. the Premier, Sir. When the Bell Island mine closed, Mr. Speaker,

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: When the Bell Island mine closed, Mr. Speaker, hon. gentlemen -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. gentleman is having difficulty making himself heard.

MR. NEARY: I am trying to put a very serious question to the hon. the Premier if I can just have a little silence, Sir. When the Bell Island mine closed the government took over

MR. NEARY: all the assets of DOSCO and dispose of them for \$1, or took it over for \$1 rather and disposed of the assets later.

Now, Buchans Mine is going to close about a year and a half from now, the Labrador Linerboard logging at Goose Bay has closed, there are rumours that the mine at St. Lawrence is going to close and there will become available tremendous expertise in underground mining, men and equipment will become available. What I want to ask the Premier is this, that if the government would give serious consideration to opening up negotiations with the various companies involved - they already own Labrador Linerboard so they can freeze the equipment there - open up negotiations with a view to say when they provide the data that Ottawa needs to get the Lower Churchill Hydro Development underway, the tunnel under the Straits of Bell Isle and the transmission line, will the Premier open up serious negotiations with a view to getting this expertise, men and equipment that can become available immediately, to start the construction of the tunnel underneath the Straits of Bell Isle, the transmission line and the development of the Lower Churchill.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, regarding a start on a tunnel for the hydro development, obviously when the hydro development goes ahead that is going to be one of the requirements needed. That of course would be part and parcel to the development of the site itself but also what the hon. member suggests certainly has a great deal of room for thought. I take exception to just some of his introductory remarks about the closing of the Buchans Mine and the closing of St. Lawrence, I would certainly hope that that does not transpire but there have been miners around

PREMIER MOORES: the Province at mines that have phased out that are probably doing other types of work now and not necessarily doing the same type of work that they have always done; and regarding the equipment and the people available for that sort of work, maybe we could look at a make-work project because a lot of the make-work projects the federal government are doing now are not necessarily ones that will be of any lasting benefit to the Province nor to resource development itself, and maybe if we could take some of the make-work monies that are available to the Province, plus some of our own, this sort of approach could very easily be a very interesting and worthwhile type of usage for that money.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: The hon. Premier of course is his usual one step ahead of me because that was to be my next question. With all this expertise, men and equipment, some of it available now at Labrador Linerboard, some to become available, and we have miners in Green Bay and probably in Buchans and a few left around Bell Island, we have the expertise, so in the package, in the updating of the data that Mr. Jamieson asked for when he spoke to the Equipment Operators Convention here recently, when he asked for the upgrading of the data, could the Premier include that in a part of the updating because this would be an excellent make work project that could do a lot of good for the Province and for the nation as a whole?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: As the hon. member I think probably realizes, a lot of the equipment that he refers to was in fact financed by Dree money itself.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

PREMIER MOORES: And it would be, I would think, any of the equipment that was suitable, if this sort of a project was contemplated and if

PREMIER MOORES: it showed that it had any viability for that sort of equipment which in the main is not apparently suitable for the woods operation that it was originally bought for, there is some serious doubt about that. The whole type of thing would have to be taken into consideration and if such a project ever did go ahead obviously this would be the logical place to look for equipment to do it.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the Premier's answer and the serious nature of this whole matter to provide alternative employment and to create a make work project, instead of the Government of Canada piddling away its funds on foolish nonsense, would the Premier tell the House if he would agree to put together a task force or a committee of some kind to look at this matter because Mr. Jamieson has asked for updating? I am sure the government is going to take the broad hint given by Mr. Jamieson and supply Ottawa with the updating that it needs on the data to get this project underway as quickly as possible.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: I will certainly suggest to Mines and Energy and through them to Hydro that this be looked at as a possibility and also to Intergovernmental Affairs

PREMIER MOORES: to take it up with their federal counterparts and see if something can be done.

MR. NEARY: One final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I want to draw this to the hon. Premier's attention. This is really what put it in my mind yesterday, a letter in the Telegram, "The Waste at Gull Island." This gentleman apparently visited Gull Island and he wrote a letter to the editor of the Evening Telegram. He said "This equipment " he was talking about equipment down there, "This equipment is going to be auctioned off and sold for about one quarter of the original price" He said, "What fool bought it? What the hell goes on when somebody buys stuff, pays millions of dollars for things that they do not intend to use? There was never any confirmation to go ahead with the Gull Island Project!"

The gentleman is referring to twenty-two vans he claims were auctioned off recently to a Nova Scotia firm. I want to find out if there is any validity to this and if so would the Premier put a stop to this sort of thing until we decide where we are going on the Gull Island project and the tunnel?

PREMIER MOORES: I read the same letter, Mr. Speaker, and I thought he was talking about Linerboard equipment at one stage but apparently it was Gull Island equipment.

MR. NEARY: Yes, he was talking about both.

PREMIER MOORES: We have already instigated a query as to why these vans were sold off. I understand there were trailers sold off as well.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

PREMIER MOORES: But I think they remained in Newfoundland, if I got my information correctly. And we should maybe have an investigation into this sort of thing and see why and how.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. STRACHAN: A question for the Premier. I asked this

MR. STRACHAN: question a number of times previously and it concerns a serious situation in Happy Valley-Goose Bay with the businessmen in there.

Could the Premier assure us that if these companies are faced with bankruptcy, as they are now, and if their backs are to the wall and they are going to have to close down totally, could the Premier assure us that the administration will stand behind them and give them some assistance so that they can manage to keep functioning and that three quarters of the businesses in Happy Valley-Goose Bay will not close down totally?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: A very difficult one, Mr. Speaker, when one deals with something that happened at the CN and the insurance claims and all that are outstanding, it is certainly one of major concern. But to make a commitment as to how far any government agency could go to provide immediate assistance, I am not sure. I think probably the way we could be of assistance is know what sort of insurance we are talking about and maybe through the banks request their assistance and co-operation as well as ours, and see if there is not some formula that can be come up with so that these people can remain not just solvent but in the same position they would have been if the boat had not sank.

MR. STRACHAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. STRACHAN: Could the Premier indicate whether the administration would be prepared to consider government guaranteeing, for instance, a bank loan or something in that form that the government guarantees so that the money could be available to them to continue on?

PREMIER MOORES: Actually, Mr. Speaker, I think that once again when you start talking about governments' responsibilities, federal-provincial, the time it takes to work out who is going to do what - it is too late to do what is necessary like in a case like this.

PREMIER MOORES: Certainly we would be prepared - after having consulted with the CN, to make sure there is no prejudice to the insurance claim or anything of this sort - we would be very prepared to intervene, if you like, with the banks and ask them for their co-operation. There should be no difficulty if the insurance is coming to these people for the goods that were lost. I would think that in itself it should be a form of collateral for the banks but it is certainly that we will follow through for the hon. member.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I have a private question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. I wonder if the minister could tell us at what stage his capitol works project for municipal council - what stage it is at the moment?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. minister.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, we are trying to get the programme together now. It is compiled with respect to most items. Some of the items have been approved, but not all of them. We have not finished the whole programme for the year so all we can say is it is on its way.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, a couple of weeks ago the minister said in the House in answer to a question from me that he would have this programme ready and be able to table it in the House before the House closes for the summer. I wonder if he still hopes to go ahead with that proposed schedule?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, anyone can check the record and at no time did I ever say that I would table anything in the House, but that if indeed the programme was ready for when the House was here and people wanted some information I would certainly be available to give it to them if it was available. But I never, never did say that I would table the programme.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. The hon. member for Bellevue followed by the hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. Could the minister indicate when he will be in a position to inform councils whether they are successful or unsuccessful in their applications for water and sewer?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. DINN: As I just answered, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Lewisporte, when it is completed. It is not finished yet. When the final thing is done, I will be informing councils almost immediately when it is prepared. It is not quite ready yet.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. CALLAN: Can the minister give some time frame? Will it be a week, two weeks or two days? And will the MHA's also be informed at the same time or, you know, will the MHA's be kept in the dark and find out by way of the grapevine or something that a water and sewer project may be approved for some area of his district?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. DINN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I do not know the full import of the question, but most of the MHA's that are in touch with me will be informed when the projects are ready to go. So about two weeks, I would say. You know, that is at the outset right now.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Port au Port followed by the hon. gentleman for LaPoile.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, the question is for the Minister of Tourism and it concerns a herd of caribou which was placed on the Port au Port Peninsula some years ago. I believe there were about 100 caribou in that herd and now over the past year or so the herd is gone down to about thirty caribou because of, as the wildlife officials say, poaching and lynx, although the lynx is not a natural enemy. My question is: What is the minister or

Mr. Hodder.

his department doing to halt the destruction of this caribou herd?

MR. STRACHAN: Get rid of the member for Naskaupi.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, there is only a limited amount of effort that my department can put into preserving any caribou herd or any herd, be it moose or caribou, that is transplanted from one area to another. When the herd was transplanted to that area the usual public relations effort and the usual explanations to the people, through the media and through other means, was made with regards to pointing out that the herd could only prosper and increase and provide a reasonable hunting experience in later years if the public totally co-operated. It is quite evident now that they have not. It is difficult to say what action we can take at this point in time except to restate again, which we are doing, and which we will be doing certainly before the hunting season opens that unless the public makes a final effort to co-operate and realize that those animals are there to prosper and increase, and if this is not done then they are really cutting off their nose to spite their own face and there is not very much more than we can do.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. HODDER: Does the minister have any intentions of putting power wildlife officials in that area? At the present time there are very few. There are wildlife officials in the general area but in the immediate area there is nobody to look after that herd and very few wildlife officials, to my knowledge, go into that particular area of the peninsula.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. HICKEY: No, Mr. Speaker, we have no plans to put additional people there because for the simple reason we do not have additional people to put there. I must point out again that this

Mr. Hickey.

kind of project can only succeed where the general public wishes it to succeed. Now if we have got to hire people to go out and knock people over the head, you know, to say that we are transplanting animals in here for your good, for your own good and for your use, and if we have got to sort of tie you on to keep you from shooting them, well, you know, this is a bit ludicrous to me. It does not make much sense. If the people of that area want this herd to prosper and increase then they will allow them to do so. If not, then that is about it. The matter of snowmobiles and ski-doo's have been raised. We have seen some instances where those vehicles have been used - or misused, I suppose I should say, during Winter, harassing and hunting animals. Again the question arises, Should we ban them for all the people because of the few guilty ones? My position on that is, no, we should not do that. Wherever we find or whenever we

Mr. Hickey:

catch somebody, then we take the usual action.

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Would the minister indicate whether or not that his department is confident and sure that the reason that herd has been depleted from one hundred to around thirty is through poaching, and not that the environment in the area would have ever been able to handle that herd that that habitat was right for caribou in the first instance? Is it through poaching or is it possible there are other factors?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, my Wildlife Division got a pretty good track record.

MR. FLIGHT: No they have not.

MR. HICKEY: If the hon. gentleman asked me a question and now he is going to have to listen to the answer. He may not agree with my answer but I want to tell him that my Wildlife Division has a very good track record when it comes to transplanting animals from one area to another. And what I mean by that is that we do not needlessly go to the expense and all the problems related to, and in a few days I will be announcing another area where caribou will be moved into for the first time, at least for as long as anyone can recall.

We do not move animals, Mr. Speaker, from one area to another without a thorough investigation with regards to the environment or the fauna that those animals feed on. And so therefore if those animals are moved in from one area to another, those investigations are done prior to that. We are satisfied that, you know, in no way is it caused by any lack of food in the area, or the lack of proper kinds or types of environment. We do not believe that that is it at all. And our investigation certainly does not lead us to believe it. It is a matter of poaching. I suppose maybe there are some animals that probably die off in the usual way. There is usually a casualty list, but it is not very large, and certainly if given a chance those animals will usually prosper and grow.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Eagle River, a supplementary.

MR. STRACHAN: On the general topic of caribou and poaching and the state of the herds and so on. Could the minister indicate to us the state of the Mealy Mountains herd and the situation with that, the numbers and what he expects the situation is with that herd in the future? And possibly the Red Wine River Mountain herd too around that area. I am not referring to the activities the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) but I am referring to other activities.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, obviously I am sure my hon. friend appreciates the fact that I do not have an updated current situation in terms of numbers. My last discussions with my officials with regards to the Mealy Mountains herd in relation to hunting practices in Labrador, because we have discussed this many times, is that it is not in a healthy position, certainly not in a healthy position to the degree where we can allow the kind of hunting that we would want or that we wish to allow. I have no indication that there is any poaching to a degree that is going to destroy or wipe out the herds. However we have been concerned and we have expressed concern during the past year that too many animals were taken. Certainly we want that to stop, and we are doing whatever we can to stop it.

When my friend raised the point a moment ago about what we intend to do, I neglected to point out that in addition to our regular wildlife staff in any given area we have what we call a helicopter patrol which usually does a reasonably good job in keeping people away from those animals.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile followed by the hon. member for St. George's.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I should really put this question to the Minister of Justice, but the minister obviously has made up his mind, so if I can get the attention of the Premier for a minute? As I said, Mr. Speaker, just so the hon. Minister of Justice can hear the question I am going to ask the Premier, the minister has already made up his mind in connection with the briefing session that

MR. NEARY:

is being requested by the City Council in connection with the Unified Family Court that the minister wants to put over here on the O'Dea property that is owned by Memorial University. Is it the policy of the government to ignore briefings of City Council or would the Premier indicate if he will issue instructions to his Minister of Justice who has made a statement publicly that he would not appear before these hearings, would the Premier reconsider this and have somebody in the Justice Department appear before the briefing the same as every other group and every other individual in the city has to do?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES:

Mr. Speaker, we certainly do listen to grievances from municipal bodies, but as to the detail of what the hon. member asked, I would refer it to the Minister of Justice and let him explain as to why not.

MR. NEARY:

Can the Minister of Justice tell us then, Sir, if he intends to stand by his decision that he made public, his statement that he made? 'Justice Minister Alex Hickman says he certainly will not turn up if a briefing session is held, City Manager Alex Henley reported to City Council, and the department seems unwilling to send any representative.' Would the minister reconsider this and either attend the briefing himself or have somebody from his department attend the briefing in connection with this family court situation? The government seem to be on a collision course with the City Council over this matter.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN:

Mr. Speaker, let me assure this hon. House that to my knowledge this government is not on a collision course with the St. John's City Council. Nothin could be further from the truth or nothing could be further removed from the facts. The simple fact is - or shall I put it the other way? - the facts are this Province has taken the lead, together with two other Provinces, in the establishment, on an experimental basis in co-operation with the Government of Canada through their minister the Attorney General of Canada, the hon. Ronald Basford, P.C., in the setting up of a unified family court. When Mr. Basford was in St. John's a month and a half ago, or thereabouts, there was a joint announcement made by both of us that we hoped to have the unified family court ongoing to serve, on an experimental

MR. HICKMAN:

basis, Metropolitan

St. John's by the end of September of this year. I think that that is a target date that we are going to strive very manfully and very assiduously to meet.

Obviously the first thing we have to do is to find suitable accommodations, and suitable accommodation, in my opinion, for a unified family court on an experimental basis, is not the traditional courthouse building. I am sure this House, and I am sure the citizens of St. John's, and particularly those who have an interest in law and order and in family life would be as excited as we were when we found that a house situated on King's Bridge Road, St. John's, that has been used by Memorial University Extension Department, is available.

MR. NEARY:

Waterford Bridge Road?

MR. HICKMAN:

No, it is King's Bridge

Road, the - I do not know whose property it was - it is the building that is presently owned by Memorial University of Newfoundland and used in the right of Her Majesty the Queen so I suppose we own it. The Crown owns it, at least. It was occupied by the Extension Department and the Extension Department have moved out. There may be some misapprehension on the part of the public as to what a family court is all about. It is a non-adversary type of institution. It should be in an atmosphere that is close to residential. The property will be adequately protected. You will not have crowds moving in and out. Certainly it is a very desirable thing, but time is of the essence if it is going to go in St. John's or if we take a look at the City of Corner Brook or Central Newfoundland or Southern Newfoundland.

The officials, I understand, in my department wrote the City Council as a matter of

MR. HICKMAN: courtesy, which this government has done - I emphasize it is a matter of courtesy because the Crown is not subject, nor should it ever be, to city or municipal ordinances - and said what we would like to do. It has been made abundantly clear - again, this is second-hand advice to me, but I am sure it is correct - it has been made abundantly clear to the City of St. John's and/or their officials that whatever information is required with respect to the use of the building and the programme that we envisage to go in there has either been made available now or will be made available.

To the last part of the question - will I as Minister of the Crown go down as part of the briefing session? - the answer is an emphatic, No. N-o. And

MR. HICKMAN: any more than any other municipality, I look upon all municipalities in the Province of Newfoundland as being of equal status.

MR. DOODY: Except Grand Bank.

MR. HICKMAN: Well, Grand Bank has a lot of affection for me but even then they have been in municipal business so long and under the leadership of the Dean of Municipal Government in Newfoundland, they would not even extend that kind of invitation because he knows the practice and procedure.

Insofar as officials are concerned, and there is really one official who has played a lead role in this, I am sure that she is available any time at all that the City Council needs her for any purpose in order to articulate very clearly the use this building is put to. My concern is that we seem to be running into a delay and I am apprehensive of this delay when I see what happened to the John Howard Society.

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

MR. STRACHAN: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. The minister is talking about delays and running into delays in the questions and so on. All he is doing is ranting on and on about things that should be discussed elsewhere and not in Question Period or explained elsewhere and I hope we can try to keep the answers reasonably short, the same length as the questions.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Liberal abuse.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order. The hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) asked me a very broad, far-reaching question which is very topical, I would, hope throughout Newfoundland today, namely our proposal to establish a unified family court on an experimental basis in the Province. I am sure that Your Honour would have ruled me out of order if I had uttered but one word, one comma, one syllable that was not totally relevant to the question asked by the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary).

MR. HICKMAN: If in my anxiety to make information known to this House, and to the public, I deeply apologize to the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan).

MR. FLIGHT: We do not get to ask a question now.

MR. SPEAKER: Before calling Orders of the day, there can be little doubt that the Question Period is best served by short questions, with very brief preambles, and answers accordingly. Actually there was a ruling in the House of Commons, I think it makes a great deal of sense, and that is that a preamble to a question should rarely exceed one sentence and also that if they are supplementaries, when supplementaries are allowed there should be no preamble, because they are supposed to follow out of the answer. I am inclined to think that that is something we should give serious consideration to.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. FLIGHT: The answers were the problem, not the questions.

MR. SPEAKER: They are both sometimes. They are closely related.

MR. HICKMAN: Motion 6.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Education to introduce a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Education (Teachers' Pensions) Act (No. 2)," (No. 95), carried.

On motion, Bill No. 95, read a first time, ordered read a second time presently by leave.

MR. HICKMAN: Motion 7.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Health to introduce a bill, "An Act For The Protection Of The Health Of Persons Exposed To Radiation And For The Safety Of Persons In Connection With The Operation And Use Of The Electrical And Mechanical Components Of Radiation Producing Equipment And Associated Apparatus," (No. 96).

On motion, Bill No. 96, read a first time, ordered read a second time presently by leave.

MR. HICKMAN: Motion 8.

Motion, the hon. Minister of Finance to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Public Service (Pensions) Act," (No. 97), carried.

On motion, Bill No. 97, read a first time, ordered read a second time presently by leave.

MR. HICKMAN: Motion 9.

Motion, the hon. Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Restructure The Law Society Of Newfoundland," (No. 81), carried.

On motion, Bill No. 81, read a first time, ordered read a second time presently by leave.

MR. HICKMAN: Motion 10.

Motion, the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy to introduce a bill, "An Act To Control The Rates Of Newfoundland And Labrador Hydro And To Declare A Provincial Power Policy," (No. 98), carried.

On motion, Bill No. 98, read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. HICKMAN: Motion 11.

Motion, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing to introduce a bill, "An Act Respecting Elections To The Council Of The City Of St. John's," (Bill No. 99), carried.

On motion, Bill No. 99, read a first time, ordered read a second time presently by leave.

MR. HICKMAN: Motion 12.

Motion, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing to introduce a bill, "An Act Respecting Certain Leasehold Interests Within The City Of St. John's," (Bill No. 100), carried.

On motion, Bill No. 100, read a first time, ordered read a second time presently by leave.

MR. HICKMAN: Motion 13.

Motion, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing to introduce a bill, "An Act To Establish The St. John's Urban Region," (Bill No. 101), carried.

On motion, Bill No. 101, read a first time, ordered read a second time presently by leave.

MR. HICKMAN: Motion 14.

Motion, the hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Meat Inspection Act," (Bill No. 106), carried.

On motion, Bill No. 106, read a first time, ordered read a second time presently by leave.

MR. HICKMAN: Motion 15.

Motion, the hon. Minister of Health to introduce a bill, "An Act Respecting Dispensing Opticians," (No. 107), carried.

On motion, Bill No. 107, read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. HICKMAN: Motion 16.

Motion, the hon. Minister of Health to introduce a bill, "An Act Respecting The Newfoundland Optometric Association And Governing The Practice Of Optometry In The Province," (No. 28), carried.

On motion, Bill No. 28, read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. HICKMAN: Motion 17.

Motion, the hon. Minister of Health to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Department Of Health Act," (No. 108), carried.

On motion, Bill No. 108, read a first time, ordered read a second time presently by leave.

MR. HICKMAN: Motion 18.

Motion, the hon. Minister of Health to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Registration (Vital Statistics) Act," (No. 109), carried.

On motion, Bill No. 109, read a first time, ordered read a second time presently by leave.

MR. HICKMAN: Motion 19.

Motion, the hon. Minister of Finance to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Increase Of Pensions Act," (No. 102), carried.

On motion, Bill No. 102, read a first time, ordered read a second time presently by leave.

MR. HICKMAN:

Motion 20.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Finance to introduce a bill, "An Act To Ratify, Confirm And Adopt An Agreement Made Between The Government And The Government Of Canada Respecting Reciprocal Taxation Of These Governments And Their Agencies," (Bill No. 91), carried.

On Motion, Bill No. 91, read a first time, ordered read a second time presently by leave.

MR. HICKMAN:

Motion 21.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower to introduce a bill, "An Act To Establish A Municipal Grant System," (Bill No. 105), carried.

On motion, Bill No. 105, read a first time, ordered read a second time presently by leave.

MR. HICKMAN:

Motion 22.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Social Services to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend, Revise And Consolidate The Law Respecting Social Assistance," (Bill No. 110), carried.

On motion, Bill No. 110, read a first time, ordered read a second time presently by leave.

MR. HICKMAN:

Motion 23.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Motor Carrier Act," (Bill No. 104), carried.

On motion, Bill No. 104, read a first time, ordered read a second time presently by leave.

MR. HICKMAN:

Motion 24.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Automobile Insurance Act," (Bill No. 87), carried.

On motion, Bill No. 87, read a first time, ordered read a second time presently by leave.

MR. HICKMAN:

Motion 25.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Transportation and Communications to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Highway Traffic Act," (Bill No. 111), carried.

On motion, Bill No. 111, read a first time, ordered read a second time presently by leave.

MR. HICKMAN:

Order 11.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The City Of St. John's Act," (Bill No. 47).

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DINN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, these are some amendments that have been requested by the city of St. John's and it seems very reasonable that they should be implemented. I have condensed the thing. There are nine clauses to be changed and I have condensed it in my language so that I could understand it. Just going through the different clauses to explain to the committee what these things will do.

Clause (1) - This clause will extend the powers of the city to deal with emergency situations brought about by the acute shortage of water such as the one which occurred last summer. For that purpose this will enable the city to restrict or prohibit the use of water in the city. The other emergency powers contained in the amendment are merely repetition of those formerly contained in the act. So Clause (1) is just to give City Council the power to declare an emergency in case of water shortage.

Clause (2) - This amendment will change the existing legislation to remove the restriction requiring that three members of St. John's Parks and Recreation Commission shall be members of Council. In other words, they can appoint their members now and councillors need not sit on that commission.

Clause (3) - will increase the maximum fine to owners of dogs running at large from not more than \$5 to not more than \$100 and is consistent

MR. DINN:

with the council's policy of endeavouring to provide more effective control over roaming dogs.

Clause (4), this amendment will provide that payment of the business tax by the operator of a business will not prevent the council from taking action against him for any other violation of the City Act, or of regulations made by the council under the act. This is not a new power but merely to clarify their existing power.

Clause (5) is designed to elaborate on the statutory procedures with respect to the timing of interest charges levied in respect of taxes and assessments imposed by the city. Again this is a clarification of the act of their existing power.

Clause (6) provides for the appointment of a city manager. It outlines in general terms his duties and responsibilities.

Clause (7) provide that civil servants employed by the city after July 1, 1973 will not be entitled to be paid by the city for years of pensionable service previously earned. So that somebody working in the provincial government moving down to City Hall would not be able to carry their pension down, but their pension up here is still good.

Clause (8) extends the requirement that payment for services in subdivisions which are paid by the landowner would include now such utilities as pedestrian overhead lights, etc. So that would be included in the cost of the subdivision. It also provides that easements for telephone and power installations in subdivisions shall be obtained prior to construction taking place instead of prior to the approval of council, or the subdivision. In addition the clause grants more flexibility to council with respect to the charges it may make in regard to land developed for public parks and playgrounds in new subdivisions.

MR. DINN:

Clause (9) empowers the council to charge a planning fee to developers of new subdivisions to permit the recovery of the cost of administrative and technical services provided with respect to checking out the plans, etc that are provided by developers to the city. So, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to say very much about this particular bill. A lot of it is simple housekeeping as the minister has explained pretty well.

MR. DINN: I did not use that word.

MR. WHITE: No, I know you did not use that word. And the minister at this time did give a good explanation to the House of what it is all about, and other ministers would be advised to do the same.

There is one thing here that I am a little concerned about, Mr. Speaker, and I would like for the minister to address himself to it and that is the emergency powers being conferred on the council and mayor in St. John's. Now I lived in St. John's for a long, long time, and I saw a lot of emergencies, or so-called emergencies, and in my opinion they were not always emergencies, and I could suggest that at sometimes they were probably erratically arrived at the decisions to call emergencies in St. John's. By 2:00 P.M. the sun might be shining and very little snow on the ground. But there is one section, and that is 47 (a)(b) that sort of concerns me, and I would like for the minister to address himself to it, because this gives the Mayor of St. John's power to call an emergency in St. John's whenever she feels like it, or he or whoever the mayor might be. It says that the council or mayor, as the case may be, may declare a state of emergency in the city or any specified parts or parts thereof when it appears desirable in the public interest

Mr. White.

to do so because of the city being affected in whole or in part by civil commotion. Now that is one of the things mentioned there. Now what is a civil commotion, Mr. Speaker? Is a civil commotion a simple demonstration outside of City Hall by a group of taxi drivers? Is that a civil commotion? Should not we here in the Legislature who are giving powers to municipal councils be a little more specific in what we are doing? Now, granted the mayor and council in St. John's are reasonable people, they are responsible people, and I am not suggesting anything else, but I am just wondering, Mr. Speaker, if we should bestow this kind of power -

MR. DINN: They already have it.

MR. WHITE: I know they already have it.

- if we should continue to bestow this kind of power on the city council in

Mr. White:

St. John's or any other municipal body without some provision that there be consultation with the Provincial Government, which is the highest government in the Province. Would it not be appropriate if somebody at City Hall decided there should be a state of emergency for the Mayor or some member of Council to touch base with the Minister of Justice or the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing before going ahead and declaring a state of emergency. It would not take much, maybe just a phone call or something. But, as I said, I am a little concerned what a civil commotion could be. Almost anything could be classed in the form of a civil commotion, three or four street lights out and that would almost be classed as cause for a state of emergency. It concerns me a little bit because I am very concerned about the rights of people, and about people's rights generally throughout the Province, and in St. John's as well. And I am just wondering whether or not this is a little bit too much power for the Provincial Government to be passing on.

Other than that, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the rest of this is just housekeeping. Most of it designed to facilitate the new town manager or the City Manager in St. John's, Mr. Henley, who I understand is doing a good job. So I would just ask the minister to comment on my remarks with respect to civil commotion being a cause for declaring a state of emergency in St. John's.

I also wonder why Paragraph A of Section 72 (a) of the said Act as amended by striking out the words "three of whom shall be members of council". Why members of council who are not required to be on the Recreation Commission any more. Because I have always encouraged members of councils in other towns because I have seen cases where the Recreation Commission have sort of gotten out of hand because there has been no member of council on it in some

Mr. White:

of the smaller areas of the Province, and I just wondered why they can set up a Recreation Commission without having a member of council on it? It would seem to me to the advantage of council to have a member on the Commission to see how things are going.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. member for Mount Pearl.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments on this bill. First of all I would like to say to the minister I will be supporting it, although I have a few things that I want to say about it, and things I do not agree with in it. But since it is basically requested by the City of St. John's, these are matters really municipal problems. I respect the City's right to govern their City as they see fit. And I do not see any great problem with this, although as I said there are some things that I disagree with.

Let me comment on the hon. gentleman first. I could make a comment on what a civil disaster is at City Hall, but I will be charitable and not make any comment.

Section (3), Mr. Speaker, relating to increasing the fine on dogs from -

MR. PECKFORD: What gender was that civil disaster?

MR. N. WINDSOR: Neither.

MR. PECKFORD: Neither.

MR. N. WINDSOR: - \$5 to \$100 be increased on the fine for animals roaming at large. I respect the city's reason for doing that as an attempt to solve a dog problem which pretty well every city in North America is faced with, and I am familiar with it. The Community of Mount Pearl has struggled with it for years. I do not think this is going to do an awful lot to solve it. What it will do, Mr. Speaker, is an animal that is roaming at large because its owner does not care for it, really could not care less, will be picked up by the animal controllers and will be destroyed because these people are not going to pay \$100 for that animal, they do not care enough for it. Whereas the person who has perhaps a pure bred

Mr. N. Windsor:

animal or an animal that is really cared for if that animal gets loose, perhaps the mailman leaves the gate open or the children untie the dog or this sort of thing, and on one or two occasions he gets out, well these people who really care for the animal, and who are pretty well all of the time caring for it and looking after it, and keeping it tied on or within a confined garden whatever will then have to face a \$100 fine to get it back. So obviously they will pick up their animal, and they will pay this fine. But the person who is not looking after their animal, is letting it roam at large all of the time, that animal will be picked up and destroyed. So in effect what this clause will be doing will be ensuring that more animals will be destroyed. But that is the city's decision. If that is the way they wish to tackle their dog problem I will not vote against it, but simply express my concerns on it.

Clauses (8) and (9) are the ones that concern me more, Mr. Speaker. What the city is doing here is putting more restrictions on land developers, and what I am afraid of is that if we put too many restrictions on land

MR. N. WINDSOR: developers, soon you will not find any private developers. For instance, including pedestrian overhead lights and poles there in Part 1 of Clause 8. How far do you go when you say to a developer you must develop? Perhaps it is legitimate, but I would rather put that -

MR. WHITE: The consumer is going to pay anyway.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Yes, the homeowner is going to pay, the person who buys the property is going to pay for it. What you are talking about here is traffic control. Now does the person who buys a piece of land, does he accept the responsibility for traffic control in his area or is that a city-wide responsibility that is going to be shared from the general tax dollar paid by every citizen? In Part 3 of that same clause deals with the percentage of land to be given, I think, for recreational facilities. Is that correct?

MR. DINN: Yes.

MR. N. WINDSOR: The general procedure in many communities or most communities that I am familiar with, is that ten per cent of the land area would be set aside as open space or for recreation, which is a reasonable percentage. And I think that that is indeed the city's practice at the moment, although in certain instances it has been less, I think, and perhaps in certain instances more. What this is doing is giving the city flexibility to set that amount and I accept that, that is fine, but is there a maximum? I do not see one here. The city could very well say, "Well, let us make it thirty per cent or forty per cent." That would prohibit that development from proceeding. The same thing in Section 9(1) the charge of a planning fee to a new development. I would say that if there has been a charge, the city has paid planning costs directly relating to that subdivision.

MR. DINN: That is what they are talking about here.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Well, it is not very clear.

MR. DINN: That is all there is to it.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Yes, I realize that, but it is not the point I am trying to make. If there is a cost it is directly related to that subdivision, for instance, if a planner goes in and says, or a developer goes into the city and says, "Look, I want to develop this piece of property." And the city says to him, "Fine, yes, you may develop it. Here is your street layout." Now that is a fair piece of work already done for you, if it is a properly engineered layout, design, preliminary plan. If that is given to the developer then the developer has benefited simply because he has a certain amount of engineering work already done for him and he will not have to do it. So it is fair and reasonable I think that the developer should pay a cost or a charge for that. But if the city is going to build into that planning cost a proportion of planning, arterial roads and the overall city, for instance, if they are going to put in a proportion of Plan 91, a proportion of any cost they might have incurred in the urban region plan, this sort of thing, I question whether or not that is valid to be charged to that subdivision. Or is that an overall city responsibility? Now this is the clarification I would like to have on that. If it is purely within that area of land that is being developed by a private developer, if they are charges that have been put in there that if the city had not done it then the private developer would have to do it then that is fair ball, that is fine, as long as the cities costs are not outrageous in comparison to what the private developer could have done the same work for with his own consultants. But if it is charges that are incurred because of an overall city plan then I do not feel they should go in there.

So as I said, Mr. Speaker, I just point to these couple of comments. I disagree with these things but I will support the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. minister now speaks he closes the debate. The hon minister.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, just to reply to the hon. member for Lewisporte with respect to emergency powers, what we are basically here is that the powers that were contained in the act are staying in the act and we are adding one more and that is the water shortage one. Having just completed Bay Bulls Big Pond we do not anticipate a water shortage in the next year or two so I do not think that will be a problem but they want it in there and I saw no reason why it should not go in.

With respect to the specific item "a civil commotion" brought up by the hon member from Lewisporte, it was in the act before and councils have, to my way of thinking, controlled this to some extent, I mean, they have not done it on ad hoc basis; they had an emergency when it was there. Now there might have been some time lag from the time of removing the emergency and so on but they certainly have not been irresponsible or anything in this respect.

MR. WHITE: I did not say they were.

MR. DINN: No, I know you did not.

MR. WHITE: I pointed out it could happen.

MR. DINN: It could happen, yes, but we have to - we are trying to, Mr. Speaker, give more local autonomy to

MR. DINN: government and as they progress and since this has been in the act I would not want to take that away unless they were, for example, to abuse something like that and then of course the minister and the Lieutenant-Governor in Council indeed have certain powers that could certainly control any situation that may arise in that case.

So, Mr. Speaker, I note the concern of the hon. member and certainly we are all concerned that these things are followed, the intent of the legislation is followed and not to be abused in the future.

With respect to the hon. member for Mount Pearl (Mr. N. Windsor) and the fee to be charged for roaming dogs now, Mr. Speaker, I realize that \$100 is a fair amount of money to pay if your dog happens to get out of the yard and gets caught roaming. I had a dog myself, a collie dog, and it got out once in all the time that I had it; it got free and got out and if it had been caught by the dog catcher, whomever, I would have had to pay the \$100, and I would have paid it. I would have felt bad about it but I would have paid it."

I think the problem we have in the city with respect to roaming dogs is a very serious problem, and certainly \$5 is not going to help in any way to control that problem. \$100 may be a little bit high but to my way of thinking we should leave that kind of power in the hands of the city. If a person cares for his animal, if it gets out once and it costs \$100 it will not get out the second time.

MR. WHITE: Is it always a fine of \$100, or is that a maximum?

MR. DINN: That is a maximum, \$100.

MR. WHITE: They can fine whatever they want, can they?

MR. DINN: Just one moment now, I will check that.

MR. WHITE: It is \$100 regardless, is it not?

AN HON. MEMBER: It is automatically \$100.

MR. DINN: Yes, it is \$100. Right now it is \$5, it would be \$100. Right.

So \$100 is a little bit steep but I do not think, Mr. Speaker, any one who cares for his animal and has to pay \$100 if the animal gets out would think twice about allowing that animal to get free the second time.

AN HON. MEMBER: Dogs are becoming a nuisance.

MR. DINN: They certainly are. Here in the city they are a problem right now. I know I had a problem with dogs around the area I lived previously and right now.

MR. PECKFORD: The place is gone to the dogs.

MR. DINN: Now, Mr. Speaker, with respect to restriction on developers, etc. Basically if you read through this carefully what they are talking about here is with respect to the ten per cent of land, in some areas of the city where there is an existing plan for open space and recreation, etc., what we are talking about here is that some of this in a development would go over the ten per cent and councils do not want to be restricted to just that ten per cent. If it happens to be in a particular development, thirteen per cent and they want the right to have that thirteen per cent, especially if you have got a heavily populated or densely populated area for development. So that is basically what we are getting at here.

MR. N. WINDSOR: If the minister will permit a comment on that? If because of a plan that is laid down by the city the amount of open space is more than ten per cent, then the city should compensate the developer for the price of the raw land over and above ten per cent. Otherwise the cost of your land is going to go up so high that the private home owner is still going to be paying for it, the guy who is trying to buy that lot. And if you keep doing that, and keep adding these costs into a private development, there comes a time where your land is no longer saleable.

MR. DINN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I realize that, you know, as a problem but if you have more than ten per cent development then obviously the

MR. DINN: people in there will have the advantage of that open space, and they are paying for the advantage in their area. So what we are saying is in St. John's, which is not the same in most other places in the Island, but in St. John's what we are saying is if you have fourteen per cent open space you pay for fourteen per cent open space. And that is basically what we are getting at here.

Section 9, I believe 9 (1), the hon. member brought up was with respect to planning fees and what the city is addressing itself to here is that when a developer comes in with a plan for an area to develop and they have to go through certain procedures and if it is a fairly intricate plan it costs a little more and if it is a small development it costs, you know, it may be approved almost immediately. So what they are saying here is that they be given the opportunity to recover the administrative costs and whatever planning costs, etc., that are involved. So that is what they are asking for, the power to recover those costs.

MR. N. WINDSOR: I realize that but I am just wondering what the cost will be, and who will decide.

MR. DINN: I cannot determine that right now.

MR. N. WINDSOR: I know. I realize that.

MR. DINN: Okay. So with that, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The City Of St. John's Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave.

MP. PECKFORD: Order 12, Bill No. 68.

Motion second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The City Of Corner Brook Act," (No. 68).

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. DINN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, and these are amendments as we are aware to the City of Corner Brook Act. I have done the same thing for hon. members if they will bear with me.

Just to go through the individual clauses that we are becoming involved in here, Clause 1 provides for authority for the city to vary the penalties to be applied in respect of breaches of city regulations mainly. The section was originally in The City Act and 71 to 76 was repealed and is now being reinstated.

MR. WHITE: Why was that?

MR. DINN: Well there was thought to be a problem with that section and we have since referred it to Justice and had a discussion about it with the city and we do not see the problem that we thought there was in the act so we decided that it would be a good idea.

MR. BECKFORD: In other words, you changed your mind.

MR. DINN: To put it back in. Right.

MR. PECKFORD: Okay.

MR. DINN: Clause 2 provides for taxation of mobile homes and trailers and establishes the accepted definition of real property across Canada. So they are just now they will be able to tax mobile homes and trailers as property tax.

Clause 3

Mr. Dinn.

provides for a fine of \$25 as a general penalty particularly with respect to non-payment of taxes. So these are the three clauses in the act, and the explanation of the amendments that we are attempting to put in, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, we can go along with this. If the city of Corner Brook wants those powers, we will give them the powers. I mean it is as simple as that. I would like to say one thing that really this act is now giving the mobile homeowners or making them eligible for the same kind of property taxes as everybody else. On the other hand, it is still discrimination against mobile homeowners and trailer owners because their insurance rates are so much higher and it is still going to be inequitable because they are going to have to pay higher insurance rates but at the same time pay basically the same real property tax as other homeowners. So, you know, that is a bit of a concern to me, but that is another issue that we can deal with some other time. Mr. Speaker, we have no problem with this. We will go along with it.

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. minister speaks now he closes the debate.

The hon. minister.

MR. DINN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, just to address myself to the one item brought up by the hon. member for Lewisporte (Mr. White). I realize the problem, of course, with mobile homeowners and the fact that the insurance is much higher, and there is a difference there. The problem the city is having is the fact that they have property tax out in the city, and these people have property and they are basically getting off scot-free right now.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do they have to pay anything?

MR. DINN: They have to pay what I believe in the city of Corner Brook is a service fee. So what they want to do is

MR. DINN:

make it more equitable. By the way, this is the accepted way that it is done across Canada. Real property defined in other jurisdictions is, you know, contained in mobile homes and trailers. So this is just to clear that up.

MR. WHITE: In St. John's is there a mobile home park?

MR. DINN: I do not know if they have a mobile home park within the city, Mr. Speaker, no, I do not believe they do. They are outside the city. So with that, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The City Of Corner Brook Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave.

MR. PECKFORD:

Order 16, Bill No. 75.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Community Councils Act, 1972." (Bill No. 75).

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, this one I was not anticipating coming up right away. There is not very much in this. There are three clauses in this also respecting community councils. They are very simple to read so I did not necessarily go through any condensation of what is here.

The purpose of clause 1 of this amendment is to clarify the voting procedure whereby if a councillor now decides that he does not want to vote, we still have to have a majority voting for a particular item.

Clause 2: The amendment would permit the minister to waive audit of a community's accounts under specific regulations. Section 24(1) and (2) of the present act reads that audits go on on a yearly basis and right now I can waive them. In most cases they are not required, there is just not that much.

Clause 3: This amendment would make it an offense not to pay a tax in accordance with the Act or to fail to collect and pay over a tax under the Act when required to do so by the Act. The new provision follows section 98 of the Local Government Act, so we are attempting to put this in here and make it the same as is now contained in the Local Government Act. That is it, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WHITE:

Mr. Chairman, just a couple of concerns with respect to community councils. The minister is talking about waiving the audit of community councils and I am just wondering whether or not there

MR. WHITE: should be closer scrutiny of community council books rather than less scrutiny of community council books and other council books throughout the Province? In many cases, as the minister knows, there are inexperienced municipal workers in some of those areas - in a lot of areas - because there are only part-time town clerks and so on, and it would be my feeling that we should maintain some kind of policing activity with respect to the books of community councils and town councils.

 Also, Mr. Speaker, there is something else I would like to see, and that is a little more direction given to community councils and town councils in Newfoundland by the minister's department. I know that they are moving into regional offices and I have to commend the department for this, because I feel they are working out pretty good. At least the one in my area, in Gander, is working out pretty good. It is still not up to the standard that it should be. I think it should be to the point where councils would be able to send delegations into the regional office in Gander, but yet they all still want to come to St. John's to meet with the minister because they feel they can get a better hearing. Because they have expressed the concern to me that the regional offices cannot make the decisions that they should be able to make. So it would be my feeling that more power should be given to the regional offices of the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing so they could make some decisions on the spot. It is usually the case that they cannot make decisions without going to St. John's.

 With respect to the collection of taxes, this is a big concern, Mr. Speaker, in rural areas. The minister knows full well that in some cases communities have been split right down the middle because

MR. WHITE: of the system of collecting local taxes. People on council have to collect taxes from their relatives and they are not speaking to them for weeks on end. Surely we should be aiming at maybe some kind of tax collector service in a regional area where one tax collector is responsible for a certain number of councils. I know that that will eventually come about with regional government, but this is something that I would like to see straightened up. Because I know where new councils have gone in in my area in particular, they have been hated for months and years after that.

I was also going to ask the minister, Mr. Speaker, about the collection of service fees in smaller areas. Councils have expressed the opinion to me that they are at a loss to determine how to collect local taxes. It is very, very difficult collecting local taxes.

MR. PECKFORD: It is not now. The bill last year provided for a fine beside the fact that -

MR. WHITE: But I am still getting those complaints.

MR. PECKFORD: Is that right?

MR. WHITE: They take it to the court
and

MR. WHITE:

the magistrate does very little about it.

MR. PECKFORD: He has to fine them now you see.

MR. WHITE: He has to?

MR. PECKFORD: Yes.

MR. WHITE: Yes, I know.

MR. PECKFORD: Before he did not.

MR. WHITE: In one council in my area there is about two hundred and some odd taxpayers, and there are over one hundred that have not paid for about two years. I think that is absolutely ridiculous. I have spoken to the officers of the Department of Municipal Affairs about it, and they have sent some instructions to the council concerned. But this is one area that I would like to see something done about, and that is with respect to the collection of local taxes when councils got to do it themselves, go to court, testify against their grandmothers or grandparents. It is absolutely ridiculous and something such be done about it.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): If the minister now speaks the debate is closed.

MR. J. DINN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have, as the hon. member knows, quite a few community councils in Newfoundland, and a lot of them are operating from year to year with virtually no problem at all. So what this does now, this amendment, under certain conditions, as judged by the minister, an audit may not be done, you know, this particular year. In some instances we would like to do an audit every month.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: Yes.

But this is a recommendation, you know, by the Auditor General, and, you know, I accept the Auditor General's statement in most cases as to what is -

MR. ROUSSEAU: Be very sensitive of the Auditor General.

MR. DINN: Yes. The other one mentioned by the hon. member for Lewisporte (Mr. White) is more power to the regional office. Well basically the regional offices that we have set up now can handle

Mr. Dinn:

most things with respect to councils. They can assist them with books, they can assist them with certain things in the community, and that kind of thing. They cannot spend money.

MR. NEARY: I wish you would go down to Burnt Island and hold an election down there.

MR. DINN: They cannot spend money, and that is reasonable. There has to be control of the purse strings somewhere. They just cannot say, you know, for your region you can have \$50,000 or something like that, and give them that option, you know.

So only with respect to the spending of money, The sending in of reports, if they, for example, if councils want something done in a community we will send the regional engineer to that community to have a look at it to see if indeed it is a requirement, and how much approximately it would cost. Then his report is made up and sent into St. John's here, and they have a look at it downstairs, and if they got the dollars available, if it is with respect to a special grant or something then it goes into the Finance Committee and it is approved or disapproved.

But basically the regional office is, from our point of view, a verification of requests, and it takes a little time, communication-wise, to get back and forth. But I think it has cut the time in half, you know, for approval of most of these items in that it is a matter sometimes of a phone call from the regional office, the council has gone to the regional office, talked to them, and then sent their request in here for dollars or something, it is a matter of calling the regional office and asking what is the story on a request for such and such. You know, it can be done on the phone in a lot of cases, and the regional office is aware of basically what is going on in the communities.

The tax collection problem is one, Mr. Speaker, that the amendment here would clarify even more. Right now community councils are having quite a difficult problem collecting taxes and they go to the magistrate and the magistrate fines them, fines the

Mr. Dinn:

person so much money \$25, and then that is all the council hears about it. They do not know the procedure to follow. Councils are having trouble with the procedures to follow to collect the taxes having gotten the judgment from the courts. And that is a continuing problem.

Right now under this section a person would be guilty of an offence on each day that he does not pay his taxes. So that right now it is advisable for the person who is

MR. DINN: in tax arrears to pay the taxes and this enforces the community council's authority to collect that taxes. It puts a person who does not pay in a pretty precarious position right now. So this is why this amendment was put in there, to attempt to assist them in enforcing their powers to collect. I do not know if we will ever have tax collectors in Newfoundland. I certainly would not want to be a tax collector in a community.

MR. HICKMAN: St. Matthew was a tax collector.

MR. DINN: Yes, he was.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I hope this explains the different points brought up by the hon. member and I therefore move second reading.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Community Councils Act, 1972," Bill No. 75, read a second time, ordered referred to a committee of the Whole House presently by leave.

MR. SPEAKER: (Dr. Collins) Motion 5.

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

RESOLUTION

That it is expedient to bring in a measure further to amend the Local Authority Guarantee Act, 1957 - the Act No. 71 of 1957 to provide for the advance of loans to and the guarantee of the repayment of funds with debentures issued by or loans advanced to certain local authorities.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the resolution carry?

MR. DOODY: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: I was bringing to the attention, Sir, of the House Leader that there are a couple of typographical errors in the bill itself and they would have to be amended. There is one there that

MR. DOODY: says \$300,000 which is \$30,000 and the other one is the year. I think they have got the wrong year in there.

This particular motion, Sir, deals with the annual shopping list of the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing and asks the House to -

MR. NEARY: What is the number of the bill?

MR. DOODY: Bill No. 74 - asks the House to approve the water and sewerage and other programmes that were carried out through the various municipalities in the Province during the past year. I notice as usual, and it happens every year, that they have not bothered to total it in the bill. This year I was somewhat more prepared so that the total amount is \$23,786,000 - a little bit short of \$24 million. And this is the regular NMFC financing. As members are aware, each year as the various projects are approved, short term financing is arranged through the banks near the communities who have made the application for the programme or project. And from time to time as the debenture issue is raised the proceeds of that issue are used to pay the short term financing and arrange a long term financing with the various municipalities.

MR. F. WHITE: How does this relate to projects going ahead this year?

MR. DOODY: This is not related to projects for this year. This is for the year that - although some of them may very well be ongoing and will have to be completed this year. There is maybe part of last year's - some of them, those that are in here that are not completed - certainly the most of them unless there are some extraordinary reasons why they should not be, presumably these particular projects which are not completed will be. The money will be provided to the communities to finish them - not to finish them, in many cases, but to carry them on. For instance the town council of Conception Bay South are in there for \$1.8 million and \$1.6 million and in this particular bill they will undoubtedly be in the coming years and in next year is and I wonder if there

June 9, 1977

Tape 4037

EC - 3

MR. DOODY: is enough money in Fort Knox to finish the water and sewerage system in Conception South, but it has got to be done. I guess Conception Bay South is probably the third or fourth largest community in the Province right now.

I think it is St. John's, Corner Brook and then Conception South in terms of population. So obviously there is a great need there and it is very expansive. There is another one

Mr. Doody.

that shows up every year, and I fully expect to see it every year as long as I am around and maybe many years beyond that, and that is the Town Council of Bay Roberts. That seems to be a water and sewage system that never gets finished. It is an ongoing programme.

MR. NEARY: That is probably road paving.

MR. DOODY: No. I can identify them. I can run down the list very quickly if hon. members would like to know what the programmes are for. I will take them in order.

The Town Council of Bay Roberts, water and sewage; Town Council of Bishops Falls, water and sewage; Bonavista, water and sewage; Botwood, paving; -

MR. NEARY: Is that fifty/fifty now?

MR. DOODY: Sixty/forty.

- Botwood Urban Development area - there was a second one there -

MR. NEARY: Oh, that got the member for Exploits elected.

MR. DOODY: No, that was last year.

MR. RIDEOUT: That was some Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOODY: That was last year. That got the hon. -

MR. NEARY: Yes, but you had -

MR. DOODY: Yes, I know, but this particular project was to help get our friend over here elected. Anyway there were some sober second thoughts about that decision and the people went back to the polls again.

- the Town Council of Brigus, partial sewer system; Burin, sewer; Cape St. George, water and partial sewer; Carbonear, water trunk main; Channel - Port aux Basques, water system; Clarenville, comprehensive development area; Clarenville again, water and sewage; Corner Brook, water system; Corner Brook, water and sewage; Coachman's Cove, water system, Conception South, again - well, I mentioned that earlier. That is a water and sewage; Conception South, water and sewage; Town Council of Dover, water and sewage;

Mr. Doody.

Freshwater, water system; Gander, water system; Gander, pump house and associated facilities; Gander, paving. That is a sixty/forty programme. I am going through this in anticipation of eventually finding something for Harbour Main - Bell Island. I go through this exercise every year.

MR. NEARY: The only thing you will find for Bell Island is a property tax. And the minister promised these people over there a meeting and he did not keep his promise.

MR. DOODY: And they did not have the meeting.

MR. NEARY: There was no public meeting -

MR. DOODY: And there was no public meeting.

MR. NEARY: - and the people did not like it.

MR. DOODY: That is right. Well, there is no sense in saying that it was in my absence, but anyway that is another story.

MR. NEARY: Gendreau is going to get the works in November. You will have no more trouble with him.

MR. DOODY: Well, if Mr. Gendreau would be a little less vocal we would not have as half as many problems. The property tax that is imposed over there now is less in many cases than the service fee that was being paid. It is not the property tax that is the factor, nor is it even the mil rate. It is the assessment of the value assessment, and the value assesement of the properties on Bell Island were very, very low. The actual tax bills in many cases would be less than the service fees that they were charged. But unfortunately it was not presented in quite that light by the town council.

MR. NEARY: He should go up and give his buddy 'Rene' a hand.

MR. DOODY: Gander, pump house and related works; Glenwood, water system; Glenwood, street paving-

MR. H. COLLINS: What district is that in?

MR. DOODY: I do not know. It is not in Harbour Main - Bell Island, I can assure you of that.

Mr. Doody.

Gillams, water and sewage system; Glovertown, water and sewage system; Goulds, water and sewage system; Grand Falls, regular water supply; Grand Falls, upgrading and paving; Greenspond, water system. There must be a reservoir up in the hills. A Hampdem water and sewage system; Happy Valley - Goose Bay, water system; Harbour Grace, pay bond issue re Harbour Grace stadium; Town Council of -

MR. NEARY: The Moores Memorial.

MR. DOODY: The Moores Memorial Stadium.

- Hawkes Bay, sewage system; Holyrood, town hall and fire hall.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DOODY: How about that? I remember that very well.

This is one of the -

MR. NEARY: That was before the 1972 election.

MR. DOODY: No, that was done last year. This is one of the few in here which there is no subsidy. This is one of the ones that has been paid back in full. They are paying it off themselves. All they needed was a government guarantee. Oh, well, so much for progressive communities. They very rarely get mentioned.

MR. PECKFORD: The Minister of Finance, I guess, knows that I am thinking that it might be the only guaranteed loan to a municipality in the Province of the size of Holyrood where there is no subsidy.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, not true.

MR. DOODY: They got a subsidy on their water system, their water and sewage system, -

MR. PECKFORD: That is a guaranteed loan.

MR. DOODY: - and a very substantial subsidy it is too. As a matter of fact, if the water system and the sewerage system up in Holyrood is so elaborate as to be really a shame and it is certainly not the fault of the people in the community. The thing was just foisted on them.

MR. NEARY: Channel-Port aux Basques.

MR. PECKFORD: It is larger than Holyrood.

MR. DOODY: And that was done - the water system in Holyrood now, the water and sewage system there was done just prior to a momentous date of 1971.

MR. NEARY: September 18, 1975.

MR. DOODY: No, it was done in 1971 just prior to that great election when the Doody-Dawe team met head on that fantastic team of Mahoney and Fagan.

MR. NEARY: What was that was done?

MR. DOODY: The water -sewerage in Holyrood. There is no mention of it here, it has long since been -

MR. WHITE: Who is better off?

MR. DOODY: Mr. Fagan and Mr. Mahoney appear on the face of it to have come out best in the result. Dawe and I won the election and -

MR. WHITE: You have been suffering ever since.

MR. NEARY: The real winners. Like the real winner in LaPoile was Al Evans.

MR. DOODY: Well, you know, you did the same generous deed for one of our local attorneys, now very actively practicing in St. John's, who had served as the member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. DOODY: I did the same service for you in Bell Island and you now have a very comfortable pew in LaPoile. The Indian Bay water and sewerage system ; community of Lourdes, water and partically sewerage system. I presume that is Lourdes on the West Coast and not in France; Leading Tickles West, water system; Massey Drive, water-sewerage; McIvers, water and sewerage system; the Town of Mount Pearl, complete stadium; community of

MR. DOODY: Melrose, water and sewerage system; North West River, water and sewerage system; Pasadena, sewerage system; Petty Harbour - Maddox Cove, water and sewerage system; town of Placentia, water and sewerage system; Point Leamington, water and sewerage; Pouch Cove, water and sewerage system; Robert's Arm, sewerage system; Roddickton, water and sewerage system; Salvage, water system; Shoal Harbour, water system; Southern Harbour, water and sewerage system; St. Alban's, water and sewerage system. And that seems to be another one that is in there every year and will continue to be in there every year, St. Alban's again, water and sewerage system; St. Bernard's, sewerage system; St. John's Metropolitan Area Board, water and sewerage system, Old Petty Harbour Road area; St. Brendan's, water system - that is an artesian well system; St. George's, water and sewerage system; Spaniard's Bay, water and sewerage system; Spaniard's Bay, paving; Stephenville Crossing, water system; St. Lawrence, improvement to the drainage system; Terrenceville, water and sewerage system; Torbay, water and sewerage system - that is another town that is after growing in leaps and bounds over the past couple of years; Trinity, Bonavista Bay, water and sewerage system. Oh, this is one of the more popular and prosperous communities in the Province -

MR. NEARY: Port aux Basques.

MR. DOODY: Triton-Jim's Cove-Card's Harbour, water and sewerage system.

MR. NEARY: You talk about pork barreling!

MR. DOODY: Here is another one for Triton-Jim's Cove-

MR. NEARY: We were only babies!

MR. DOODY: -Card's Harbour. I think every person in this House should have a turn at being Minister of Municipal Affairs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DOODY: Upper Island Cove, water and sewerage system; town council of Wabana -

MR. NEARY: What is that about Upper Island Cove?

MR. DOODY: Upper Island Cove, water and sewerage system.

MR. NEARY: How much?

MR. DOODY: \$205,000.

MR. NEARY: We had a petition the other day. That must be engineering work or something.

MR. PECKFORD: No, it is sewer.

MR. DOODY: No, water and sewerage it says here.

MR. PECKFORD: Water and -

MR. DOODY: Water in the sewerage line.

MR. PECKFORD: In the subdivision.

MR. DOODY: Sort of a slurry system.

MR. NEARY: It is not in the main part of Upper Island Cove.

MR. DOODY: And that happens on many occasions too. And here is one of the more progressive communities. Wabana, \$74,500 for repairs to the arena.

MR. NEARY: What?

MR. DOODY: \$74,500 for repairs to the arena for Wabana.

You certainly would not deprive or certainly would not ask that the people on Wabana be deprived of their arena.

MR. NEARY: No, but I have a few questions I would like to ask the minister about it though just the same, if he does not mind.

MR. DOODY: I do not think I will continue with this, Your Honour. Wedgewood Park, paving. That is another self-sufficient community that pays the whole shot all the way, K-Mart pays the whole shot all the way, the town of K-Mart. Whitbourne, water and sewerage system. The town of Windsor, to redeem a debenture.

MR. WHITE: What is that about?

MR. DOODY: I can only assume that that was a previous loan which they could not pay and the Department of Municipal Affairs must have had to refinance it for them and put it back in there. That is the only thing that I can imagine that that might be for. As I say, these are all Municipal Affairs projects and there is little that I can add to that except to say that the list is as I have read it and the total amount which was guaranteed by this Province was \$23,786,000. The

MR. DOODY:

gentleman who prepared the notes for me was kind enough to put on the bottom of the list, "Note: The initials W and S indicated above stand for Water and sewage systems," which is probably one of the greatest compliments that I have ever been paid since I came into this outfit.

MR. WHITE: A real bureaucrat.

MR. DOODY: In any event, Your Honour, I commend the resolution to the attention of the committee and sincerely hope that the committee grants the authority to look after these very worthwhile projects. I would be ashamed to have to go out there now and start rolling up that pavement and digging up systems. I cannot do it.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman.

MR. DOODY: One other thing before the gentleman sits down. No, no! When you stand up could you explain please for the benefit of the committee the significance of the necktie, where it came from and does it have some special message for us?

MR. NEARY: I believe I told the hon. gentleman it came from Nebraska, it came from Michigan really. A good friend of mine in Michigan sent it to me.

MR. DOODY: She knew you before then?

MR. NEARY: No these are very popular down in the United States. It cost \$7.50

MR. NEARY: in case the hon. gentleman is interested.

And as the hon. gentleman can see it is pointed towards that side of the House more or less for the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter).

MR. DOODY: He is not with us this morning.

MR. NEARY: It is a fine day today. The hon. gentleman is back with his hands down in the savoury patch. He should be horse whipped, not go out in his savoury patch.

Mr. Chairman, there are three or four items that were read out there by the hon. gentleman that I want to ask a few questions about. And the first one I want to deal with is the \$650,000 loan and guarantee for the community of Torbay. As the hon. gentleman is aware, Metro Engineering, one of Mr. A.B. Walsh's companies, was the successful bidder on the contract to put water and sewerage into the community of Torbay. Now Mr. Walsh stated the other day that Metro Engineering does not do any work for the government. Now my understanding is that these public tenders that were called were called by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing -

MR. DINN: On behalf of the town.

MR. NEARY: - and the loan and guarantee is taxpayers money out of the public treasury which will either have to be paid back in part or in full or subsidized by the public treasury. So indirectly, Mr. Walsh, Metro Engineering is doing a tremendous amount of business, or was doing a fair amount of business with this government. So that is the first little point that I want to make.

Now in the process of installing water and sewerage in the community of Torbay, Metro Engineering, for some reason that is unknown to the town council, decided to pull his men and equipment out of the community of Torbay, leaving the town council and the people of Torbay high and dry as far as the implementation

MR. NEARY: of water and sewerage is concerned. Now the council has been forced to have a writ served on the bond holders and on Metro Engineering to try and get the work completed. Now what I want to ask the minister is in the process of doing all this, it could be a long, drawn-out legal battle in the courts, it could be a long, drawn-out process, it could cost the community of Torbay a lot of money for legal fees, delays, escalation in the cost of the project and so forth, now who will be responsible for this ultimately? Will it be the contractor for pulling out for no significant reason other than wanting

Mr. Neary:

a few fringe benefits that the town council of Torbay would not go along with? Who will pay for the escalation in cost? Will the cost be passed on to the people who will be using the water and sewer services in Torbay as a result of this negligence and this pulling out by the contractor because of incompetence, and because the contractor was unable to plan and organize his work? Will the people of Torbay be the ones that will have to suffer because of this? Because undoubtedly there is going to be a tremendous increase now in the cost of putting in the first phase of water and sewerage in Torbay. It is going to cost a lot more than \$50,000, as the minister just read out in the Loan and Guarantee Act. Who will pick up the tab for the difference? If the community of Torbay has to come back and ask for, say, to have this brought up to \$1 million increased by \$350,000, because of the inconvenience and because of the contractor not wanting to finish the job, will the people of Torbay have to pay this? Will they have to foot the bills for the legal fees? Why did the contractor pull out? Perhaps the minister can tell us. And how much of this money has been paid out to this contractor? Have there been any holdbacks? And if there are holdbacks, would the minister tell the House now where the situation stands with regard these holdbacks? Will there be any penalties imposed on the contractor for pulling out and causing additional expenses to the people of this Province to put the water and sewerage, the first phase of this project in Torbay?

And while the minister is on his feet, perhaps the minister can give me the same information in connection with Pouch Cove, where I think \$800,000 of a loan and guarantee has been made to the town of Pouch Cove for a forty year period. And the same contractor did exactly the same thing. Metro Engineering again, Mr. A. B. Walsh, who made a public statement the other day that he does no business with this government - Metro Engineering does no business with this government? - indirectly have two contracts valued at

Mr. Neary:

\$1, 450,000 in two contracts alone, and left the people down in Pouch Cove high and dry.

Now what will happen in this case? My understanding is in the case of Pouch Cove a writ has not yet been served on the bondholder -

MR. DINN:

Yes.

MR. NEARY:

The minister says, yes. Well, I am looking for an updating now because we are approving the loan and guarantee. But a lot of this money has been paid out to clean up the mess that Metro Engineering left behind, and there is still quite a mess in Pouch Cove. As I said the other day, it looked like the landing in Normandy after Metro Engineering pulled out. The town council had to go in, and I do not know whether they got permission from the minister but they had to use some of this loan, some of this money that was guaranteed, they had to use some of it to put back fences, to repair the road so that people could drive over the road to get back and forth to work in the community of Pouch Cove. The whole countryside, Sir, was practically destroyed, devastated by Metro Engineering, which pulled out again and left the people of Pouch Cove high and dry. Now that is going to cost the people of Pouch Cove an additional sum of money. How much, we do not know. Will that be passed on to the householders?

MR. DINN:

Or the government?

MR. NEARY:

No, Mr. Speaker, it is the fault of Metro Engineering.

MR. DINN:

It has not been determined.

MR. NEARY:

It has been determined, Sir. The community of Pouch Cove, the town council have been to see the minister on a number of occasions, and they were told they had three courses of action open to them, and the one I believe that got their dander up was to kick the consulting engineers off the site, to kick off Procter and Redfern which are, I suppose, one of the most reputable engineering firms in this Province, in the nation. And it was suggested and hinted that

Mr. Neary:

if they wanted the project to continue that Procter and Redfern's Mr. Raffety be kicked off the job, because Metro was looking for fringe benefits, looking for handouts, looking for additional things that were not in the original contract, and the consulting engineer said they were not entitled to them, and they were not getting them, And so they got stubborn and contrary and Mr. A. B. Walsh pulled his contractor out of the community and left the community, left the town council and the people down in Pouch Cove high and dry the same as he did in Torbay. And as a result of this, Sir, the people of these two communities should not be the ones to suffer, because the cost is going to be passed on whether it is in the form of a water and sewerage tax or in the form of a property tax or a service fee. Utimately the negligence

MR. NEARY: and the incompetence of Metro Engineering, Mr. A. B. Walsh and his company, is going to be passed on to the people and they are the ones who are going to have to pay through the nose for his pulling out and leaving the communities high and dry. No doubt they are going to have to come back for additional money because they have had to use some of the funds, a good bit of it I believe - they have had to use \$40,000 or \$50,000 I think.

MR. DINN: But there is not necessarily you know going to be more money. I mean it might be the contractor who is responsible and if he is he will pay.

MR. NEARY: It might be the contractor or the bond holder.

MR. DINN: Whoever.

MR. NEARY: But there is going to be legal costs. I hope the minister is right. I hope that Metro will be forced to go back and finish the job or the bond holder.

MR. DINN: If they are wrong.

MR. NEARY: I do not think it makes much difference to the people as long - Well, it does, It is going to cause delays and inconvenience. People have had their fences destroyed. Their lawns have been destroyed. Their trees that have been set there for years and years, their landscaping has been destroyed and so there is going to be tremendous inconvenience and tremendous cost to the people no matter what happens. But I hope that the minister is right that they will not be back looking for more money because of an escalation in the cost of the project -

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. NEARY: - caused by the delays or the legal battles in the courts that may take place. I hope the minister is right. That is two projects, Sir, that I would like to hear a progress report on. The loans and guarantees are in place. The work has ground to a halt because of the stubbornness - I do not know what else you could call it - of the contractor, in this case Metro Engineering, Mr. A.B. Walsh, the gentleman whom we have heard so much about inside and outside

MR. NEARY: of this House over the past several weeks. Now we have a -

MR. H. COLLINS: Those are tendered. They are not -

MR. NEARY: That is what I said. They tendered and they got the contract, but Mr. Chairman, what the hon. gentleman does not realize, and maybe I am suspicious by nature, that they bid low hoping that they would get fringe benefits, additional costs, that they would get cost -

MR. DINN: No way!

MR. NEARY: Oh yes, Mr. Chairman, because this is why they are not on the job. They are not on either one of these projects at the moment. They were looking for more money and they argued that they had to do work that they were not supposed to do and they needed more money from the town councils and that is why they pulled out. They could see they had bid too low and the reason they bid low was they were hoping to come back to the administration with their hand out and the government would bail them out. But the government -

MR. DINN: They have got another thing coming there.

MR. NEARY: Only time will tell, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DINN: That is right.

MR. NEARY: But in the meantime we have also this situation down in Placentia that I have spoken about so often where we have practically, I believe, \$1 million spent on putting in water and sewerage, I believe it is in Southeast Placentia, is it? The south eastern part -

MR. PECKFORD: You are talking about the sewerage system now, are you?

MR. DINN: No. The sewerage system is right in the town.

MR. NEARY: Right in the town itself?

MR. DINN: Yes.

MR. NEARY: Well anyway, the system is there but the houses are not hooked up. Here we have another situation where Dart -

MR. DINN: It does not work.

MR. NEARY: It does not work and it will not work. I am told that the pipes were smashed up when they were being put in the ground.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. DINN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order.

MR. DINN: I would love to be able to speak on these.

The problem with two of them -

MR. NEARY: You can have your opportunity. You can speak on them.

MR. DINN: No. But the problem with two of these. Mr. Chairman, is that, as I understand it, writs have been issued in Placentia and in Torbay and therefore they are before the courts. I am just wondering if we are getting outside the area, although I would love to be able to discuss them. I am quite well aware of all three projects but two of them are, as I understand it, before the courts and whether we should be discussing them in here or not is a very good question.

MR. NEARY: Well, we are passing a Loan and Guarantee Act so -

MR. DINN: Yes, I know.

MR. NEARY: - we have a right to get a progress report.

MR. DINN: I can give that.

MR. NEARY: Well that is what I am looking for, a progress report, an updating on what is going on.

MR. CHAIRMAN (MR. YOUNG): Order, please! I feel it is not a point of order but it is more or less a point of explanation. If writs have been issued concerning this matter I would ask the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) to refrain from discussing it if it is before the courts.

MR. DINN: Pouch Cove is all right.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am not questioning Your Honour's ruling, but in my opinion, Sir, civil

MR. NEARY: matters you can discuss in this House. Mr. Chairman, we are passing a bill -

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Young) Yes.

MR. NEARY: - the minister is asking us to give \$600,000 -

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am informed that regardless it is before the courts and not to be discussed in the House.

MR. NEARY: Well the trouble is, you see, Your Honour, I do not know whether they are before the courts or not and I do not believe Your Honour is aware these matters are before the courts.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Neither do I, but -

AN HON. MEMBER: The minister says they are.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. minister has indicated that they are.

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. NEARY: Well, that is what I am asking for, an updating. I want a progress report of what is happening in the case of the Placentia sewer system that is in place and not a house has been hooked up. And the minister is asking us to approve \$600,000! I believe we have a right to know what is being done. Has the money been spent? Is there any holdback? What is the situation concerning Placentia? These three especially I would like to know about.

And then there was the controversy in connection with the Burin Bay Inlet sewerage system. There was some controversy about that three years ago and I believe the consulting engineers were hauled over the carpet. There was a big investigation into the extension of this project because the engineers apparently were taking the town council and the government to the cleaners.

MR. HICKMAN: Where is this?

MR. NEARY: In Burin Bay Inlet.

MR. PECKFORD: These were DREE projects apart from the provincial part.

MR. NEARY: That is right. And then the Minister of Municipal Affairs launched an internal investigation as a result of my probing and prodding on this matter; not only an investigation into consulting engineering fees as far as the Burin Inlet sewerage system was concerned but launched an investigation, period, into consulting engineering fees. Because a lot of the money, Mr. Chairman, in these loans and guarantees, as Your Honour knows from the little job that was done over in Upper Island Cove, as Your Honour knows a lot of the money in here in these loans and guarantees is for consulting engineering fees. And so it is about time that we got a report now on this Burin sewerage system. And was the consulting engineer in actual fact trying to extort more than he was entitled to from the town council? Because we are told, Mr. Chairman, that bills were sent directly to the Department of Municipal Affairs when my hon. friend was minister - the present Minister of Mines and Energy - were sent and approved by the department without prior consultation or without approval from the Town Council of Burin. We do not know whether it is true or not, and the minister is not nodding yes or no. I have a feeling myself that there was an element of truth in it.

MR. PECKFORD: No, I do not. That particular detail I am not familiar with right now. I do know that the internal investigation was undertaken, because, you know, I instructed the people to do it. After the full investigation was done it could not be ascertained that there was any element of dishonesty or criminality involved with the consulting engineers or the contractors as far as I remember the situation. They were cleared of any wrongdoing.

MR. NEARY: Okay, well then perhaps the minister might table the report in the House.

MR. PECKFORD: Well you will have to ask the appropriate minister for what.

MR. NEARY: No, the report was not - or the internal investigation after I believe was broadened. It was not just restricted

MR. NEARY: to the Burin sewerage system. My understanding from the questions that I put to the minister, and the answers I got from the minister when the hon. gentleman was Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, was -

MR. PECKFORD: We did an assessment -

MR. NEARY: - that they did an assessment on all consulting engineer projects -

MR. PECKFORD: Right.

MR. NEARY: - and I believe the minister indicated at the time there would be a black list prepared.

MR. PECKFORD: No, but that there would be a rating system compiled as engineers in the Department of Municipal Affairs saw the quality of the work done by the different engineering firms.

MR. NEARY: Well, Sir, a rose by any other name!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, well I would like to know if the rating system is now in effect and working in connection with all these loans and guarantees that we have before us. And I do not see why the minister would hesitate in laying on the table of the House a copy of that assessment -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) be made public.

MR. NEARY: of the consulting engineering firms in this Province in order of priority - who will get the work and who does not get the work and the justification for it. Because, Mr. Chairman, I feel for the minister's own protection that this should be done because there may be firms black-listed unknowingly, unwittingly. The minister may

Mr. Neary:

have a list in his department of priorities giving a certain firm, a very low priority for example.

MR. H. COLLINS: But those firms themselves are engaged by the town councils.

MR. PECKFORD: Yes.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman for Gander (Mr. H. Collins) must think that I am naive and stunned.

MR. PECKFORD: No, a municipality can insist upon -

MR. NEARY: I spent fourteen years on a town council, I spent three and a half years a minister, and I have got some idea -

AN HON. MEMBER: It is up to the town council.

MR. NEARY: -I have got some idea how these things are done.

MR. PECKFORD: No, but you are wrong. The situation is if a municipality wishes a certain consulting engineering firm the government has no alternative but to -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. minister must think I am awfully, awfully gullible. The recommendation, nine chances out of ten - well, not nine chances; 100 per cent of the cases the recommendation comes from the Department of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PECKFORD: No.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Chairman, let us face it, A town council will not, because it is afraid, it is looking for a loan and guarantee, is looking for a project, it is looking for -

MR. PECKFORD: You know what the town of Carbonear did last year or the year before?

MR. NEARY: I know they can dig their heels in.

MR. PECKFORD: Not only did they dig their heels in. but they asked for proposals of who would give them the best rate?

MR. NEARY: Yes, and that is the way it should be really.

MR. PECKFORD: And that is what happened.

MR. NEARY: But it does not happen that way, Sir.

MR. PECKFORD: It does so.

MR. NEARY: The process, the procedure -

MR. PECKFORD: It does so.

MR. NEARY: - the procedure up to now has been that a gentle hint will come from the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing. They will say, Look, here are the best people that can do this, -

MR. PECKFORD: No.

MR. NEARY: - and the town council will not go against it, afraid they may be going against the wishes of the minister or some official in the department. It is not left entirely up to the communities, the town councils.

MR. PECKFORD: That is when you were in power; it is not like that now.

MR. NEARY: No, it is still going on, Sir.

MR. PECKFORD: We changed it.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I just gave the hon. gentleman a case in question down in Pouch Cove - and that is not before the court where the minister or somebody indicated to the town council in Pouch Cove that they get rid of their engineering consultants if they want to get the co-operation of the contractor and the government.

MR. H. COLLINS: So they (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: No, they had not.

MR. PECKFORD: That is an allegation, that is not a fact.

MR. NEARY: Well the hon. gentleman will answer me in due course. Just take it easy. I am only repeating, I am merely repeating what I was told.

MR. PECKFORD: Oh good!

MR. NEARY: I was told after my research and my consultation with the gentleman who are in the know in Pouch Cove, and I believe they might know what they are talking about, some of these gentlemen. I spend a Sunday afternoon in part of my continuing research in connection with these two water and sewer projects, the one in Pouch Cove and the one in Torbay, and I spent another weekend in Placentia discussing that one with a gentleman down there. And I know it is

Mr. Neary:

only a matter of the minister's word against mine, Sir. But it is not my word, I am repeating what I was told, and I am repeating what I was told by gentlemen in Pouch Cove who know, I believe, what they are talking about, that one of the options open to them was to kick out their engineering consultants. Now is that freedom of choice, Mr. Chairman?

I do not know what the community of Upper Island Cove did in connection with their water and sewer project, whether they were allowed to pick their own consultants or not, but there is always that little gentle hint. Now but the thing is I am not going to get into that now, What I want to get into now is whether or not there is a black list - a list of priorities is the same as a black list - and I believe if there is one we should have freedom of information, Sir. We should not hold it back at all, lay it on the table of the House and let the chips fall where they may.

And so I am hoping that the minister will not hesitate to give us the report on the Burin sewerage project, and on the internal assessment, as the minister puts it, the internal assessment that was done on consulting engineering fees in this Province. Did it bring about economy and saving to the people of this Province? And we never did get a report. This is the first time I believe it has come up this session, and it has come up rightly so under the Loan and Guarantee Act. And I would also like to know, Mr. Chairman - I hope the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Municipal Affairs are making notes on the questions I am asking - I would also like to know if the matter of the controversy between Mount Pearl town council and the Recreation Committee has been straightened out because there is a loan and guarantee, as Your Honour can see right in front of Your Honour there in the book, just to show Your Honour I am completely in order, there is an amount there for the Mount Pearl stadium that ran into

Mr. Neary.

some rough water, ran into some stiff criticism there a few months ago when apparently the Recreation Commission of which my hon. friend, the member for Mount Pearl, I believe, at one time or still is a member of the -

MR. N. WINDSOR: No,

MR. NEARY: No; was at one time, is not now, so the hon. gentleman tells us. This loan and guarantee was brought out in a peculiar way. Now I honestly and sincerely agree, Sir, that Mount Pearl should have a stadium. Nobody is knocking the stadium, and I hope that the minister or the member will not think for one moment that anybody in this House is knocking the stadium for Mount Pearl. What we are questioning, Sir, is the procedure under which the loan and guarantee came about. Apart from being a classic example of pork-barrelling in this Province, we are told that the town council was unable to get an audited financial statement from the Recreation Commission.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not true.

MR. NEARY: I am only - we have no updating, and we have no way of knowing unless I get up now and keep asking questions and hope that I will get some answers. All I want to know is: Has the matter been resolved?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Well, if it has then, we do not know. And I am not going to belabour the point. All I want to know is if that the matter has been straightened out, if the department are satisfied with the audited statements, if the council were given these statements and passed on to the minister's department and everything now is just sweetness and life, and I hope it is, Sir, because it was a strange set of circumstances indeed. And although nobody was knocking a stadium - no more than they were knocking a stadium for the Southern Shore. I want to see that promise carried out, that stadium built on the Southern Shore. This is the third by-election, the third election they have had down there now. I hope the third time will be lucky. There was a group went up to Montreal

MR. NEARY:

to look at a new type of building, a new type of stadium for Ferryland. I hope -

MR. N. WINDSOR: They were looking at the same building for Mount Pearl.

MR. NEARY: Well, why did they not wait and go down in Mount Pearl and take a look at it. Now who paid the expenses of these people going up to Montreal with Mr. Charles Power when he was the member of the House of Assembly for Ferryland? Did Mr. Power pay the expenses of the committee? Did the government pay it; because there is no town council in the area, I do not believe, that could pay it or did the Tory Party pay it?

MR. DOODY: I cannot understand why they would not rather go to Mount Pearl.

MR. NEARY: Right, because they already had been experimenting. There was a pilot project.

MR. DOODY: In both towns, and I think Mount Pearl -

MR. NEARY: There was a pilot project in Mount Pearl that started out, by the way, Mr. Chairman, that started out to be, I believe, a project that would cost in the vicinity of - was it \$200,000 or \$300,000? - well, I take a stab in the dark. I think I am a bit high when I say \$300,000. It is now up close to \$1 million or over \$1 million.

MR. N. WINDSOR: It depends on the period of time you are talking about.

MR. NEARY: Oh, it depends on the period of time! I am making a statement, Sir. The project started out to be in the vicinity, to cost in the vicinity of somewhere between \$200,000 and \$300,000, and it is now up close to or over \$1 million. And, Mr. Chairman, in the process of getting it up to \$1 million some strange and weird and wonderful things happened, and that is why the project ran into heavy ice there a few weeks ago. But I am glad to hear now that the ship of state is moving on through the ice.

Mr. Neary.

It is out of the ice jam and making steady progress. I am certainly glad to hear that, Sir.

Now I do not know if the minister read anything out for Carmanville or not, but I believe the hon. Premier or somebody gave the people of Carmanville - was there anything there for Carmanville? - gave the people of Carmanville a promise, a little note, a scribbled note on the back of an envelop before one of the election campaigns that they would repave the road through Carmanville.

MR. DOODY: There are two here for Clarenville.

MR. NEARY: No, the Carmanville road needs to be repaved, as the hon. gentleman knows.

MR. PECKFORD: There is no guarantee on that.

MR. NEARY: No guarantee, so therefore I cannot discuss it. I can only ask the question why is it not in there?

MR. PECKFORD: I think that would be Transportation and Communications. I think there is some Department of Highways road involved there.

MR. NEARY: It is a main highway. It does not come under the town council?

MR. PECKFORD: Right.

MR. NEARY: Well, it is too bad, because the people have been calling me up down there day and night wanting me to find out from the administration, are they going to repave that road as the Premier promised?

MR. DOODY: There is nothing there.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is that North or South?

MR. NEARY: I do not know if it is North or South.

I would not know one end of her from the other, although I have been there several times. I would not know one end of the hon. gentleman from the other, you know.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, that brings me now - I have gone through now Pouch

MR. NEARY: Cove, Torbay, Placentia, Burin, the consulting engineers report, Carmanville, the Mount Pearl Stadium and now that takes me back to my old district -

MR. DOODY: Do not forget Montreal.

MR. NEARY: - my hon. friend's new district, my old district of Bell Island, where we have a loan and guarantee of \$75,000 for repairs to the Monsignor Bartlett Memorial Stadium in that great and historic district. Now, Mr. Chairman, perhaps the hon. gentleman can answer a few questions in connection with this. Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to say to the minister that out in my own district of Port aux Basques there is a stadium -

MR. DOODY: Do not bring that up again.

MR. NEARY: Do not bring it up. Well, I have to bring it up because I have to draw comparisons between Bell Island and Port aux Basques, the town of Wabana and Port aux Basques.

There was a promise made by the former Premier who resigned yesterday, left this House for the last time and is now wending his way towards England, that gentleman promised the Town Council of Port aux Basques that -

MR. DOODY: Verbal.

MR. NEARY: - verbally, orally - that the government would pick up the tab the same as was done for all the other communities in Newfoundland where stadiums were built at that time. This administration refused to honour the commitment and as a result of that the town of Channel-Port aux Basques had been placed in the most embarrassing, in the most difficult financial position that any council could be forced into through lack of consideration by the administration, by this administration. They refused to honour an old commitment made by the former Premier of this Province and as a result the town council of Channel-Port aux Basques have to pony up the money that they did not expect, commitments that they did not expect to have to meet.

MR. NEARY: Now over on Bell Island, Mr. Chairman, let me explain the situation for the benefit of hon. members of the House in connection with the loan and guarantee for the stadium over there, which Your Honour has been in more than once and I would not be a bit surprised but Your Honour skated in that stadium in his younger days. At least Your Honour attended many a sport's dance there and many a good time we had together in that stadium. But, Sir, the stadium was owned by the RC Episcopal -

MR. DOODY: Corporation.

MR. NEARY: -Corporation. It was owned by the parish on Bell Island and as a result was of course a part of the overall corporation. Now that stadium was built by the late Monsignor Bartlett. As a matter of fact, I helped to build it along with hundreds of other people. I contributed towards the construction of that stadium and when the gentleman passed away there was difficulty in settling the estate and as a result of it the RC parish on Bell Island had to pay out a substantial amount of money, I believe \$120,000, to the sisters of the late Monsignor Bartlett. And so the stadium was there for a few years. One year it did not operate and it was deteriorating. It did not operate one year and then other years, when I was the member, we managed to get a grant from the provincial government to pay the electricity bills and to pay the hired help and to get it operating. But anyway, Sir, up to the time I left the stadium was still the same as it was, say, when it was built except it had deteriorated slightly, the equipment may not have been as good. So what happens, Mr. Chairman, to that stadium? The RC parish approached the government, - no, they approached the town council on Bell Island and asked the town council through its recreational commission to take the stadium off their hands. Now remember, the stadium in the beginning really belonged to the people

MR. NEARY: of Bell Island because people of all denominations had contributed to that stadium. Well anyway, nobody on the island really objected too strongly to that except that it looked like a very peculiar thing to do, to ask the government to ask the town council to ask the people to pay for a stadium that they thought they already owned even though it was in the name of the RC parish. Anyway, Mr. Chairman, that move was successful. Is the minister listening to what I am saying?

MR. DOODY: I was trying to answer a question.

MR. NEARY: Well perhaps the hon. gentleman from Bellevue (Mr. Callan) can restrain himself for a moment while I -

MR. CALLAN: Normans Cove, by the way.

MR. NEARY: I am talking about the hon. gentleman's district, otherwise I would not worry about it. And so anyway the stadium was taken off the hands of the RC parish and now was conveyed to the recreation commission, which is really the town council, really the town of Wabana, because the recreation commission is a creature of the town council, another one of my godchildren, by the way, because I was the one who set it up, the recreation commission, not the present members. I set up the original recreation commission.

MR. DOODY: There is a good group there now.

MR. NEARY: They were always a good group.

MR. DOODY: I am not saying the other crowd were not.

MR. NEARY: They were the ones who operated the stadium.

But anyway, Mr. Chairman, so they now have the stadium in their hands. So then they decided to apply for a LIP project to repair the front because, if Your Honour will remember, the front of the stadium was rotted out, needed to be replaced. So they decided to get a LIP project. I believe they got two, to remove the front of the stadium to put a new front back in because the front really was not used that much anyway. They could put the offices and so forth in the back of the stadium and to do some general upgrading they decided to -

MR. DOODY: The power plant.

MR. NEARY: - to get a couple of LIP projects.

And so that was carried out very successfully.

But then, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Bern Fitzpatrick, the gentleman that I defeated on two occasions, decided to give up his career as an insurance salesman and move back to Bell Island. Before he moved back I might say he managed to get his hooks into the Rural Development Authority, if the hon. gentleman will just listen for a moment. Mr. Fitzpatrick managed to get his hooks into the Rural Development Authority for some \$15,000 or \$20,000 or \$25,000

MR. NEARY: to build two greenhouses that have not grown - they were supposed to be built to grow tomatoes and there has not been a tomato grown in either one of them for the last two years. And then the gentleman got a loan from Newfoundland Farm Products to buy a tractor and this tractor was hired out, Sir, to the stadium -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Your Honour is trying to figure out how to tie the two things in together.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like the hon. member to keep it relevant, please.

MR. NEARY: Well, I have to give a little preliminary, Sir, to be relevant. But anyway, the gentleman somehow or other moved in, took over the recreation commission, took over the stadium, got himself hired as manager of the stadium, manager of the project and the minister just told us in the Loan and Guarantee Act that there is \$75,000. I would submit to this hon. House that that is closer to \$500,000 now, closer to \$500,000. It is probably well over \$500,000. And yet the people out in Channel - Port aux Basques, who had a commitment from the former administration, cannot get the subsidy paid on their stadium, they have got to pay it themselves. Why the favouritism? Is it because Mr. Fitzpatrick was a defeated Tory candidate? And, Mr. Chairman, in the process of building this stadium the mayor of the town, an unemployed electrician, got himself in on the bonanza, Mr. Fitzpatrick, instead of using the tractor he had for farm purposes, hired it out to the stadium and there were all kinds of strange things going on. I am not knocking the upgrading of the stadium, Sir, which needed to be done, but I believe there is room for a minor investigation into the way the money was spent on this stadium and how the hiring was done and who got the contracts and were public tenders called.

MR. NEARY: Certain members of the town council, as my hon. friend knows, and the recreation commission have been asking for a financial statement, financial reports, documentation of why certain things were done and they cannot get it. And this \$75,000 is just peanuts compared to what is going to be brought in in next year's loan and guarantee. I do not know if there is anything is last year's but certainly in next year's.

Mr. Chairman, is this not pork barrelling?
I mean, what would Your Honour call it? I cannot think of any other name to put on it.

Mr. Neary:

We saw it in Mount Pearl, now we see it on Bell Island, and nobody is knocking. Now I hope neither one of the gentlemen will get up and say that I am knocking a stadium for Mount Pearl or a stadium for Bell Island. I want to see a stadium in Ferryland. But why do they not do it on the level, above board? Why does it have to be done through the backdoor by former defeated Tory candidates who are the ones who get themselves in nice little cushy positions. Now the gentleman is manager of the stadium over there after he gets it finished, gets all of the money out of the public treasury to build it, rebuild it and everything else. And it is a beautiful stadium. Now the gentleman gets himself hired on as manager. I am sure the hon. gentleman will be a thorn in the minister's side as long as he stays on Bell Island.

So I would like some explanation for all of these things. Will the town council get their financial statements? Will there be a mini-investigation into the way the money was spent on this stadium? Even one of the staunches Tories over there has fallen out with the hierarchy of the Tory Party over this, a great friend of Mr. James McGrath's, now fallen out with the mayor of the town, who was also a great Tory, over the stadium controversy. So there are all kinds of doubts and suspicion in the people's minds that needs to be straightened out. And I hope that the minister will give us a full and detail -

MR. DOODY: A Doubting Thomas.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, I am not a Doubting Thomas, I am repeating what I know, what I was told, and if the hon. gentleman had any conscience at all the hon. gentleman would be getting up and supporting some of the questions that I am putting to the minister.

MR. WOODROW: You have not got the facts.

MR. NEARY: I have not got the facts!

MR. WOODROW: You are only repeating, that is all.

MR. NEARY: I see.

MR. WOODROW: Why do you not act like a gentleman?

MR. NEARY: I mean, I did not go to the stadium on Bell Island and see Mr. Fitzpatrick sitting in his chair in his office as manager of the stadium. I did not go there and see the mayor who was unemployed, an unemployed Tory, get himself a nice little contract on that stadium. I did not see any of that. The hon. gentleman, I have got news for him. I did not go down to Pouch Cove and consult with the people down there who know about what happened down there, Torbay, Placentia. I just came in here shouting from the hip without any consultation with any of these people at all. How does the hon. gentleman think I spend my evenings, holidays, and weekends?

MR. WOODROW: I know you are a very hard worker.

MR. NEARY: Yes, I certainly am. And that is where I spend my time.

MR. WOODROW: You should have to produce a sworn affidavit.

MR. NEARY: Going around investigating and researching things that are brought to my attention, evidences of wrongdoing and scandal. I spend half of my time at it. You know, I do not come into this House and shoot from the hip unless I know whereof I speak. And I know in cases I have mentioned whereof I speak. And I know that it is the people who are going to suffer. And it is the people who are going to have their taxes increased as a result of all of this. And this loan and guarantee that was given to the town council on Bell Island, the minister promised that there would be a public meeting before a property tax was implemented on the Island. That promise has not been kept. And that is causing great controversy. I was over Sunday afternoon at the Boys Club when they had their annual presentation.

MR. DOODY: Boys and Girls Club.

MR. NEARY: A Boys and Girls Club, the first Boys and Girls Club in Newfoundland.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Sir, as a matter of fact we pioneered it.

MR. DOODY: Helped get the Buchans one started.

MR. NEARY: An early copy of the one that went out to Buchans and started the one out there, and he was there for the awards the other night when my hon. friend announced an increase in the grant to the Boys Club, and then I believe whoever was representing the minister got up and confirmed it. My hon. friend announced it, and was it the minister who was there?

MR. PECKFORD: No, the deputy minister.

MR. NEARY: The deputy minister got up then and confirmed it. I thought that was one of the amusing things I have ever heard, when my hon. friend was speaking at the presentation of awards my hon. friend announced an increase in the grant to the Buchans Boys and Girls Club, and then the deputy minister got up and said he was bringing good news from his minister.

MR. DOODY: Sure what is wrong with that?

MR. NEARY: Nothing wrong with it, that is the way it should be. That is democracy at work.

MR. DOODY: That is right.

MR. NEARY: So if my hon. friend thinks for one moment

Mr. Neary.

that I just come in here and shoot from the hip without doing my homework I have got news for the hon. gentleman.

MR. WOODROW: I must say you are pretty fair indeed. There is no doubt about it. You have got to give him full marks for working hard.

MR. NEARY: So there are a lot of questions, Mr. Chairman, in connection with this Loan and Guarantee Act that I would like to see answered, and I am going to throw the floor open now to the minister - I imagine both ministers - and maybe the previous minister may have to get in on the act and maybe the member for Mount Pearl (Mr. N. Windsor). But all these things should be straightened out to the satisfaction, not to my satisfaction, to the satisfaction of the people of this Province who are the taxpayers, who are the people who pay the bills, because after all, Sir, if you leave any doubt or suspicion in their minds at all, then they are going to lose respect for people in authority. They are going to lose respect for the government. They are going to lose respect for their member. They are going to lose respect for the Opposition. They are going to lose respect for the House. They want to see their money spent properly. They do not want any politics played with their money, any pork-barrelling, any favouritism, any political patronage. They do not want to see this. They want to see things done straight and above board, and that is all I am trying to do is to get the government -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: to straighten these matters out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The forty-five minutes have expired.
The hon. member for Mount Pearl.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to take a few moments to react to some statements made by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) in relation to the Mount Pearl arena, the way in which that was built. The hon. member claims that when it started out the original cost was estimated at \$300,000.

MR. N. WINDSOR:

That is not true. The estimated cost when we started out was, maybe, \$25,000 or \$30,000. Now let me tell you the story of it, and I have no hesitation in telling the story, Mr. Chairman, because I am proud of the story. It is a story that perhaps should be told, and that many communities across this Province could learn from.

It started out, Mr. Chairman, after -

I should go back perhaps. For the last ten years there have been several committees established to try to build an arena in Mount Pearl. They met with limited success. In 1974 the Mount Pearl Minor Hockey Association was formed, and we were operating a minor hockey programme. I was part of that committee and we found that it was almost impossible to get ice time in the St. John's area, at least at a reasonable time. We were taking kids, nine and ten years old, getting them out of bed at five o'clock on a Wednesday morning, taking them to St. John's for practice, say, from six o'clock to seven thirty perhaps, bringing them home, pushing some breakfast into them and sending them to school, And we said, That is not satisfactory. A kid eight and nine years old should not be subjected to that sort of treatment in trying to play a game of hockey. Those kids obviously could not perform to their best in school that day. Added to that, of course, we could not get enough ice time. We were only operating, I think, three teams that year. It gave you a total of maybe fifty kids in Mount Pearl getting properly organized hockey, other than the school systems, the Avalon Consolidated School system and so forth, and those people, of course, are doing an excellent job. But in the minor hockey programme itself we had perhaps fifty young people taking part.

So we said, well, sitting over a cool brew at the Legion Club in Mount Pearl one night, we said, What are we going to do about this? Well, we said, let us build an arena, half jokingly, half seriously. And we said, Well, why not? Maybe we cannot build an arena, but let us build a facility where we can have

Mr. N. Windosr.

some ice time for these kinds. And we looked around at the town, and we said, Well, we have got some lovely courts up there. If they were twice as large as they are, and the town has been saying we need more tennis courts, so let us say we expand on the tennis courts, let us double the size of those tennis courts, and we will have a fair sized paved surface. Let us make an agreement with the town council that we will provide twice as many tennis courts as you have now on the proviso that we be allowed to run those tennis courts in the Wintertime, to erect some boards on them, to flood the area and have a natural ice rink and that the Minor Hockey Association would have, at least, certain priority and control over that. And we perhaps may even make a dollar to help pay for the cost of it with general skating and this sort of thing. So that was our first thought. We approached the town council and they said, That is a great idea. You know, we have been wondering how we can get somebody to build some tennis courts, and this is the way to do it. It will give you a place to have an outdoor ice surfate as well. So we started along those lines. And all of a sudden along came one of the councillors who happens to be - and I will use his name because I think he should go in the record, Councillor Eric Reid, who is a professional engineer, an employee of Labatt's Gadens, and he said, Look, we are modernizing our plant down there now, we are taking out some refrigeration equipment at a surplus to us, we are just modernizing. It is very good equipment. There is nothing wrong with it. I think we might be able to make it available to you. So we asked him to investigate further, and he did. And he went to the head office in Toronto, and the Labatt's people in Toronto agreed that since it was surplus to them, they had no need for it, it could be donated to the town of Mount Pearl. Now you are talking about equipment worth \$50,000 or \$60,000

MR. WINDSOR: if we had to buy new equipment. And that was donated to us. And now all of a sudden we have a cooling plant, and we said, 'Now we can have an outdoor artificial ice surface.' And then we said, 'Well now, what is the point in putting it there? Hopefully some day we will be able to put an arena around it and have a proper arena. Well, why put it in the middle of town? We could never enclose the tennis courts, could never put an arena in that particular location. Maybe if we are going to go that far, if we have a cooling plant and we are going to put some pipes in the ground, maybe we should have a look at finding a piece of land that we can use, something that could eventually become an arena.' And so we did. We looked around the town again and we found a piece of land back from Smallwood Drive that was zoned for open space, which under the town zoning regulations states very clearly may be used for recreational purposes such as an arena or a soccer pitch or a baseball field or that sort of thing. We again approached the town council and said, 'Look, you have this piece of land.' It was owned by the town in fact, except for one small section which happened to be smack in the middle of it. We approached the town council again and we said, 'Look, we have now come across this proposal. Would you make that piece of land available for an arena?' And they agreed and they procured that piece of land that was not owned by the town, in fact were most co-operative. And so now we say, 'Great! Now we can put an outdoor artificial ice surface in a location properly planned that some day we can put an arena.' Now we started thinking a little bit more and said, 'Well, climatic conditions in Newfoundland are far from excellent and outdoor ice surfaces are far from desirable really in our Province with the amount of snowfall we have and the number of freeze/thaw cycles we go through in the run of a winter.' We said, 'Now if we could just get some sort of a building to put over it just to keep the snow off, we would save a lot of money in snow clearing on that thing over a winter. Let us have a look at that.' And we did. And two of our members went to Quebec City. The cost of

MR. WINDSOR: that, for the hon. gentleman's information was paid for, and I realize he did not question this one. But we did have two members go up to Quebec City and have a look at one. That was paid by the Mount Pearl Minor Hockey Association.

MR. DOODY: If he had known he would have made scandal out of it.

MR. WINDSOR: Oh, yes, he would have made a scandal. But anyway, they went to Quebec City and they looked at a building that was most excellent. It was a self-supporting structure, which means it does not have any beams or girders. The shell itself is self-supporting. It was used there. And it is a beautiful arena in Quebec City. It is completely finished. They have a carpeted boardroom and everything there, something that we really would not hope to have and I am not sure we need. But it certainly is an excellent structure up there and all landscaped and paved and it is used not only for hockey but it is used for a general auditorium and musical shows and whatnot. So they looked at it and we analysed the cost of it and it was very favourable. At the same time we also had quotes from contractors who construct conventional buildings in the Province and the city. We had three or four quotes on it, as I recall, and the most attractive by far was this one. And the reason it was is that it is almost like a giant mechano set, very repetitious, that it does not take any great amount of skill to erect that building, just several hundred pieces of steel all identical, all the same size bolts and you just bolt one on after the other. And it lent itself beautifully to a labour intensive programme such as the LIP programme. And we said, 'Now if we could apply to LIP and get some money how good that would be.' Because we do not need any specialized skills. And at the same time we applied to the Province for some funding and we had great programmes - we had the first Mount Pearl Day on July, if I recall correctly, 17th, 1975. And I recall it very vividly because I was appointed that day to work on the barbecue and I barbecued over 500 T-bone steaks in one day. And I was barbecued more than most of the

MR. WINDSOR: steaks were by the time I was finished, but we had a very enjoyable day. It was extremely successful and as I recall we made in excess of \$7,000 profit that day -

AN HON. MEMBER: Well done!

MR. WINDSOR: - on St. David's Avenue field in Mount Pearl. And that was a start of our financial drive, really, to raise money for the Mount Pearl arena. We went on from there, and the provincial government came through with some funding and the federal government came through with a LIP programme and we started off with our arena. Now it was just to be a shell, just to be a shell arena. But it was planned so that eventually it could be built on to and we could add proper dressing rooms and showers and canteen, the whole bit. And so we started off with a LIP programme.

MR. NEARY: The cost is going up all the time.

MR. WINDSOR: The cost is going up, the scope of the project is going up. It is not an escalation in cost. It is an increase in the scope of the project.

MR. NEARY: Had that stadium not been approved by the government?

MR. WINDSOR: Sorry?

MR. NEARY: Had it been approved by the government or was this a political announcement the government was saving up?

MR. WINDSOR: No, there was no political announcement.

MR. NEARY: I see.

MR. WINDSOR: No, no. So it grew. It mushroomed, so to speak. So at this point in time we have gone from an outdoor natural ice surface on the tennis courts to an artificial ice surface with a building over it,

MR. N. WINDSOR: and it went on from there. The support in the town grew. The minor hockey people worked extremely hard and you just would not believe the amount of money that these people made working at the regatta, working here in the parking lot when the Player's Race was held a couple of years ago, the race cars going around the building here. We made I think \$1,800, if I recall correctly, in two days selling ice cream and pop, on the parking lot here behind Confederation Building and I recall those very well because I took part in that too.

So the project grew. We started our LIP project of constructing the building. And we hired people, everyone of them through Canada Manpower with the exception I think of - well he was hired through Canada Manpower but basically unskilled people, with the exception of one supervisor, a gentleman who could run the people. We had thirteen or fourteen people hired. And let me say also that two of those people I think that we hired we took straight out of the St. John's Penitentiary, at the request of certain people who said, "Look, we can get these people paroled if we can find employment for them." And this is a little side story but it is one of which I am particularly proud. And we said, "Yes, we will try them. We will give them a fair chance." And they did and they worked out very well. And I think both of these people, if I am correct on this, I think both of these people are now in full time employment, supporting their families and themselves. And that is a little side benefit of the project that we take great pride in.

And so the project grew from there, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY: It has nothing to do with the -

MR. N. WINDSOR: No. But it has something to do with the fact that, you know, the project did not start at \$300,000 and get up -

MR. NEARY: - human interest angle. Is it a red herring to distract from the pork barrelling that went on.

AN HON. MEMBER: Be quiet.

MR. N. WINDSOR: And so the hon. gentleman says that now the building has cost over \$1 million. Not true. The building is worth in the order of \$1 million but it did not cost \$1 million. It cost in the order of \$750,000, maybe.

MR. NEARY: More than that.

MR. N. WINDSOR: No. No.

MR. NEARY: Yes. Yes.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Actual cash outlay. Now if you want to throw in there \$50,000 value on the refrigeration plant donated by Gaden's, if you want to throw in there \$40,000 or \$50,000 worth of engineering costs donated by members of our committee who are professional engineers, such as myself and Ralph Neil, and Eric Reid, who is an electrical engineer, and Mike Healey, who is a mechanical engineer, and Ron Hall, who is a stationary engineer, who actually installed all the mechanical equipment, reconditioned the equipment that was donated to us.

MR. NEARY: Would other communities get the same privilege, you know, if they have the expertise? Ferryland, for instance, if they have the expertise will they get the same privileges as -

MR. N. WINDSOR: What privileges? The privilege of donating your time, hours and hours of time to build an arena. Sure they have.

MR. NEARY: Government grants.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Yes.

MR. NEARY: They will.

MR. N. WINDSOR: The grants that were given to the town of Mount Pearl were entirely, and I will leave the minister to answer, but entirely in accordance with the programme.

MR. NEARY: I see.

MR. HICKMAN: What fortune. What fortune.

MR. NEARY: And the same thing will happen to Ferryland and all the other communities in Newfoundland?

MR. N. WINDSOR: Why not?

MR. NEARY: Okay.

MR. N. WINDSOR: I cannot speak for that. I mean, that is a governmental decision. If funds are available. I cannot answer that.

MR. NEARY: Okay. We will see.

MR. N. WINDSOR: The point was that any funds that came from the provincial government were in accordance with the programme that was laid down and that every other arena that has been built in the last five or six years were built under.

MR. NEARY: The loan and guarantee was given to the town council, the recreation commission spent the money, and

MR. N. WINDSOR: Let me deal with that.

MR. NEARY: - the town council have no say in it.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Let me deal with that.

MR. NEARY: Perfectly all straightforward.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Not true.

MR. MURPHY: Not true.

MR. N. WINDSOR: As I said, the whole thing started out with the Mount Pearl Minor Hockey Association, who planned and built and worked and earned most of the money for it. Everything was in co-operation with the town council. They were fully informed. They donated the land right at the very beginning. They were kept apprised, whenever they requested information they were given it. There were numerous meetings and numerous letters back and forth. What the hon. gentleman is referring to is the fact that in order for a government of course to become involved financially in such a programme, the building would have to be owned by the town of Mount Pearl. The Minor Hockey Association never, ever intended to own an arena. Our one object was to construct an arena and have it there available for the people of Mount Pearl. And so, simply it was a matter of at an appropriate time transferring ownership of the whole thing to the town of Mount Pearl. That has been done. The arena is owned by the town of Mount Pearl.

MR. NEARY: When was that done?

June 9, 1977

Tape No. 4051

NM - 4

MR. N. WINDSOR: Well it has been ongoing for a number of months. The final details have been worked out. But it was, as I understand, signed perhaps a week or so ago, finally signed, finally transferred. So the town now owns it. It is being run by

Mr. N. Windsor:

an Arena Committee, essentially the Minor Hockey Committee, on behalf of the town, or for the town by this Committee under a signed, legal agreement between the town and that incorporated body. So there is no problem. As I said, the thing is entirely above board. And I for one am most proud, Sir, of this project and I think a lot of communities in this Province could take a lesson from it. For the simple fact is it is not a matter of going -

MR. NEARY: Do they have to elect a PC member to take advantage of it?

MR. N. WINDSOR: No, they do not, Sir. When I started that programme I was one of the four people who was sitting around the Legion Club having a beer and decided to start this, and it was only a year and a half afterwards that I became involved in politics. And that project was well on the road when I did, and it had no bearing on it whatsoever. The work that I did on that arena was because I was a member of the Minor Hockey Association and a member of the Recreation Commission, neither of which I am today because my duties here and responsibilities do not give me the time to take part as I would like to, but some day I shall indeed become involved again.

So it is not a project of the Provincial Government. The Minor Hockey people, Ralph Neil and Bruce Stoyles and Fred Burns and the other people involved in there put a tremendous effort into it. The people of Mount Pearl owe them a debt of gratitude for it. The people of Mount Pearl also are to be congratulated because it was a community project, Sir, if ever there was one in this Province, there was a community effort behind that arena, and I think many, many communities in this Province could learn a good lesson from it. It is not what government can do for you, Sir; it is, "We are going to do something, can you help us?" Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: I will take exactly as much time as I need with your permission.

MR. HICKMAN: Well then, you have it.

MR. DOODY: Thank you. I am being scourged and harassed and attacked by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, Sir, and I react violently.

The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing has every intention of having some input in the discussion here, Mr. Chairman, but I want to address myself primarily to the charges and allegations and innuendoes and insinuations and all the suggestions of wrongdoing and scandal and so on that they are associated, theoretically or by suggestion with the renovations, and indeed the virtual rebuilding of the Monsignor Bartlett Memorial Stadium on Bell Island.

As the hon. member well knows, as he described the removal of the front of the arena which is going to do such and such, and whatnot and so on, the original concept of that thing was funded by a LIP grant once again. The Chairman of the Recreation Commission at that time who applied for that LIP grant was a gentleman named Bernard Fitzpatrick. Since Mr. Fitzpatrick was a defeated candidate for the Tory Party in two elections, which for some reason or other makes him suspect and should not be involved with the Recreation Commission, should not be chairman of it, and should not have spearheaded the drive to rebuild and put back into service or use the stadium or the arena on Bell Island. And my friend knows better than I do -

MR. NEARY: Not about that, what about the one -

MR. DOODY: My friend knows better than I do that the arena on Bell Island is probably more than just an arena, and it is more than just a memorial to Monsignor Bartlett. It was the whole centre of activities on that Island for many, many years, long before I became involved with the Island.

MR. NEARY: Well, not now, it used to be one time, but not now.

MR. DOODY: It was the whole heart and centre of the place over there. Activities centered around the hockey team from Bell Island. I often remember going over there with St. Bon's hockey team and you would almost need a police guard, an escort to get out of there after some of the games, they were so heated and so excited.

MR. NEARY: No, that is not fair now. That is not fair.

MR. DOODY: It was really exciting and interesting, It was really wonderful.

MR. NEARY: I mean, I was one of the young fellows knocking around then, and I remember the time they accused of stoning the bus, which we did not do.

MR. DOODY: The bus got stoned on its own.

MR. NEARY: No. Maybe the players did.

MR. DOODY: Right. In any event there was always a very exciting and very interesting series of events. The point is that that stadium when the hon. member was representing the Island, it fell into disuse, it could not be used.

MR. NEARY: No, not true.

MR. DOODY: It was no longer serviceable.

MR. NEARY: It was useable.

MR. DOODY: The plant wore out, rusted out, it was leaky, the roof was gone. When they started to take the front out they discovered that the pipes underneath the surface,

MR. DOODY: the freezing area were all rusted and had to be replaced, the roof had to be redone, And so the recreation commission as the hon. member mentions it is really a creature of the municipal council, came through the regular channels to government for assistance through the programme that is available, and the Department of Recreation and Rehabilitation and the Department of Municipal Affairs co-operatively made some money available.

MR. NEARY: No hesitation.

MR. DOODY: There was considerable hesitation, there was a great deal of hesitation, and the hon. gentleman who is now on his feet had to fight exceedingly hard to get that project approved. And if the hon. member opposite feels that the situation in Port aux Basques is comparable to the situation on Bell Island, then he is not fooling anybody because he knows the difference in the economy of Bell Island and the economy of Port aux Basques. He knows how much money the municipal council in Port aux Basques has compared to the municipal council on Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Is that how you get a statement?

MR. DOODY: He knows the 7000 people on Bell Island cannot really afford to do all the things that they would like to do and that they need on their own as well as the people in Port aux Basques have.

MR. NEARY: Is the minister announcing a new policy now or what?

MR. DOODY: And therefore this hon. member who represents them took great pride in fighting on their behalf and convincing my colleagues that this was a very worthwhile venture indeed and one that was worth the government's attention and the ministers responsible for the departments, keeping within the restrictions of the policy, managed to find the money to carry on with the LIP grant programme which had already been started.

DR. FARRELL: The same that was done in every other area.

MR. DOODY: Every other stadium that has been built was done

MR. DOODY: under the same system. As we went along the line we were informed by the recreation commission that there was insufficient funds to complete the programme that was under way. That is where this \$74,000 comes in.

MR. NEARY: Is that true?

MR. DOODY: Overrun, the cost escalated.

MR. NEARY: How much did it cost to rebuild that stadium?

MR. DOODY: I do not know what it was. It could very well be \$500,000. I do not know.

MR. NEARY: Could it be more?

MR. DOODY: No, it would not be. And once again, as the hon. member from Mount Pearl says, if you try to estimate the costs of these things you get into LIP grants and various other programmes that were put into place and various - I do not know. I have not got the total breakdown on the cost but I do know that before this additional funding was made available there was an audit done on the Recreation Commission's books. People from the Treasury Board in the Province of Newfoundland, and people from Municipal Affairs went over there and, to use the immortal phrase of the hon. member from LaPoile "They went through the books and records with a finetoothed comb, Your Honour, with a finetoothed comb" and they discovered there were no irregularities, there was nothing wrong.

MR. DINN: No mismanagement.

MR. DOODY: No mismanagement, no waste in spending. The accounting records were in good order, the vouchers were all accounted for, tenders had been called. Now I do not know if Mr. Fitzpatrick's little tractor was hired to do some of the work there. I sincerely hope it was. If a tractor had to be hired then I sincerely hope it was going to be hired from somebody who was contributing towards the progress.

MR. NEARY: It was Fitzpatrick's LIP, his own personal LIP programme !

MR. DOODY: And I also know as a matter of record, and can confirm, that the mayor of Bell Island, who was unemployed at the time and who was a qualified electrician, was hired to do some electrical work in the stadium.

MR. NEARY: No conflict of interest.

MR. DOODY: Now is there some scandal attached to that?

MR. NEARY: No conflict of interest.

MR. DOODY: Is it a scandal to spend money to hire an electrician? The fact that the gentleman is the mayor of Bell Island disqualifies him from making a living?

MR. NEARY: They have their own LIP project.

MR. DOODY: He is not allowed to make a living because he is the unpaid mayor of Bell Island!

MR. NEARY: That is not what I said.

MR. DOODY: This is absolutely absurd -

MR. NEARY: This is not what I said, It should have been put on public tender.

MR. DOODY: _ but it reduces the member to exactly what he is. Every possible opportunity that he gets to smear somebody, to cast an innuendo at somebody. The only sin that Mr. Fitzpatrick -

MR. NEARY: A point of order, Mr. Chairman. Your Honour knows that you cannot impugn motives to an hon. gentleman of this House, Sir. I did not set out to smear anybody, through either accusations, charges or innuendo and I believe the hon. gentleman should withdraw that statement, Sir, and apologize to the House especially in view of the fact that my young nine year old daughter is sitting up in the gallery and listening to the hon. gentleman making a cod of himself.

MR. DOODY: Your Honour, if I have offended the hon gentleman in any way I certainly withdraw the statement and even if his nine year old daughter were not in the gallery I certainly have no intention of offending the hon. gentleman. I know how sensitive he is and I

MR. DOODY: know how careful he is of other people's feelings and I certainly do not want to be party or privy to any assault on him. I apologize for anything I may have said to upset him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to welcome to the gallery, as I am sure all hon. members would, the grade III class of St. Pius X accompanied by their teacher, Mrs. Bown, and as stated by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) his daughter is in that class and I would like for you to give them a warm welcome.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: It now being one o'clock I leave the Chair until three o'clock this afternoon.

MR. NEARY: jargon that has been put in by the legislative draftsmen, all it does now is convert the terms to metric. And that is one of the major features of the legislation that may, I suppose, be necessary because of the conversation in this Province to the metric system .

But, Mr. Speaker, it does nothing, Sir, this bill does nothing for instance to help the status of the Labrador Linerboard mill in getting low cost wood. It does nothing to help Ralland Forest Products down in Milltown who are into a hassle with Bowaters trying to get enough wood to keep the sawmill going down here. It does nothing to help the Conne River operation, where you have the native population, the native association operating a big sawmill down there employing a lot of people. It does nothing to help their problem in getting sufficient

Mr. Neary:

timber rights to tide them over for the next fifteen or twenty years.

I do not know if members are aware of it or not, but in the sawmill industry one of the big problems is that you cannot have just sufficient timber rights for a short term operation. It has to be long term, and it has to be the kind of timber that is suitable for saw logs. It has to be -

AN HON. MEMBER: Time for the Late Show.

MR. NEARY: Yes.

I have to move the adjournment of the debate and then go on to the Late Show. So I move the adjournment of the debate, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: It being 5:30 a motion to adjourn is deemed to be before the House. One matter for debate, and that involving the expertise, men and equipment available as a result of the closing of Labrador Linerboard at Goose Bay and the possible closures of mines at Buchans and St. Lawrence, The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the reaction that I got from the Premier this morning when I put this question was, it seemed to be, a very favourable one. But my concern, Sir, is over the fact that the hon. Premier of this Province never says no, he always says yes, and he always looks at things in a favourable light, but he never does anything about it. That is one of the great weaknesses of this government; we have a Premier who never says no, but he never does anything.

Now, Sir, during the week the Minister of External Affairs for the Government of Canada, the hon. Don Jamieson, made a statement in St. John's when he was speaking to the Equipment Distributors Convention down here at the Holiday Inn, made a statement in connection with the Lower Churchill Falls Development, the construction of a tunnel underneath the Straits of Belle Isle and the construction of a transmission line to bring the electricity development at Gull Island to the Island of Newfoundland. So this

Mr. Neary:

statement, Mr. Speaker, tossed the ball right back into the hands of the Provincial Government.

Now, Sir, my contention is this, that the administration, the Premier and the Government of Newfoundland, have been asked to update all the data in connection with these three huge projects, update the data for Mr. Gillespie, the Federal Minister of Mines and Energy, and for the Government of Canada. And I contend Sir, that in updating this data that the government of this Province include the possibility of using equipment, expertise, and men that will become available as a result of the closing of the Buchans mine sixteen months from now. Here we have a ready-made situation, Mr. Speaker; We have the men who can do the underground work, who are now involved in tunnelling underground, we have men down in Green Bay, down in my hon. friend's district, we have a few left over on Bell Island, and in the event that the mine should close in St. Lawrence we have all kinds of equipment and men available there that can be involved in constructing that tunnel underneath the Straits of Belle Isle. And we would be insane if we did not take advantage of that, if we allow that equipment and that expertise to get out of our hands. And what I am suggesting to the Premier and the government is this that they put a freeze, if necessary, on the equipment in the Buchans mine, and if St. Lawrence closes put a freeze on, try to get that equipment for one dollar, try to persuade the Government of Canada instead of piddling away its money on Canada Works projects, and foolish LIP projects, that they put their money instead into this gigantic job creation project of constructing a tunnel underneath the Straits of Belle Isle, using the expertise, the equipment and the men that will become available in the next sixteen months to a couple of years, who will be unemployed. This will create alternative employment for these people, and they can be moved quickly to the site, and they can be moved to both sides of the Straits of Belle Isle, and every foot of that tunnel that they dig they know that they will be doing it for their Province, and for their nation.

MR. NEARY:

And, Mr. Speaker, we were told this morning by the Premier that the tunnel is essential to the development of the Gull Island project, the development of the Lower Churchill. So I am hoping, Mr. Speaker, unless this Province wants a welfare ghetto a couple of years from now, I hope, Sir, that the Minister of Mines and Energy, the Premier, and the government and his colleagues will take Mr. Jamieson's very broad hint very seriously, and concentrate on the necessary steps leading to the development of the Gull Island project, the tunnel underneath the Straits of Belle Isle and the transmission and use the expertise, the men, and the equipment that I have mentioned.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to respond to the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and the suggestions that he has made as a result of questions to the hon. the Premier this morning.

Number one, the ideas that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has indicated, the ideas that he has put forward are interesting ideas and where possible the manpower at these other industrial or mining sites, if it so happens that these other sites have to close down for economic reasons, manpower will be used on any development on the Lower Churchill where their expertise is needed for the tunnel construction or whatever and the only problem with the machinery part of it is in a great many instances the machinery is not suitable for the kind of work that they have to do on the tunnel crossing, but where it is, if a suitable deal can be arranged with the company, fine.

AN HON. MEMBER: At Buchans, the equipment there is not suitable?

MR. PECKFORD: Not exactly, no. Not all of the equipment is the kind of equipment that could be used. But where there is equipment and we can work out some kind of reasonable deal with the companies concerned, well then, fine, we will work that way. Now as far as the Lower Churchill itself goes and the broad hint thrown out by the Minister of External Affairs, let it be recorded, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier initiated meetings with the Minister of External Affairs, the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, the Minister of DREE, the Minister of the Environment in Ottawa at which I attended, and at which the hon. Minister responsible for Intergovernmental Affairs attended, at which time we went over the whole range of priorities as it related to the development of the Province and one of the major items under discussion was hydro development.

We indicated then to Mr. Jamieson and to the hon. ministers our priorities and our eagerness to get on with the

MR. PECKFORD: hydro development in Labrador and since then of course we firmed up the Labrador powers studies thing, a fifty-fifty deal with the money from DREE and from the provincial government and that is ongoing, and indicated our eagerness to get on with the whole project.

Mr. Gillespie had indicated earlier than that that he wanted some late figures on the whole development. On May 17th. or 18th., I think it was the 18th., there was a meeting between Newfoundland Hydro and officials from Energy Mines and Resources at which meeting it was indicated to the officials of Energy Mines and Resources the cost figures that we were now looking at as it related to the Lower Churchill development. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the people in Ottawa today, since May 18th., are aware of the kinds of costs we are talking about for the development of the Lower Churchill.

Now the other matter is that, as the hon. Premier has mentioned, a tunnel across the Strait is essential and is the kind of way we want to go. Secondly, that if all the money was in place tomorrow morning for the Lower Churchill the development still could not fly unless you can have some way to market the surplus power there. You are talking about 1600 megawatts or 1700 megawatts, and people always get this confused, and we can use approximately half of that power. The question is what do you do with the other half? You market the other half until you need it. Where do you market the other half? You either attract industry industry or you market it West. How do you get it West? The most viable way to get it West is through the Province of Quebec, and that takes negotiations with Quebec and with the federal government to allow suitable arrangements to be made which are not going to jeopardize the project or jeopardize this Province. In other words, we must be able to either sell it to Quebec at a marketable rate, or transmit it through

MR. PECKFORD: Quebec by a corridor given to us by the federal government.

MR. NEARY: - and build a transmission line.

MR. PECKFORD: We need to have the whole package put together, obviously.

Now thirdly, I think I am on number three or number four, thirdly we are presently talking to the federal government about projects dealing with the whole Labrador Lower Churchill problem right now.

MR. DOODY: Five minutes up, Your Honour?

MR. PECKFORD: Not verbally but in writing, and over the next couple of weeks it will become evident as these negotiations continue the kind of initiatives that this administration has taken in the last few months to expedite some development on that very valuable resource.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The motion before the Chair is that the House do now adjourn. Is the House ready for the question. Those in favour "Aye," contrary "Nay," in my opinion the "Mayes" have it.

MR. FLIGHT: What?

MR. SPEAKER: Do hon. members agree to call it six o'clock? Is it agreed? Agreed! It being six o'clock I leave the Chair until eight this evening.

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
8:00 p.m. - 11:00 p.m.
THURSDAY, JUNE 9, 1977

The House resumed at 8:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member for Eagle River.

AN HON. MEMBER: What bill are we on?

MR. STRACHAN: Bill No. 67, the Forest Tax Bill.

I cannot remember exactly where we were. The member from Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) led off, but there are some points that we were concerned about. The fact is that this bill is essentially a tax on forest lands and we are concerned a little bit about the minister's preamble to the bill in which he was virtually stating that the tax would be applicable in the cases of Bowaters and other companies. I understand the tax is applicable to all corporations or all companies - or is it just applicable to Bowaters? It is applicable to all companies, is it not?

AN HON. MEMBER: They are the only two that own limits.

MR. STRACHAN: Yes, and what we are talking about here is that the nature of the tax will depend very much on the relationship between the companies and the government. That is what it seems to imply. And I wonder if the minister would, when he is closing off this reading here, because we will get into it in clause by clause reading, but I wonder if the minister could indicate whether the companies - how the nature of that tax will be applied to the companies. He is stating that if the companies are in some ways providing good management, then the tax will be less than maximum or less than what is applied. And it seems very much to us as though the amount of tax that will be assessed will be up to the discretion of the minister, according to his statements. And there seems to be some kind of sweetheart relationship or something, if we want to put it as harshly as that, between the companies and the departments, assessing from what the minister has stated. So I wonder if the minister could reply to that, because we feel strongly that what needs to be done with the companies in certain ways is that there should

MR. STRACHAN: be a rationalization of the forests of this Province. It was a platform which the administration opposite came in with a way back, that the resources belong to the people and there would be a rationalization of the forests of this Province. And if this bill here is the final the culminating rationalization of the forests as far as the administration opposite is concerned, then it does not seem to contain a tremendous amount of teeth. It does not seem to be the rationalization we are concerned about. We understand it is an amendment, but it is a fairly heavy piece of legislation as far as the member from Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) is concerned. It is a fairly heavy piece of legislation as far as we are concerned, because it is a tax act,

MR. STRACHAN: and if it is just a simple amendment in housekeeping, then we do not think it is quite the housekeeping the minister is implying it is. We have great concern about this because we feel that the situation that arose with Linerboard and so on hinges around the management of the forests and the taxation of the forests in this Province, and although these are the only two companies which this applies to, we wonder what will happen in the situation in Labrador if there are any provisions made for any future development of the forest in Labrador. For instance, I do not know under these statements here whether VanBeke under any arrangement will come under this, I suppose he is outside of this, but I wonder how that will be applicable to, for instance, VanBeke, if he wants to get into it, or other companies who want to get into it. This is a tax then which is placed on companies who have holdings prior to now. What happens in the future? Or how does that happen? For instance, VanBeke has applied to cut 40,000 cords this year, cords he is going to ship to Europe, by the way, and I often wonder how Van Beke is going to manage to ship 40,000 cords to Europe and make a profit at it when the government could not ship the wood from Goose Bay to Stephenville? In fact, we are taking tremendous losses at it. And I think it shows the fact that the government made a mess of the administration and the management of Lab. Linerboard in Goose Bay and the whole area there.

It also seems to me that there are certain sections dealing with the management or the husbandry of the area, and again as the member who is far more familiar with the Bowater and Price holdings we are concerned that as such there is very little management of the forests. There is very little afforestation programme in this Province and very little good, orderly cutting of the forests in the Province. I certainly know that one of our problems with Lab. Linerboard in Goose Bay was that they were almost cutting everything, slashing everything. There

MR. STRACHAN: was little reforestation. They tried in the end when Stu Allen took over to try to get back into a proper management programme, but I know before that there was very little management programme as such and if this is applicable elsewhere in the Province then the situation must be very bad indeed. So I wonder if the minister, when he is closing off this section here, could explain some of the situations there.

We are also concerned that there is a deal with Bowaters, and we are also concerned that if the deal is a special deal or in any way arrangements made with Bowaters because of their being - I do not say 'good corporate citizens,' I cannot remember what the minister used in his terms here. He said they were good management or they would be alleviated or let off some of the clauses or less tax or something for good management, something in that relationship there, and we wonder exactly what the principles were that they adopted, developed this track. Because we feel that Bowaters has made their money out of the forest industry in this Province. They have made their money. They certainly should not be here for anything else. There are certain years in which they are hammered when they do not make a profit, they are getting very close to the bone, but in the years which are good years they certainly make a great profit in this Province and we feel that they have not invested that capital back into this Province. They have used much of the profits they made out of this Province to build mills elsewhere in North America, and we understand that they are getting to the stage now where any attempt at assessing a proper tax against them meets with Bowaters stating immediately that they are going to walk out of Corner Brook and leave the mill alone. And although we understand the seriousness of this we feel that it is a pressure tactic by Bowaters. It is an understandable tactic which most resource management corporations, most resource corporations use in order so they are not taxed the proper amount

MR. STRACHAN: of tax.

So I wonder if the minister could relate the tax to the rationalization of the forest, whether this is only one step on the way to the rationalization of the forest and whether we can expect any redistribution within this Province of the ownership of the forest lands. I understand that Reids, for instance, did have holdings. They own ten per cent of the square miles of the area of the Island part of the Province, ten per cent, and they were paid off or bought out for their timber holdings. I think they were paid something like \$3.1 million. I cannot remember that far back.

Mr. Strachan:

but I think it was \$3.1 million they were paid or \$3.9 million, I am not sure. They were paid for their holdings, and they are holding out on their mineral rights. But I wonder how this assesses then against the situation that Bowaters and Price do have large holdings, they may be prepared to give up certain holdings that they do have, but there needs to be a whole rationalization. I wonder if this tax is aimed at that to try and push towards that aim or whether the tax is just brought in as a sign that the government is doing something but not doing very much, in fact, in a sweetheart arrangement with the companies.

So I wonder if the minister could explain that and point out some areas in that when he finishes this reading.

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. minister speaks now he closes the debate.

The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, I will try to reply to a few of the things that have been said and a few of the questions that have been asked. First of all, let me make it quite clear that the original bill of 1974, and the bill as proposed to be amended today, is not a taxation bill. It is a bill aimed towards rational forest management resources here in this Province, and the taxation is used as a weapon to ensure that management is carried out in the proper manner.

Some hon. gentlemen asked what kind of a sweetheart deal or whatever with Bowaters? There is no deal with Bowaters or with Price or with any other company. However, Price and Bowaters are the only two companies remaining in this Province that own any substantial amount of forest resource. There may be a couple of other small blocks around the Eastern part of Newfoundland.

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

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

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, the minister is hard enough to hear as it is without the noise on the other side or in the corridors or something.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member wishes other hon. members to remain silent so that he can hear the hon. minister speaking.

The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. MAYNARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As I was saying, there are very few holdings of any substantial size in the Province other than Bowaters and Price where they have the exclusive right to harvest trees under acts signed in the Legislature back in sometime in Newfoundland. But the Act does apply to anything over 300 acres. Any lot of land that is privately owned over 300 acres the Taxation Act applies.

Essentially what happens, or what has happened, Mr. Speaker, is that when the Act was brought in in 1974, as I stated earlier today, neither Bowaters nor Price, where they had never been required to do a complete analysis of the timber holdings - the annual allowable cut per year on those timber holdings, or the species mix or the size mix or anything like that - where they had never done this in the past, on a universal scale, that is, they therefore had to be given time to build up their data, to do the ground surveys, to do their aerial surveys in conjunction with our people, and to find out exactly how much timber was on their holdings, how much the allowable cut would be per year, what the maximum sustainable yield is - in other words, how many cords per acre per year is normal for various areas - and we gave them two years in which we said we will only apply the basic seven and one half cents per acre tax on your properties, whether it is freehold land, leasehold or straight timber leases, we will apply the seven and a half cents per acre because that is the amount we determined it will cost the government at this point in time to protect the forest resource of the companies; in other words, protection against fire, some insect protection, and other types of protection that were needed.

Now in two years, which were the years 1975 and 1976, both Bowaters and Price

MR. MAYNARD: devised their data base in order to come up with their plans, their management plans. At the beginning of this year, as of the 1st. of January of 1977, the two year moratorium was over. Now, what I said today when I introduced the bill was not anything at all about Bowaters or Price being good corporate citizens. What I said was that in the application of the 1974 Act and in devising their management plans and in putting all the data together, the two companies have been very co-operative. Even though Bowaters was fighting, or had threatened to take the case to court claiming that the 1974 act did not apply to them, they still continued to pay the seven and one-half cents per acre and they continued to devise their management plans without prejudice. However, early in 1977, I think it was in February, the Bowater people made a decision that they would not contest the Forest Management And Taxation Act in court and wrote me a letter to that effect. Even though that letter was written, this bill was already in the initial draft form and the bill here, I believe, makes only specific reference to Bowaters, and this is for two reasons: Price holdings are not under the same system as Bowaters, which have timber licenses but very little if any freehold or leasehold holdings, and the difference I am not so sure about in legal terminology .

 The other thing was that the Bowaters 1938 act had certain provisions in there which they were saying initially insured this 1974 Act did not apply to them. And there was the export wood provision in the 1938 Act that we wanted cleared up. In 1938 the government determined that Bowaters must export 50,000 cords a year or be subject to a penalty. Our policy is that they should cut that 50,000 cords or allow the 50,000 cords to be cut but not necessarily exported unless there is no market in the Province of Newfoundland for that wood.

MR. NEARY: Under no circumstances export it.

MR. MAYNARD: Well, it is not much point in cutting it and leaving it lying on the ground. That is kind of a stupid statement.

MR. NEARY: Give it to the sawmills.

MR. MAYNARD: If there are no buyers for the wood in the Province then they may be allowed to export it and the section amending the 1938 Act is specifically for that purpose.

MR. NEARY: I do not agree with it.

MR. MAYNARD: The reforestation bit was mentioned by a couple of people and the gentleman who mentioned the reforestation bit is absolutely right because previous to 1974 there was never an attempt of any kind, any nature for government to do anything with the forests in this Province, never an attempt of any kind. The only thing that the government ever did was to sign the Price (Nfld.) agreement or the Anglo-Newfoundland Development back in the 1920's giving away large tracts of land, the Bowater agreement in 1938 giving away more large tracts of land, and then pass out a permit to someone who had a sawmill. That was the only involvement that government ever had in forestry in this Province.

Now why have we not done everything overnight?

Because it is impossible to do everything overnight. We could not set up a nursery and have it started overnight so we could plant trees out on the Bonavista North peninsula on the burnt overs.

MR. NEARY: The nurseries were already started. The hon. gentleman knows that.

MR. MAYNARD: The nurseries were not started.

MR. NEARY: They were started.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, in 1972 there was not even a seedling in the ground in the New Bay nurseries.

MR. NEARY: Where were you living, my son? Were you away to another province or what?

MR. MAYNARD: I happened to be in New Bay nursery in 1972

MR. MAYNARD: immediately after the first seedlings were planted there. There was never a seedling planted. There was never a tree grown big enough to be planted anywhere else in this Province. There is no point for the hon. gentleman to say that the nursery was started because it was not.

MR. NEARY: Yes, it was started. It was.

MR. MAYNARD: Somebody might have had it in his mind.

MR. NEARY: No, it was started. The hon. gentleman knows that.

MR. MAYNARD: -but nobody ever took the time to start it.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman had a foundation to build on. Now let us face it.

MR. MAYNARD: The hon. gentleman did not have a foundation to build on. There was not even a forestry department, Mr. Speaker, that is how much of a foundation there was.

MR. NEARY: Do not be so foolish. Where were you living? Were you up in Ontario somewhere or what?

MR. MAYNARD: There was not even a forestry division. There was a director of forestry tucked away somewhere in the bowels of a department called Mines, Agriculture and Resources. Not even a mention of forestry anywhere in the department's act of Mines, Agriculture and Resources.

MR. NEARY: Sure, we had the Right Honourable Mr. Ralph, the chief forester, the expert, the man -

MR. MAYNARD: The poor gentleman across -

MR. NEARY: What do you think he was, the man who got the water bomber to fly his furniture down to Connecticut where he was going to university?

MR. MAYNARD: I hope the hon. gentleman does not want me to reply to that.

MR. NEARY: No, and I could give the hon. gentleman a good story on it too. But he is still on the go and he is still conning the government.

MR. MAYNARD: Well, he is not haunting me very much, Mr. Speaker, not haunting me very much at all. He does not give me -

MR. NEARY: 'Conning' I said. He is still conning the government. He has found a new milch cow now, the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation.

MR. MAYNARD: We started in 1972 to put the forestry department together and we started with forest management policies in 1973 and we have continued them since then.

MR. NEARY: You have a tax bill here.

MR. MAYNARD: There is thinning, reseeding, fertilization, there will be replanting when the nursery comes on stream. All of our timber on crown lands we have tried to get a handle on to try to get the cutting done in the right manner. We are still doing that and this act of 1974 and the subsequent amendments here today will enable us to ensure that everyone that operates in this Province will use good forest management techniques and that is simply what the bill is for. And if they do not use good forest management techniques and carry out the utilization of the forest resource in the proper manner then they are subject to a high tax.

MR. NEARY: Well, that is what it is, a tax bill. It is a tax bill.

MR. MAYNARD: No, it is not a tax bill.

MR. NEARY: It is a tax bill.

MR. MAYNARD: It is a management bill, Mr. Speaker, where tax is used as a penalty. Now we could have said, If you do not manage that block properly we will fine you \$50,000.

MR. DOODY: If it was a tax bill they would have me putting it through.

MR. MAYNARD: It is only a penalty section.

MR. NEARY: It is a source of revenue for the government.

MR. MAYNARD: The whole purpose behind the 1974 bill, Mr. Speaker, was not to raise any revenue for the Province. The only revenue raised would be the seven and one half cents or the ten cents per acre which is just barely adequate to meet the cost of fire protection and insect protection.

MR. NEARY: Yes, but now that you have their management plans you can sock it to them now.

MR. MAYNARD: Now, Mr. Speaker, the way the plans are submitted the Province is divided up into various areas. Some of these management areas are on company land and some of them are crown land but let us take, for instance, the company land or the company holdings is a better word. They will submit a management plan and an operational plan for each of those areas. I have the option to accept or reject either the management plan or the operational plan. If my people go over it and they say that that operational plan is not adequate to fully utilize the resource, it is not adequate to ensure that the resource is going to be there twenty years from now, forty, fifty, a hundred years from now, is not adequate to protect the environment, the wildlife or whatever, and there is more than just cutting of trees involved here, then they give me advice and I say I will not accept that plan. Now if it is Bowaters or Price they are immediately subjected to a taxation of five per cent of the fair market value of the resource.

MR. MCNEIL: What standards will you use just in your opinion?

MR. NEARY: The same as they used in Reid property.

MR. MAYNARD: In the past three years we have put together in the department as competent a bunch of people as we know how to get our hands on who are experts in forestry, in all the techniques of forestry and they also have a concept of how the forest is to be managed.

MR. NEARY: It will be done the same as the Reid property. \$5 million of the taxpayers money paid out without as much as a ground survey.

MR. MORGAN: Can you keep quiet?

MR. NEARY: I am only just telling the truth, that is all.

MR. MCNEIL: Would the hon. minister permit a question?

MR. MAYNARD: Sure.

MR. MCNEIL: The standard that you will be judging whether it is managed properly or not, do you have the criteria now available? Do you have the standards set or do you have a framework? Will you be tabling this in the House today?

MR. MAYNARD:

Do you want about fifty copies?

The framework is worked out in very great detail by the department as to what they see being the appropriate management plan. Even though you work with the framework, of course, you cannot apply the same broad criteria to each area because, obviously, the limits in the Bonavista North Peninsula are quite different from the limits in Bay d'Espoir or the limits on the Northern Peninsula because of the terrain or whatever. But in general terms, we can make a value judgement as to whether or not the plans that are submitted and the operational, the cutting plans and this sort of thing are adequate to, number one, fully utilize the resource providing there is a market for the raw material, and number two, to make sure that the resource is preserved forever and ever.

If the companies submit these plans that are accepted then we will give them a certificate of management, but the certificate is renewed every year, or is reviewed every year, so at the end of the year they have to indicate to us what they have done. Our field people have to check it out and we can cancel the certificate at any time. So we have the leverage.

Now the purpose of the Act again was not to take away the holdings of the companies. It was merely to insure that the companies used their resource they had in the best possible manner.

For instance, Bowaters have enough timber on their licenced, leased or freehold holdings or whatever to nearly operate two mills the size of the one they have in Corner Brook, about one-and-a-half the size of the one they have in Corner Brook, which is quite a bit of excess timber. If we say to them that under the Act if there is a market for that excess wood, whether it is linerboard or whether it is sawmills or some other market, then if you do not cut the annual allowable cut

MR. MAYNARD: or permit it to be cut, then you cannot consider that as being properly managed. On the other hand, if Bowaters were to come in with a plan to us, and let us assume that their annual allowable cut by scientific methods is 700,000 cords a year, and they say that they are going to cut 850,000 cords a year, we would also say that that is not managed because that is wiping out their resource. I do not know if that makes it clear as to the basic concept behind the management plan.

We also, of course, in the management plan want to know what is going to be done with refertilization or fertilization, replanting, thinning, precommercial and commercial thinning, helping the trees to grow, species mix and this sort of thing. It is a complex thing and I am trying to make it fairly short and fairly simplified, or the House Leader is going to be calling out 'carried' in a few minutes.

MR. MCNEIL: Would the hon. minister permit a question?

MR. MAYNARD: Sure.

MR. MCNEIL: How much revenue have you received from Bowaters from this taxation and how much do you expect to receive in the coming year from just the Bowaters holdings itself?

MR. MAYNARD: I think at the rate of seven and-a-half cents per acre it is around \$400,000 per year.

MR. MCNEIL: Three hundred?

MR. MAYNARD: Four hundred thousand dollars per year from Bowaters. That is at the low, assuming that all properties are managed or given a managed certificate. Of course if they do not manage all their properties - now they could if they have six management

June 9, 1977, Tape 4091, Page 3 -- apb

MR. MAYNARD: areas on their property, or
in their holdings and they submit plans

MR. MAYNARD: which show that four of those areas are managed properly, then those four areas and the acreage is subject to the low tax. If the other two areas are not deemed to be managed properly, then they are subjected to the high tax.

MR. MCNEIL: Like for example, a non-management area, would that be where you have deadwood? Would they be responsible for clearing this deadwood out so that they give the new trees a chance to grow? You know, how far do you go with proper management?

MR. MAYNARD: Yes, if the deadwood is something that is hindering the new growth then the clearing of that and facilitating the new growth is part of the whole operational plan.

MR. MCNEIL: So it is possible that it would cost them more than they would pay in taxes so they would let it rot and not manage it and pay their taxes, if it is only \$400,000.

MR. MAYNARD: No. I think if you look at the fair market value of a cord of wood and you take five per cent of that fair market value per year, you are getting into some large sums. I do not know exactly what the figures are now. Let us see if I can find them. I know I have them. The seven and a half cents per acre is around \$400,000. I believe that if all of their property was deemed to be unmanaged it would be in the vicinity of \$2.5 million to \$3 million a year as a penalty tax. And Bowaters, of course, do not spend near that amount and neither would they have to spend nearly that amount in forest management. Because you can cover a lot of area with that amount of money. So that the tax is heavy enough to ensure that the companies do manage their properties.

The other thing that is going to happen, although we are not forcing anyone into it, the other thing that is going to happen through the application of this management plan or management

MR. MAYNARD: legislation is that both the companies will be turning back excess timber limits to government for certain periods of time.

MR. NEARY: Is there any indication of that now?

MR. MAYNARD: Well, Price has already done it on the Northern Peninsula for instance.

MR. NEARY: For the Hawkes Bay mill?

MR. MAYNARD: Well, it can be used for anything. The Mooney block that was turned back for eight years, with no cost to government, can be used for anything. We can put any sawmill in there, whether it is the Forest Products -

MR. NEARY: No more sawmills! There is not a sawmill in the country that is going to survive.

MR. MAYNARD: Well, if the hon. gentleman wants to take a pessimistic view that is fine. There are sawmills in the country that are going to survive.

MR. NEARY: Well tell me where they are.

MR. MAYNARD: And the sawmills in the country that are going to survive are the ones that, number one, have good management; number two, have good markets; and number three, have a supply of logs.

MR. NEARY: Well that is the answer, the timber. Timber is the answer. A supply of logs is the answer.

MR. MAYNARD: And not necessarily in that order. A supply of logs? Mills that are getting in trouble now, Mr. Speaker, are there, and I will say to you -

MR. NEARY: Well, why can they not get at it?

MR. MAYNARD: I will say to you that each and every one of the mills that have gone down in Newfoundland in the past three years have been due to lack of management, and no other reason.

MR. NEARY: Is that what is happening in Milltown?

MR. MAYNARD: That is what is happening in Milltown. Yes.

MR. NEARY: Oh, no! That is not what is happening in Milltown. That is not so. Bowaters will not give them the timber rights they want.

MR. MAYNARD: I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: And I beg the minister's pardon. I had a big long telegram today.

MR. MAYNARD: There are adequate timber rights. We have guaranteed the mill in Milltown or Bay d'Espoir -

MR. NEARY: Yes, for three or four years.

MR. MAYNARD: - their timber rights and that they can get it and that there is timber there. Now that they can get there will be timber there in October they can cut, there will be timber there in 1978 that they can cut.

MR. NEARY: Yes, but they want ten or fifteen years ahead.

MR. MAYNARD: I am not going to guarantee anybody fifteen years ahead.

MR. NEARY: And they want to get at the Bowaters -

MR. MAYNARD: And I think that any government -

MR. NEARY: - at the Bowaters timber.

MR. MAYNARD: Any government that signs another agreement like the 1938 Bowaters Act or the 1920 Anglo-Newfoundland Development Act would be off its rocker.

MR. NEARY: Well, is the minister saying that it is poor management in Milltown that is causing the mill to shut down?

MR. MAYNARD: I would say it is a big factor.

MR. NEARY: And not the timber that they are look for from Bowaters.

MR. MAYNARD: Timber may be some of the problem.

MR. SIMMONS: The Minister of Rural Development -

MR. MAYNARD: But I am telling you that the timber is there.

MR. NEARY: The Minister of Rural Development -

MR. SIMMONS: The Minister of Rural Development does not agree with you.

MR. NEARY: The Minister of Rural Development does not say that.

MR. SIMMONS: The Minister of Rural Development does not agree with you.

MR. NEARY: Poor management - the other minister does not say it, poor management in Milltown.

MR. SIMMONS: The minister says the problem with Ralland is poor management.

MR. NEARY: The minister told us there was great management there in Milltown and this minister says it is due to poor management that they are going to have to close down the sawmill in Milltown.

MR. MAYNARD: I listed out three things.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. MAYNARD: I listed out three things that the sawmills in this Province have to have as timber, management and markets. And I am saying to you now that there is timber in the Milltown area.

MR. NEARY: Well, that is not what the company is saying.

MR. MAYNARD: There is timber in the Hawkes Bay area for the Newfoundland Forest Products mill to use. There is timber in the Gambo area for the other mills to use. There is timber in Gander for Mr. Beard's mill to use if he were still operating.

MR. SIMMONS: If you did not run him out of business.

MR. MAYNARD: Oh yes, we ran him out of business all right -

MR. NEARY: Well then, you are -

MR. MARNARD: - after investing \$312,000!

MR. NEARY: Your colleague down there is doling out the money from the Newfoundland Development Loan Corporation. Do you mean to tell me he is giving it to people who cannot manage mills? We have got about \$8 million or \$10 million lashed out.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, the minister has just given some information to the committee saying that the major factor in the Ralland operation was management. Now, of course, he said the major factor in Milltown was management. He repeated it the second time. Mr. Chairman, my point of order is that it is obvious from our knowledge to the contrary on that point that the minister is tonight not fully aware of what he is saying to the committee, to the House. And I would suggest he be asked to discontinue closing debate until such time, Mr. Chairman, as we can get some responsible information from him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I feel that is not a point of order. It is a difference of opinion. The hon. minister.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, I agree. That is a very, very poor point of order, and even with my limited knowledge of the rules of the House.

MR. MAYNARD:

And I am not going to discontinue debate now. There is a future for -

MR. NEARY: How come you let Ed Ralph get away scot-free and get out of that company in Milltown?

MR. MAYNARD: I did not let Ed Ralph get out of it.

MR. NEARY: Well, your colleague let him off the hook -

MR. MAYNARD: Who?

MR. NEARY: - because the Newfoundland Development Loan Corporation had to have a meeting to allow the transfer of the shares of the company.

MR. MAYNARD: If somebody wanted to buy out Mr. Ralph, well that was their prerogative.

MR. NEARY: Oh sure, and let him get away after getting \$1.25 million out of the government.

MR. DOODY: Is there any way of controlling the -

MR. NEARY: No. Look, I cannot stomach this.

MR. HICKMAN: Well then leave.

MR. DOODY: Well then leave.

MR. NEARY: No, I am going to stay here and I am going to try to get the truth.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Get at the truth.

MR. DOODY: Well yes, but do it in a parliamentary manner.

MR. NEARY: I cannot speak anymore because I have already spoken on second reading.

MR. DOODY: You have not shut up since I met you.

MR. NEARY: The only thing I can do now is ask questions of the minister.

MR. MAYNARD: Please, please! The member from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) said at one point in time that the implementation was delayed of the 1974 act because Bowaters did not want to pay the taxes. That is

MR. MAYNARD:

nonsense. They have paid the taxes. They did not delay it because they did not want to pay them obviously. But they have paid the seven and a half cents an acre tax. And they will be subjected to the higher tax if they do not submit management plan.

MR. DOODY: Do not confuse the hon. member with facts.

MR. MAYNARD: No, I suppose not. It is terrible for me to do that.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman must have been in the dining room again this evening.

MR. DOODY: I was on the phone.

AN HON. MEMBER: In the dining room.

MR. DOODY: No, Sir. Yes, in my dining room, home in the kitchen. A piece of chicken in one hand and the phone in the other!

MR. MAYNARD: The hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) asked what provision was in this act with regards to the development of Labrador. The act as it written does not really apply to Labrador because Labrador is all Crown territory. And Mr. Van Beke's operation is run strictly on a year to year permit from the government, the same as the Crown lands permit is given to anyone in this Province who wants to run a small mill or cut pulpwood or whatever.

Mr. Van Beke does not own or control any timber in the Province, whether in Labrador or on the Island, and therefore is not subject to taxation. Mr. Van Beke, of course, pays stumpage.

MR. STRACHAN: Will the minister permit a question? If the act is based on management, the taxation is really to assure good forest management, then how do you in the case of Van Beke when he is on Crown lands assure that he is operating according to good management techniques?

MR. MAYNARD: We simply apply the same techniques to the Crown lands permit that is issued to Van Beke or to Joe Blow, whoever it is. The permit specifies that the proper management techniques must be carried out. Now obviously since Mr. Van Beke does not have total control of

MR. MAYNARD:

any timber area, then he would not be required to replant, for instance, as Bowaters would on their own territory. But then he does not control the area. But he would be required to cut and harvest in a manner

- MR. MAYNARD: prescribed by the Department of Forestry.
- MR. STRACHAN: Is that checked very often?
- MR. MAYNARD: Yes, there are people in the area all the time. We have our staff in Labrador, we have our staff all around the Island. We have an extensive field staff now who follow up on these permits all the time.
- MR. DOODY: The Van Beke operation is probably the most closely monitored one that started in the Province since its -
- MR. MAYNARD: I would say it is right now seeing we have got sixteen people in the Goose Bay area.
- MR. DOODY: That is right.
- MR. MAYNARD: It would be close to the most monitored one.
- MR. NEARY: What is he doing? Is he stealing the pulp down there or what?
- MR. MAYNARD: Not stealing any pulp, Mr. Speaker.
- MR. DOODY: Never asked government for any help so we are worried to death.
- MR. NEARY: Well, boy you had better watch it.
- MR. MAYNARD: When they ask for help we will go broke.
- MR. DOODY: That is right. He might just you know.
- MR. STRACHAN: Shipping wood from here to Europe.
- MR. DOODY: That is right. It is a new departure in Newfoundland and we are worried to death.
- MR. MAYNARD: The one other thing that I will deal with, the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) again asked was this the first start in management, Yes, the '74 bill was the first start in management but obviously all of the management techniques that are to be used are not necessarily in the legislation. There is a lot going to regulations, A part of the regulations is the whole concept of forest management techniques that are outlined in the broad outline that we require from the companies or that we require from ourselves our Crown holdings.

The Forest Land Management Taxation Act, 1974 and the amendment here is to form the basis, the foundation for the

MR. MAYNARD: proper management but it is not necessarily the total package. There is much more detail -

MR. NEARY: That is what I have been saying, Now the hon. gentleman is agreeing with me. That is precisely what I have been saying and I have been saying it for two years.

MR. MAYNARD: There are stacks and stacks of regulations and booklets and all this sort of thing that are applied because the taxation act was enacted in the Legislature, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Well okay, now we are getting down to brass tacks.

MR. MAYNARD: The same as any act has a provision for regulations. Mr. Speaker, I move second reading.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Forest Land (Management and Taxation) Act And To Make Other Amendments In Respect Thereto," (No. 67), read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave.

MR. HICKMAN: Order 8, Bill No. 39.

Motion second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Department Of Rural Development Act, 1973," (No. 39)

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

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, this is a housekeeping piece of legislation.

AN HON. MEMBER: What bill are we on?

MR. HICKMAN: Order 8, Bill No. 39.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill no. 39.

MR. HICKMAN: It was circulated in February.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I will wait until the hon. member retrieves his file.

Mr. Speaker, that is just barely to strike out the term "the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council" which basically means that it eliminates the necessity of referring every last decision in the department to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. The requisition of referring the particular decisions, all the various loans and grants and other decisions, most of them of a very minor nature, is very time consuming on the cluttered process from the government

MR. LUNDRIGAN: point of view. It is also impeding our effectiveness in making decisions within the department because it does mean terrible delay and I would say practically doubles the time frame in which decisions can be made.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: If I understand the hon. gentleman correctly, Sir, and I hope I do not, I hope I am misunderstanding the hon. gentleman. Mr. Speaker, could I get the attention of the hon. gentleman.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Am I understanding the hon. gentleman correctly? Well if this amendment goes through, that the minister, the department will no longer have to refer matters or applications for loans and grants, approval for loans and grants to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, in other words his colleagues. Is that correct?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, that is correct. The same thing as today, for example, in the Fisheries Loan Board there is no reference to Cabinet once the decision is made to allocate funds, go through the proper procedures, have Treasury Board make the decision, have the government present the budgetary figures, have the department estimates voted on by Cabinet. There is no requirement, I doubt if there is a requirement in any department of government, to have decisions of this nature referred back and I do not know why it was ever included. As a matter of fact I might say to the hon. gentleman that until very recently, the last half a dozen months. -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I have answered the hon. gentleman's question.

MR. NEARY: Well, does this include the Rural Development Authority?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. This includes -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I thought I misunderstood the hon. gentleman first and then I glanced at the bill and I have to congratulate the Sergeant-at-Arms for keeping my bills in order here.

Mr. Lundrigan:

take the hon. member's speech as read.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Can we take the hon. gentleman's speech as read?

MR. MURPHY: We can take it as said.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, I have got to lash into this one, because as the hon. House knows, Sir, that we have tried long and hard to try to get a list of loans and grants that were made by this department, by the Rural Development Authority and by the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation. And the minister, during the introduction of his estimates, promised this House that he would table a list of all the loans and grants— or all the loans; there are no grants, I do not think, from the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation. There are grants?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: All loans.

MR. NEARY: All loans. The minister promised to table the loans, a list of the loans, of those who got loans. The minister told us that the minister up in Ottawa agreed that it would be treated the same as DREE loans and grants. But the minister did not put the list on the table. Why not?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I will give the member the list. It is not relevant to the bill here.

MR. NEARY: It is relevant to the bill.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, it is not.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon, Sir, it is.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, it is not.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, because before this amendment was brought in the minister, when granting loans and grants from the Rural Development Authority, and I presume from the Newfoundland Development Loan Corporation, had to take a recommendation to his colleagues in Cabinet. Now I am not so sure about the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Loan Corporation, but certainly from the Rural Development Authority. Now I do not know why there was a distinction drawn between the Newfoundland Development Loan

Mr. Neary:

Corporation and the Rural Development Authority. Maybe it is because there is federal money, because the federal government put \$20 million into the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Loan Corporation.

MR. DOODY: They were in for \$200 million.

MR. NEARY: In the Newfoundland Development Loan Corporation?

MR. DOODY: No, \$20 million.

MR. NEARY: \$20 million. Well, no wonder the public treasury is in such a bad state, Sir, when the minister does not know the difference -

MR. DOODY: It is these dots.

MR. NEARY: - between \$20 million and \$200 million.

MR. DOODY: It is these dots, these damn dots. They keep getting me all mixed up.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, that Rural Development Authority, that game of Rural Development roulette that the hon. gentleman has been playing -

AN HON. MEMBER: Roulette! Roulette!

MR. NEARY: - not only do they not want to answer to the Legislature, we cannot get the information in the Legislature, but now the minister wants a blank cheque, he does not even want to refer the matters to his colleagues. The minister, and the officials down in the department have completely ignored the Legislature. They have refused to give the Legislature any information in connection with these loans and grants. And now the minister wants it all to himself. He wants to have clear sailing. He wants to remove the last obstacle in the way of giving the minister full authority, to go full speed ahead and lash it out in his little game of Rural Development roulette, and not even consult with his colleagues.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is no way we can vote for that bill, Sir. No way. There is a -

MR. DOODY: Who is the 'we'? Is that the Royal 'We'?

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not know. I cannot speak for my hon. colleagues. I can speak for we, the independent Liberals.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: That we, the independent Liberals of this Province, will vote against that bill. It is a dangerous piece of legislation. And, you know, Mr. Speaker, this is the hon. crowd that were going to put the power back into the Legislature, out the power back into the hands of the people.

MR. DOODY: We will as soon as that Ferryland election is over and Charlie Power returns to the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the gall, the gall of the administration and the minister, the cheek of the minister to come in to this House with a piece of legislation asking that he not consult with his colleagues. Why even the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, I do not know if he does not now, but up until recently had to bring

MR. NEARY: every little application for a piece of Crown land before the Cabinet to get it approved. Every application has to be approved. There were routine meetings of the Cabinet called and the minister would go down over the list. Sometimes you would pass thirty and forty and fifty. If you had a backlog you might pass a hundred.

MR. DOODY: You got the routine duties.

MR. NEARY: I was on every committee that you could mention. I was even on Treasury Board at one stage of my career and that is why I know so much about the bureaucracy and the planning and priorities. But, Mr. Speaker, this is a dangerous piece of legislation, Sir. It is one of the most dangerous pieces of legislation ever to be brought before this House. The government now are getting so arrogant that they are careless and reckless and they do not seem to care what they do. Just imagine, Mr. Speaker! Put in the hands of the Minister of Rural Development the right to dole out \$4 million or \$5 million of taxpayers' money a year without referring it to a single person other than himself! Mr. Speaker, does that make any sense? Is it in the interest of good government, Sir? I know Your Honour cannot answer me. If Your Honour could, Your Honour would probably agree.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: We just cannot - at least I cannot, Sir - with all due respect to the hon. gentleman I just cannot put that much trust in the hon. gentleman's department, because we have seen, Sir, examples already of extravagance and waste in that Rural Development Authority. We have seen monies lashed out to defeated candidates. I mentioned a case just today.

MR. DINN: And I gave you the truth and you shoved it away.

MR. NEARY: One time, Mr. Speaker, when the hon. gentlemen were on this side of the House if you did what the Minister of Rural Development was doing it would be called political patronage,

MR. NEARY: under the table deals. It would be called favouritism. It would have all the appearance of corruption. But when this hon. crowd does it there is not a thing in the world wrong with it. They will get up and say, 'Well, is there anything wrong with giving a loan to a defeated Tory candidate?'

MR. DINN: Is there anything wrong with the Mifflin Report?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, there is a whole lot wrong with this bill. It is a very, very dangerous weapon to put in the hands of the minister.

MR. DINN: What about the Mifflin Report?

MR. NEARY: I do not care whether it is the present minister or his successor or whether there will be another minister there next year, next election. I do not care who it is and I do not care what government is there. That kind of authority, Sir, should not be put in the hands of one minister. It could be abused and misused and it has been in the past. Even, Mr. Speaker, when it was subject to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council it was abused and misused and all kinds of pork-barrelling went on. And my hon. friend will find out about the Mifflin Report when we get the report on Mr. A. B. Walsh and Company and all the coloured televisions -

MR. DINN: We had one in -

MR. NEARY: - and Scrivener and the scandals in the minister's department.

MR. DINN: We have the Mifflin Report.

MR. NEARY: Yes, well we will have the others coming in -

MR. DINN: Yes, what about that?

MR. NEARY: - and there was nothing in that one except somebody trying to do a job for his district and somebody trying to show the administration, show the officials of this government that they were

MR. NEARY: not running the show. And if the minister only does his job half as good as it was done then -

MR. DINN: You do not have to worry about my job.

MR. NEARY: - the minister will be able to get up -

MR. DINN: Any recommendations -

MR. NEARY: - and make a proud boast in this House.

MR. DINN: That is right. The -

MR. NEARY: The minister should go down and try to straighten out some of the scandals in his own department, like the one bringing a deputy minister in from Gander and paying \$15,000 expenses, moving expenses. What about that? That is the taxpayers' money.

MR. DINN: All according to the regulations set up by the previous administration.

MR. NEARY: All according to the extravagance and waste of the minister.

MR. DINN: Any regulations set up to do that?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I would ask the hon. member if he will be a little relevant with the Rural Development Department, please.

Mr. Neary.

Sir, the hon. gentleman who just woke up, Sir, should be taken out and horsewhipped. You know, we have been passing legislation so fast here today that it is a wonder we have not passed a piece of legislation to have the hon. gentleman taken out and hanged out in the square. If it was brought in it would probably go through and nobody would know a thing about it, we are whacking legislation through the House so fast. And now here is another piece they hope to sneak through.

MR. J. CARTER: The truth will -

MR. NEARY: The Minister of Rural Development now is learning a few tricks from his colleagues of trying to sneak a piece of legislation through that will set up a dictatorship down in the minister's department, an outright dictatorship. The minister will have to answer to nobody, only himself. Mr. Speaker, there is no way we are going to allow it. We are going to vote against it on this side of the House. You know, Mr. Speaker, this administration is rocked to its very foundation now with scandals, with misuse of public funds and abuse of public funds, rocked to its very foundation. Governments have had to resign for far less, Mr. Speaker, than the things that have gone on in all the various departments starting with the Department of Fisheries, the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing, the Department of Public Works, the Department of Transportation and Communication, the Department of Rural Development.

MR. J. CARTER: Do not leave anyone out.

MR. NEARY: You can go on and on and on. Only one of these scandals in any free country, in any democratic country would make an administration go out and resign, but not this hon. crowd. They think they can brazen it out. And here we have the Minister of Rural Development wanting to set up his own little kingdom, his own dictatorship down in the Department of Rural Development, and there is no way he is going to get away with it.

Mr. Neary.

Mr. Speaker, this is the most treacherous and dangerous piece of legislation that I have seen come before this House in a long time, to take the power, not only out of the Legislature - the Cabinet have already taken the power from the Legislature - but now the minister wants to take it from the Lieutenant-Governor-in Council by not referring any of these loans or grants. Can Your Honour just see the pork-barrelling, the misuse and the abuse of public funds that can take place if this piece of legislation is approved? We never heard tell of the like before.

MR. DINN: We did.

MR. NEARY: We certainly did not. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman now is out coasting around in the Premier's former Cadillac. I wonder how he got that? Did the Premier give it to him or did he get a sweetheart deal?

MR. DINN: Elm Mercury.

MR. NEARY: Was there a sweetheart deal over the turning in of that Cadillac?

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

MR. NEARY: Maybe we should have a minor investigation into that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! A point of order has been raised.

MR. DINN: It is pretty obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member is upset over things that have transpired in the past, but he is now bringing into question where I got my car, and I got my car -

MR. NEARY: I am only asking if you got it honestly. Did you get it honestly?

MR. DINN: - to set the record straight, I paid \$4,600 and some odd for a car -

MR. NEARY: For a Cadillac.

MR. DINN: - from Elm Mercury.

MR. NEARY: For a Cadillac?

MR. DINN: - secondhand, and they could not sell it to anyone for two weeks so I bought it from Elm Mercury, Mr. Speaker, in here on the Kenmount Road.

MR. NEARY: Did the hon. Premier tip you off that he was trading in his car?

MR. DINN: No tip-off at all.

MR. SPEAKER (Young): Order, please!

MR. DOGDY: Come on now. Let us get the thing back down to a level where we can all -

MR. NEARY: If the hon. gentleman wants, I will fight fire with fire. He need not worry.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

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

MR. SPEAKER: Before we go any further, I do not think there is any point of order.

MR. RIDEOUT: I agree with you one hundred per cent. There is as much order to that now as there is to the minister.

MR. SPEAKER: - and I would ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to the bill under debate and not bring in personal references.

MR. RIDEOUT: Up she comes!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the whole administration is rocked with scandal. She is rocked to the very foundation with scandal and now the Minister of Rural Development wants to open it up a little further, leave it wide open for abuse and misuse. There is no way that that sort of thing can be controlled. There is no way we can condone that sort of thing in this Province, and we are not going to condone it. I can tell the minister and the administration right now that I am voting against that bill. It is too much power to put into the hands of the Minister of Rural Development. The minister so far has shown us that he is

MR. NEARY: not capable of giving the House the information it requires in connection with Rural Development loans. I do not think the minister can be trusted with that kind of power. Not that the minister is dishonest or anything, but I do not think that kind of judgement should be left in the hands of one man. It is too much power, Sir, to leave in the hands of one man.

MR. J. CARTER: Loan us your copy of the Mifflin report.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) is still smarting under the attacks. I guarantee you that Mitchell Court will give the hon. gentleman what he is due the next election.

MR. WHITE: Who?

MR. NEARY: Mitchell Court. A gentleman called my hon. friend up yesterday and invited him to come over in Mitchell Court, which is in the hon. gentleman's district, and knock on his door the next time, if he wants to get a belt in the gob.

MR. FLIGHT: Is that what he said?

MR. NEARY: That is what he told me. As a matter of fact, Sir, he put it in stronger words than that. When we were knocking around we had a name for hon. gentlemen like that which began with a 'P'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER: And ended with a 'P', did it?

MR. NEARY: No, that is what it did not, end with a 'P'. We had names for hon. gentlemen, Sir, like that.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know who dreamt up this bill, who dreamt up this piece of legislation, but whoever dreamt it up, Sir, must want to give the minister dictatorial powers. Mr. Speaker,

MR. NEARY: why do they not just do away with the Legislature altogether and let each minister set up his own little dictatorship?

Mr. Speaker, there is no way, Sir, there is no way that they are going to get away with this. This is the kind of stuff that brings government down. We have had enough to bring this crowd down already, one scandal after another. I think for the minister's own protection, if nothing else, to put the minister above partisan politics, to put the minister and his department above suspect and above suspicion, that the minister should be glad to submit these applications to his colleagues in Cabinet for approval rather than the minister take on the responsibility and be accused of making decisions that are based on political judgements, that are based on favouritism and patronage. The minister certainly should not be put in that position. The hon. gentleman spent a few terms up in Ottawa and the hon. gentleman knows what would happen if this kind of legislation were brought before the House of Commons. The members would be scandalized beyond words. The minister will not even give the House the information.

MR. J. CARTER: They will not be long scandalizing -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I thought I had dealt adequately with the hon. gentleman, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mitchell Court? I echo every word that Mitchell Court said on the phone to the hon. gentleman yesterday, every word.

MR. J. CARTER: Then call and apologize, because that is what the hon. gentleman did.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman did not call up and apologize, and the hon. gentleman is in the

MR. NEARY: hon. member's district,
a constituent.

MR. J. CARTER: He rang to apologize.

MR. NEARY: That is not what the hon.
gentleman told since supper this evening.

MR. MURPHY: Whose is that? John's, is
it?

MR. NEARY: Most colourful! Most
colourful, I must say. I never heard adjectives
describe the hon. gentleman as well as I heard from this
man, this constituent of the hon. gentleman.

MR. DOODY: Did he repeat himself?

MR. NEARY: He repeated himself over
and over and over again.

MR. DOODY: It used to be the great
measure of invective, how often you repeated yourself
when you got into profanity.

MR. WOODROW: He rang up again this
morning.

MR. NEARY: Anyway, Sir, I cannot see
how the hon. member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow),
who is supposed to have a conscience, how the hon.
gentleman can stomach this kind of stuff. And the hon.
member for Mount Scio (Dr. Winsor) who sits over there
with a sanctimonious look on his face and a halo, almost,
over his head, how the hon. gentleman can condone this
sort of skulduggery

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WOODROW: We have to have faith in
somebody. I think he is an honourable man.

MR. NEARY: This is not an attack on
the minister as a person, Sir.

MR. DOODY: You could have fooled us.

MR. NEARY: It is an attack on the system
and on the bill. The hon. gentleman

MR. NEARY: could be down there and I would say the same thing about this bill. If my hon. friend, the member for Lewisporte (Mr. White), was over there I would say the same thing about this bill. If my former colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, (Mr. Roberts) were over there I would say the same thing about this bill.

AN HON. MEMBER: - you can be sure of that.

MR. NEARY: It is the most obnoxious piece of legislation I have seen brought before this House in a long time. And it is dangerous -

MR. J. CARTER: The hon. member is a skinful of hate.

AN HON. MEMBER: It takes one to know one.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Could I have a little water Your Honour?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: I will let her go ahead now, Sir. I will let them have a little debate back and forth. I hope that every member on this side of the House, I hope that every member on that side of the House with a conscience will oppose this bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: And what is the bill, Sir? What is the bill?

MR. DOODY: Since you are against it, I presume you will explain.

MR. NEARY: I am asking the members a question because it is like every other piece of legislation that we put through this House in the last forty-eight hours, Sir; I doubt if nine out of ten members have taken the trouble to read the legislation. They do not know what they are passing. They do not know what they are doing.

Mr. Speaker, these bills were not read by ministers before they came before the House because I heard one member say today in the House that he was told by a Legislative draftsman that they are bushed down there. They cannot cope with the situation, pumping out the bills, because the government wants to get the House closed. They are rushing

MR. NEARY: the bills in now at the last minute to try to push them through like the Minister of Rural Development is doing with this piece of legislation. And you know, Mr. Speaker, the notice of bills and the bills are being brought directly to the House without even being read by the ministers, they are in such a rush.

Now the Minister of Justice can look around all he wants but I know this to be a fact, that the ministers do not even see the bills until they are tabled in this hon. House.

MR. HICKMAN: Nonsense! Sheer nonsense!

MR. NEARY: It is not nonsense. That is true, Sir.

MR. HICKMAN: It is not true, Sir.

MR. NEARY: And we have ministers in this House introducing bills today that they have not even read. They cannot even get up and explain it properly.

MR. DOODY: Another two weeks on the phone with my hon. colleague, the Minister of Transportation, reading out various bills that were going to be introduced.

MR. SIMMONS: And explaining them.

MR. DOODY: Well, I did not have to explain them. He grasped them immediately.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, let us see what it says just for the benefit of hon. gentlemen who have not read it. Let us just see the power that the Minister of Rural Development is asking for.

MR. DOODY: The public - what do they call it?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we are not down in the Cottage Garden now, Sir, are we? The House is in complete disarray.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentlemen will bring themselves into appropriate circumstances.

MR. NEARY: It says, "Notwithstanding the provisions of the Crown Guarantee and Loan Act, 1973, but subject to the approval of the

MR. NEARY: Lieutenant-Governor in Council and to such terms and conditions, if any, as the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may prescribe, financial assistance by the way of a grant or a loan or otherwise, howsoever to associations, groups, corporations, firms and other bodies or persons engaged in or about to be engaged in small industries and enterprises" and then it says, sub-paragraph (1) "The Department of Rural Development Act, 1973 is amended by striking out the words, "the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council."

AN HON. MEMBER: To what?

MR. NEARY: Strike out the words, "the Lieutenant-Governor in Council." It is more than criminal. It is leaving the thing wide open. It is leaving it wide open for abuse. We think we have got scandals on our hands now! why just pass this bill and put the authority in the hands of one department, Mr. Speaker, and see what will happen. There will not be enough judges and magistrates in Newfoundland to head up all the public enquiries that will be necessary to investigate the loans and grants that will be given out from this department.

MR. NEARY: I am going to vote against Bill 39, Sir, because I think it is obnoxious and dangerous and should be thrown in the wastepaper basket. It should have never been dreamt up and it should never have been brought into this House at this late date hoping that we are asleep over here and that they can shove it through and turn the Minister of Rural Development into a dictator.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I could not agree with my colleague from LaPoile -

MR. DOODY: I know you never have.

MR. ROWE: - anymore than I have to on this particular bill tonight, Sir, and I would think that any member of the House of Assembly with a conscience at all would have to stand up and speak a full forty-five minutes against this particular piece of legislation no matter what side of the House we are talking about.

Sir, what disturbs me more than anything else is -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DOODY: Can the hon. member have a little bit of quiet so he can get on with his speech?

MR. ROWE: Well, the whole point that I was going to try and bring up, Mr. Speaker, is that while my colleague from LaPoile was trying to make his points we saw the attitude of hon. members opposite, laughing at the member for LaPoile, joking among themselves, throwing out a little bit of wit and this kind of a thing about a very, very important bill, Sir.

Now everybody realizes that the member for LaPoile has a very colourful way of expressing himself but this is very, very serious business.

MR. ROWE: A number of years ago, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Rural Development, Mr. Jim Reid, was forced by the Opposition to table the list of loans - or grants and loans at that time, I believe, or it might have been all loans, I am not quite sure - but he did table a list of the loans that were given out throughout this Province by the Rural Development Authority. And, Sir, the minister during the estimates of his department was torn to shreds to the point, Sir, where he gave up altogether. I could remember very clearly the minister becoming so frustrated and being torn apart so very badly by the members of the Opposition of the day because of the abuses that were uncovered when he tabled that list of loans that were granted up by the Rural Development Authority, that he went out in the corridor and never came back in to defend his estimates. He was afraid to come back into the House of Assembly or the committee. And we saw of course what happened to the minister since.

AN HON. MEMBER: What happened to him?

MR. ROWE: Well, Sir, he never returned. Not only did he not return to the committee stage to defend his estimates that year, Sir, he was so badly torn apart but he was defeated in the upcoming election. And I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that one of the main reasons why he was defeated was the way that he handled that particular department or the way that he appeared to handle it. Now I happen to think that the gentleman was an honourable man, a very honourable man, and tried to do a job but he left a certain impression. And what was the impression, Mr. Speaker? The impression was left that his department was a pork barrel department, that is was being used as a sort of a slush fund for political purposes. Now I am not saying it was, but the impression was left that it was and the evidence indicated that in certain instances the loans that were given out by the Rural Development Authority were certainly not within the framework or the guidelines

MR. ROWE: of that particular authority. We have examples of loans or grants being given out for a florist shop, for an auto body shop, and for an -

AN HON. MEMBER: They could not have done that!

MR. ROWE: Yes, Sir! Yes, Mr. Speaker, it was tabled by the then Minister of Rural Development Mr. Jim Reid. And the unfortunate thing, Sir, there were other examples that I cannot remember now, but the impression was left

MR. F. ROWE.

that this was a pork-barrel department and that the taxpayers' money was being used for political purposes. Now, Sir, that was during the day when the government and the minister had the courage to table the people to whom loans were given under the Rural Development Authority. Since that time I do not think - the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) can probably correct me - since that shemozzle, since that time when the minister did table the people to whom loans were granted, I do not think we have had one tabling of that list since. Am I right, 'Steve'? The member for LaPoile can probably indicate to me.

MR. NEARY: What was that?

MR. F. ROWE: Since that year when Mr. Jim Reid tabled the list of people -

MR. NEARY: That was the last one we had.

MR. F. ROWE: That was the last one we had. And we have not been able to get one bit of information out of the Minister of Rural Development since. Now, Sir, to add insult to injury the minister in the heat of the Summer introduces a little amendment to the Department of Rural Development Act, 1973 whereby - we already know that he does not intend to table a list now at all. He promised to, but he has not. The hon. Minister of Rural Development has yet to table the list. And I call upon the minister to table that list before this amendment is passed, because although we will fight against this right to the bitter end, the majority will carry, and this amendment will eventually pass. But I challenge the minister to table that list -

AN HON. MEMBER: - list?

MR. F. ROWE: The list of people, and the names and types of projects that Rural Development Authority funds have gone to. I mean, it is the taxpayers' money, Mr. Speaker, and the House has every right to see that list, and I do not know what the minister is hiding. But to add insult to injury on top of not disclosing that list, the minister is trying to sneak through a little piece of legislation here tonight whereby he has the complete power to approve of

Mr. Rowe.

these various guarantees and loans without the approval of Cabinet. In other words, no matter how honourable a minister is, the people of this Province know that the minister has the complete discretionary powers to approve or reject any application through the Rural Development Authority, and he in fact can use it for pork-barrelling purposes. And I am not going to say to the minister that he would. I am just - the important point is that he may. But we cannot prove that the minister could or would until he tables that list. The previous minister, the then honourable Jim Reid, had the courage to table the list, and he got caught. And it was proven on the floor of this House that certain loans were given out that were not strictly within the guidelines of the Rural Development Authority. And it gave the appearance of being a major scandal. All you got to have is two or three examples out of a hundred, Mr. Speaker, two or three rotten apples, two or three bad cases, and the whole programme stinks to high Heaven.

Now if the minister is not prepared to table the list of the projects, the amount of money loaned and the people to whom the money has been loaned -

MR. NEARY: A cover-up.

MR. F. ROWE: - and it is the taxpayers' money, we can only assume that the minister is trying to hide something.

MR. NEARY: Watergate.

MR. DINN: Do you want a list of the Social Services recipients?

MR. F. ROWE: There is no relevancy. This has got nothing to do with Social Services.

MR. DINN: You want that list, too? How many lists do you want?

MR. F. ROWE: This has got nothing to do with Social Service recipients.

MR. DOODY: It is the taxpayers' money.

MR. F. ROWE: It is the taxpayers' money, but we are not talking about Social Service recipients. -

MR. DINN: What are we -

MR. F. ROWE: - for which there are guidelines that are being very strictly adhered to, because every member of the House of Assembly is in daily contact with officials of the Department of Social Services and we know that the guidelines of the Social Services department

Mr. Rowe:

are being very strictly adhered to. Why, Mr. Speaker? Because it saves the government money.

Now probably the same argument can be used for the Rural Development Authority.

AN HON. MEMBER: Exactly.

MR. ROWE: The fact is that this can be used as political handouts, these funds, these loans. And there has been evidence in the past to indicate they have been used for political handouts.

MR. DINN: Any proof?

MR. ROWE: And I am not going -

MR. DINN: Any charity?

MR. ROWE: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing -

MR. DINN: But you should not be saying stuff like that.

MR. ROWE: - was not even an elected member of this House when this proof was brought before the House of Assembly. So it would probably be better if the hon. minister would read back through Hansard instead of trying to barge in on the debate here. The hon. member -

MR. DINN: You should not say that unless you make a charge.

MR. ROWE: The hon. minister, Sir, will have every opportunity tonight to get up and speak to this particular amendment. He does not have to try to trip me up or ask me to provide proof. The proof is in the tapes of Hansard. It is documented in Hansard.

MR. DINN: Proof of what?

MR. ROWE: Proof of the fact that loans were given out by the Rural Development Authority that were not within the guidelines of the Rural Development Authority. For example, the service sector - no loans are suppose to be given out for purposes of private enterprise purely for the service sector, such as an auto body shop, a florist shop, a mortuary or any of these cases. These are the three ones that I can remember being brought before the House. There are others.

What I am saying here, and this is even more important, is that there is a legal phrase, not only must justice be done it must

Mr. Rowe:

appear to be done, and surely the case holds even more truly here that honesty must not only be done it must appear to be done, that the guidelines of the Rural Development Authority Act, the guidelines for such loans are strictly adhered to. Not only must they be adhered to they must be appeared to be adhered to. And if the minister will not table the list, and now he has complete power to approve or reject any of these applications, Sir, it is completely contrary to what this particular administration stood for before it was elected.

Leading up before every single election, this administration promised complete disclosure of practically anything in sight as far as the administration of this Province is concerned. Complete disclosure on all contracts, tendering on all projects. We have seen that one go by the wayside. And in things such as Rural Development loans, complete openness. Everything was going to be open to public scrutiny according to the philosophy of this administration, the P.C. Administration before it got elected. But gradually in the last four and a half to five years, five and a half years we have gradually seen the situation worsen where we have the Minister of Rural Development not only refusing to table the list of the projects and the names and the amount of monies that have been loaned out to various people throughout this Province, but now he does not even have to go, not only to the House of Assembly for approval, but he does not even have to go before the Cabinet for approval.

And I am saying, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure my colleagues agree, and I am sure there are hon. members opposite who agree, I am sure members opposite will agree, Sir, that this is just giving the minister too much power, too much power. No matter how honest the Minister of Rural Development is, and I am sure he is honest and he is an honourable man, no matter how honourable and how honest he is in the use of this power

MR. F. ROWE: the fact of the matter is that the people of this Province, the fifty-one members who represent the people of this Province, Even the members of the Cabinet will not necessarily know how much money is being loaned to whom and for what purposes. The minister has utter and complete control over the amount of money that is loaned out through the Rural Development Authority, and that is just too much power to the minister, Mr. Speaker. And everybody who believes in honesty in government, reasonable disclosure, believes in what the philosophy of the PC administration was, or party was before it became an administration, is going to get up and speak out against this particular amendment, Bill No. 39, because it is giving the minister too much power. Sir, it is absolutely incredible. You almost have to invent a word such as uncredible to get your point across. It is incredible that after five years in administration and the government telling the people of this Province that things are going to change under their administration - complete openness, complete disclosure - year by year, session after session, we see each minister grab a little bit more power. And I do not think it is right, Mr. Speaker. It is as simple as that. The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications can laugh all he wishes, Sir, can laugh all he wishes, but the fact of the matter is that as long as there is any chance that any minister - in this case the Minister of Rural Development - as long as there is any chance that he could abuse or misuse his power without being answerable not only to this House, but to the Cabinet, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, as long as there is any chance or suspicion, members of this hon. House should vote against this particular amendment.

Now I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that once before we had a minister who did have the courage to table this list of Rural Development Authority loans or grants. He was torn to shreds in the House of Assembly or during Committee stage to the point where he did not have the nerve to come back in and answer to the rest of his estimates. He ran out of the House and that was the last we saw of him for the consideration of the estimates of his department. And it was based on the one thing, because

MR. F. ROWE: there were a number of abuses turned up when the minister tabled that particular list. Now we have a situation where the minister refuses to table the list. He refuses, in other words, to give this not only to the people of Newfoundland but to the elected representatives of the people of Newfoundland and now he is asking for an amendment to the Act which requires him not even to get Cabinet approval. That is too much power for a minister of the Crown, Sir, no matter how honourable that minister may be or may appear to be. He will never appear to be honourable, he will always be under suspicion as long as he is giving the appearance that he is covering up something. And, Sir, I will vote against this bill and I am sure my colleagues, and I am sure there are other hon. members opposite who, if they are in this House, will speak against this bill.

AN HON. MEMBER: The member for Bay of Islands, Sir.

MR. F. ROWE: Yes, where is the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) and the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) and the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) when it comes to something like this? These are people who argued against the government's policy with respect to tendering - or two of them, I should say. The member for St. John's East and the member for St. John's North were not in agreement with this administration when it comes to tendering. Where do they stand on this particular amendment when the Minister of Rural Development has complete

Mr. Rowe:

power to reject or approve of a loan to a particular person for however much money for whatever project. And I would say until the minister, I would say if the minister - I do not know if I am sticking my head out here now and appearing to tend to argue against myself - but I would say that if the minister, if it was in the Act here, there is no evidence that it is in the Act, if there was a subsection or a section of the Act which said that the minister must table, must table every single loan, the type of the project, the person to whom the loan was given, and the amount of money. If the minister could table that before the vote on his estimates I can see the minister being able to have this power. Why? Because the list is tabled anyway and it can be brought out.

Now if the minister is saying that this, you know, saves time, cuts out the bureaucracy, I can buy that argument if the minister tabled every single loan that was approved of. I think we would - I do not know, I would not want to speak for my colleagues on that one, I would tend to accept this amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROWE: We will be tempted to buy it if there were some other piece of legislation saying that every single loan would be tabled before the estimates of his department are passed. Because the minister then has it both ways; he can cut out the red tape, he can cut out the bureaucracy, but he is answerable to the people of this Province through their elected representative. That to me seems to make sense. But not to table the list, not to table the list and then not to bring it before the Cabinet is unbelievable, it is unacceptable, it is unreal, and the minister is not being answerable to the taxpayers of this Province who are badly hit now, Sir. When it comes to the expenditure or any legislation that relates to the expenditure of the taxpayers money in a province where the poor taxpayer is hit as hard as he can be hit we got to look at that piece of legislation

Mr. Rowe:

very, very carefully.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROWE: And this piece of legislation, Sir, is completely unacceptable. It gives the minister too much power. If the minister says I got to have this power because of the red tape, because of the bureaucracy, because of the duplication, because of having to go all over the place, and slowing up, we got that in the Crown Lands Division, the minister has to go out to get all kinds of referrals that people are frustrated for months before a piece of Crown land is rejected or accepted or the application. I can buy that. If the minister wants that power in order to wipe out delays, to wipe out red tape, we are willing, I would submit - I speak for myself on this one - I would be willing to tend to buy that amendment provided that the minister before the estimates of his department are passed tables the complete list of approved loans through the Rural Development Authority.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROWE: Then the minister has got complete openness, complete disclosure. He is answerable to this House. He will be answerable to the Committee. He will be answerable to the people of Newfoundland, and he could have this power because the way he uses this power would be shown to the House when he tables that list. But before he tables that list, Sir, no way will we even entertain voting for this particular amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROWE: And I for one intend to vote against it, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. for Eagle River.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker,

MR. STRACHAN: We just cannot understand over here why a bill such as this would be brought in. It is supposed to be a simple piece of housekeeping, I cannot understand the House Leader if we want to get out of here by Tuesday. We have been talking on this bill now since twenty minutes to nine and we will probably have another three or four members to go here. Then we will probably go all this evening on this bill because we totally reject it. We think it is a dangerous piece of legislation and we will just keep going and if nothing else we will use up the time of the House but we feel that the House Leader and the minister concerned would see the sense to withdraw totally, totally withdraw this bill -

MR. NEARY: It will be time well spent.

MR. STRACHAN: Oh, yes. Absolutely. It will be time well spent. It is a dangerous piece of legislation as far as we are concerned. I cannot understand it from the point of view of the minister himself because you would think for the minister's own protection that he would be concerned about this kind of authority which he has given himself.

Number one, he has taken onto himself all the authority to give out loans under the RDA, the Rural Development Authority, in which already there has been a great deal of concern, a great deal of controversy. We cannot get that list here in the House. The people cannot see the list. The people of this Province cannot see how money is spent, how money is given out. It is money belonging to the people of this Province. It is given out by the administration opposite and there is absolutely no way we can get at finding out how that money is spent, where it is allocated to under the guise that it is not a bank, it is trying to assist businesses and these businesses would be hurt by it being known that they have a loan from the government. That we just cannot accept, the law in itself. We just cannot accept

MR. STRACHAN: the fact that the government is going to give \$50,000, \$100,000, whatever amount of money it is going to give, it has given it out without allowing the people of the Province to know that their money is being spent on these projects, this project or that project. But even further than that, what the minister is now asking is that he be given authority not to even discuss with his fellow Cabinet members, to discuss how the money is spent. We see an example tonight in which the Minister of Forestry talked about Ralland Forest Products where the minister in a statement here tonight said the trouble with it was not the supply of wood, was not the fact that the sawmill could not operate or the markets were not there, the trouble with the Ralland Forest Products Industry was there was no management. We see the minister sitting down here saying there is poor management and therefore it is doomed, and the Minister of Rural Development funding that industry to a fairly large sum of money. What we are getting now is that at least before we would have hoped that the Minister of Rural Development would have consulted the Minister of Forestry before such money would be spent in that area. And what we are seeing now is that the Minister of Rural Development here is asking for authority to spend that money, spend that money on projects which may involve other departments of government without even consulting the other departments of government to see whether they do have good management or whether they can carry out the project from the funds allocated by the minister. It is giving far too much strength, far too much control, far too much power, the wrong kind of power, to the minister. Surely he would think that he is in a bad enough mess as it is, but come next year when we start getting onto estimates, or start discussing the Rural Development Authority and we know now that the total blame, the total blame of anything wrong with the Rural Development Authority does not now rest

MR. STRACHAN: with Cabinet, it now rests totally with that minister.

Virtually what the minister is doing is setting himself up to be shot at, setting himself up to be nailed and I cannot understand that. Even for his own protection he should have enough sense to feel that he should discuss this, he should discuss it with his colleagues in Cabinet and go through the loan, the application, the feasibility of it and decide whether that money should be spent or should not be spent and at least have other people give him advice and also he himself would be able to spread the blame, The administration has given the loan, Cabinet approved the loan, it was not me. What he is saying here now is that I have total authority, total control over where that money is spent and I will decide on my own, I will decide without any consultation whatsoever with the Cabinet or other members, I will decide on my own where that money is going to be spent. And I can assure you that once we get to the bottom of it and find out exactly where some of that monies are going, the minister is setting himself up for a real proper nailing. He is setting himself up to be crucified, virtually crucified, because I can tell you this time next year, by estimates time when it rolls around next year, the Rural Development Authority, under the power the minister is now requesting

Mr. Strachan.

in this amendment, under the power he is requesting, the Rural Development Authority is going to be easy pickings. This is going to be the easiest! You talk about scandals, you talk about scandals that have been going on so far? This is going to be the easiest one, and we are all going to sit like vultures waiting for it, because he is now asking for total authority that he alone, like God, will decide where the money is going to be spent without any request from members in Cabinet, without any advice going in, and I think it is total dictatorship. It is taking away - number one, we have already taken away the powers of this House, and we cannot find out where the money is spent now. But at least a number of gentlemen opposite know where the money was spent, and how the decision was arrived at.

Now what we are suggesting here in this legislation is that the gentlemen opposite do not want to know anything about it. So either the gentlemen opposite are setting up the minister here, setting him up as a fall guy and saying, well, you take responsibility for it. It is in a mess now already so you might as well take responsibility, and we will put this legislation through, and you take it, it is yours, and it has got nothing to do with us. If there is anything wrong with it, then you fall, we do not. It seems to be that there is some play or something in there, because otherwise why would a minister in an already suspect situation like this in the Rural Development Authority, why would a minister ask for this kind of authority, this kind of power vested unto himself? I can see the member for Mount Scio (Dr. Winsor) on the back there, who is involved already with the Public Accounts Committee, shuddering that. here the minister without any recourse to Cabinet, without any discussion to Cabinet, will have then decided how money is to be spent and if it is found out that the monies are spent wrongly and brought up at a Public Accounts Committee or brought up in the House here, for instance, that the members opposite will have to deal with it, will have

Mr. Strachan.

to go through this kind of thing and ask why there was not discussion, why there was not around the table discussions with members, why Such-and-Such a minister was not confided in, was not asked for his opinion, and we just cannot understand it at all. We just cannot understand why some of the members opposite who feel that they are self-righteous about these kind of things or feel that it is right to question these kind of things or feel that they are in roles in which they themselves should be careful about, how they prejudice themselves, can allow such legislation to go through which gives the minister total authority, total, absolute control and power to decide where money is going to be spent, how money is going to be loaned or granted without any discussion whatsoever with Cabinet. As I said earlier, before the minister came in - he probably heard it - I cannot understand already in a Rural Development Authority which has come up for so much discussion here in the House, and which there has been a great deal of controversy over it already, that I cannot understand how the minister for his own protection would not require the fact that he go to Cabinet and discuss these loans in Cabinet. If he is going to loan \$100,000 -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: You have no idea about government at all.

MR. STRACHAN: Well, I do not know about government -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Do you think the federal government makes a Cabinet decision every time CMHC lends money for a house?

MR. STRACHAN: Look, what the minister is asking for here is that he is asking for authority to loan or give grants of fairly large sums of money without any discussion with Cabinet whatsoever.-

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. STRACHAN: - that he is asking for that authority on his head alone. The minister already knows that the Rural Development Authority that we have questioned it here. The public of this Province cannot get the list of which money is being loaned to what companies. We cannot get that list. And the minister for his own reasons will not table that list. So the

Mr. Strachan.

public of the Province do not know how their money is being spent. What is happening now is that the minister is not satisfied with that. The minister is going one stage further and stating that not only does he not want to tell the public how that money is spent or where it is spent and how the decision is arrived to as to where it is spent, he now wants to have the authority totally for himself without even discussing it with members of his Cabinet. And my argument was again earlier exemplified by the Minister of Forestry who stood up and stated that Ralland Forest Products were going under and were falling not because they did not have a wood supply, not because they did not have a market and not because the equipment was not there, but they were failing because of poor management. Now the Minister of Forestry states here that that company, corporation, has poor management and cannot run their business. And on the other hand the minister here of Rural Development is giving them money and keeping on giving them money. Now surely up to this stage here we would have thought that the Rural Development Authority would have brought in that loan to Cabinet, that surely the Minister of Forestry would have questioned exactly how much money is requested, how it is to be spent and where it is to be allocated. Surely, giving him authority here now

MR. STRACHAN: means that he does not even have to discuss it with the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture or the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing or any other minister who might have some interest in that business - whatever it is they may have some interest in it - and who could protect or also give advice. Now he is asking for total authority, total, absolute authority to allow and grant that loan or grant or loan that money to a company without referring to Cabinet.

We also think that it is a dangerous piece of legislation, an absolutely dangerous piece of legislation. It gives the minister far too much power. We feel that under the Rural Development Authority already you have far too much power and that you did not or you have refused to table in the House here how the money is spent, what companies and so on. I can, to a certain extent, understand the philosophy behind it, but at the same time, although you are not quite a bank, you are loaning money. I do not see why you are any different from the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation or any other FBDB or any other groups, and here you are setting up an authority in which you can secretly - because that is what it is - secretly loan money. You are secretly loaning money because you will not tell us in the House here, or the people of the Province, who got the money, what for and why, and therefore the money has to be secretly loaned or granted. You cannot turn around and say it is not secretly loaned, it is. We cannot find out, we do not know where the money is loaned. It is secretly loaned out. And now what you are asking for is to confine the secret a little bit more so that not even the Minister of Municipal Affairs will know, and he is nodding and shaking his head and saying that is not so.

MR. DINN: I can go down and get a list anytime I want to have a look at it.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: So can a member.

MR. STRACHAN: Pardon?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: So can you.

MR. STRACHAN: Do you want to read the bill?

MR. DINN: The minister said last year you can go down and have a look at the list. He is not going to make it public, nor do we make Social Assistance roles public.

MR. STRACHAN: Well, if the minister says you can go down and look at the list why does he not make it public? If I can go down and have a look at the list and copy everything out of it and table it or send it out to the press, then what is the difference? In that case then why do you not make it public? But what you are asking for here is not only that; what you are asking for here is the right to be granted to the minister alone to make these loans or grants without discussing it in Cabinet, without getting Cabinet approval to loan that money. Now we feel - and I do not know - the minister maybe feels he does not need protection, but we feel strongly that a minister needs some kind of protection. And in some ways I sometimes wonder whether some of the loans which have been given out by RDA are suspect or whether -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I will explain it to you when I get up because you do not understand how government works, obviously. I am not criticizing you, but you do not.

MR. STRACHAN: The member for LaPoile, (Mr. Neary), and he has been in government before, he has said essentially the same things in different ways.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: What about the LIP projects?

MR. STRACHAN: And the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe), he has had some experience before and he is saying exactly the same things.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: When the Legislature votes the Minister of Manpower -

MR. STRACHAN: If the minister wants to explain I will -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: All right, I will ask a question of the hon. gentleman. When the Minister of Manpower is voted \$200 million through the House of Commons in Ottawa, having had it cleared through

MR. LUNDRIGAN: his Cabinet, his Treasury Board, pared down, analysed, then it goes to the House of Commons and is given authority through the Legislature, does the hon. member think that the minister then has to go back to the Cabinet of Canada to have the tens of thousands of projects approved?

MR. NEARY: That is not a giveaway programme.

MR. STRACHAN: There is a total difference between that kind of programme and the programme we are talking about here.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: - CMHC.

MR. PECKFORD: - 3 or 4 hundred million dollars.

MR. STRACHAN: The programme we are talking about here is not a programme designed as a very specific programme. It is a wide, all-embracing programme -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: What about the Fisheries Loan Board?

MR. STRACHAN: - in which the minister has the rights to give beauty parlours or funeral homes or good solid industries -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Nobody - give nobody.

MR. STRACHAN: - no argument about them, industries, service industries, as well as primary resource industries, money.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Give nobody. What about municipal capital grants?

MR. STRACHAN: Or loan it, grant it, that makes no difference. But what we are saying is it is already suspect.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Well let me ask the member, What about municipal capital grants?

MR. STRACHAN: This is the minister's bill. I ask you, you do not ask me.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I just want to try and enlighten the member before he gets carried away without fully understanding what he is saying. Municipal capital grants: the House gives authority for the minister to spend \$1 million, municipal capital grants. The minister and his department decides on the municipal capital grants.

June 9, 1977

Tape 4107

EC - 4

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

The ARDA programme the federal government gives X dollars, the provincial government X dollars, it goes into a pool of dollars under an ARDA programme. I just raise the question. There is a committee decides on the grants, the industrial grants, the incentive grants, a committee made up of DREE.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I will just explain this so that I will enlighten members to what this is about because I did not explain it very thoroughly. I did not realize it would touch off any more than a request for the loans -

MR. STRACHAN: You will keep talking until Saturday.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: All right, just one word. The ARDA Committee, made up of DREE, Newfoundland Development, Rural Development and Industrial Development, appointed members of a committee, decides on an incentive grant. When the decision is made, the grant does not go back - can you imagine the grant going back up and going to the Federal Cabinet? Well, it has to go to the Provincial Cabinet. Does the member understand that?

MR. STRACHAN: I do not mind the minister explaining points and so on. He will probably just dig the hole deeper and wider. The point is that the minister already knows that the capital grants in Municipal Affairs, there is no way that you can relate that kind of thing to the Rural Development Authority. The Rural Development Authority already has been suspect, it already has been nailed in this House all last year, nailed again this year, controversy over controversy over controversy. It looks to me as though the minister is looking for it.

MR. NEARY: My hon. friend, do not get coddled by the minister because municipal capital works projects go before Cabinet. Who is the minister trying to cod?

MR. STRACHAN: At the same time there is no relationship between these types of programmes which are very specific programmes. And with these types of programmes here people could be paid or given money or grants or loans because of political patronage. We are not saying that occurs.

MR. PECKFORD: Shame!

MR. STRACHAN: Maybe some other ones can say it. I said we are not saying it occurs. Maybe some other members have more information and will say it occurs. And it has been said that it has already occurred. The minister has already been under pressure from other members of this House who know, some of them, that it has occurred. I am not stating that, but what the minister is doing is asking for more invective and more suspicion to be heaped on top of him. If he now has the right alone to dish out the money to various businesses and industries and individuals and so on who come with good ideas, and it may look a good idea and the minister alone dishes out the money without discussing it with Cabinet, then I can guarantee you that next year the Public Accounts Committee is going to be real busy, very, very busy.

MR. NEARY: We will need three or four committees.

MR. STRACHAN: And like the member for LaPoile says, there may not be enough magistrates or judges in the Province to carry out the public enquiries that we are going to have to carry out into this Rural Development Authority.

It smells! This throws it wide open. So surely the minister, for his own protection, you would think he would like to spread out the responsibility for making decisions among other members of the Cabinet, making these Cabinet decisions, rather than to heap on his own head the sole right and authority to give the money out.

MR. NEARY: He wants to be like Castro. The Fidel Castro of Newfoundland.

MR. STRACHAN: Idi Amin! It is just that he will never make it either.

AN HON. MEMBER: Waiting for Fidel.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. STRACHAN:

He never made it in London

and he will never make it at all.

MR. SIMMONS:

You never know. He might be

there.

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

That is right.

MR. STRACHAN:

I think that maybe we should

get a collection up or something and send the minister

over to Uganda and see if he can maybe develop some tactics

or techniques from them.

MR. SIMMONS:

I hope he becomes as invisible

as Idi Amin these days.

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

I do not know. He is making a

lot of news.

MR. NEARY:

But you know what is wrong with

his brain, do you not?

MR. RIDEOUT:

He is frightened to death of the

news since he got out of the opposition.

MR. NEARY:

Does the hon. minister know what

is wrong with Idi's brain?

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

They are paying for it these days.

Willing to pay for it.

MR. STRACHAN:

Anyway, the minister tried to

sneak this bill 39 through. His introduction when he stood up

to introduce it was as a little housekeeping bill, just

nothing at all, no problem at all. And that was at twenty

minutes to nine, it is now five minutes to ten, and there are

probably another five members to go. So it is good for eleven

o'clock tonight. And that is one little piece of housekeeping

legislation.

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

I am going for a couple of hours.

MR. STRACHAN:

And probably by that time a couple

of members over there will go.

MR. NEARY:

It is not housekeeping, it is

housecleaning.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: That is alright.

MR. NEARY: Clean her out.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Thank you for the compliment.

MR. STRACHAN: So we will be here and the House will be here until Regatta Day. There is no question of it at this rate.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Can we have the first fine weekend off?

MR. STRACHAN: You can have a few days off as long as you do not try and sneak in any housekeeping bills.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STRACHAN: But to get back to the point, we are going to vote against it, there is no question about it. You can haul in your people and out-vote us and so on but we are going to vote against it -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Shame! If they want to (inaudible) my decision making I am going to vote against that.

MR. STRACHAN: - totally and absolutely, everyone, I think, on this side.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STRACHAN: The member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. Rowe) was making some kind of concession that if

Mr. Strachan:

you were willing to publish the list of loans under the Rural Development Authority, if you are willing to publish these lists then we would probably think that we give you the rights, and we would allow then the right for the minister himself to make these decisions.

AN HON. MEMBER: No way.

MR. STRACHAN: But even so I think that is,

I think, watering it down. We still feel the principle of this bill is wrong.

MR. NEARY: Unsound.

MR. STRACHAN: Totally wrong. We think it is dangerous. We feel there is no way in the world we can allow it. I think the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and the member for Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. Rowe) have described our feelings about that, and there is no way in the world that we can go along with this. And I am sure that many other members will get into it and discuss it. I cannot understand why the minister, as I said, is asking for that right when he already knows the programme is a controversial one. But he already knows the programme is suspect but whether that is all correct or not - the programme might be one of the best programmes there are. I am not arguing that: Other members who know more about it can argue it. I am not arguing that at all. But already you are getting nailed for political patronage. Already you are getting nailed because people -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I have not heard comments outside what the three or four of you fellows say about that. I never heard any comments.

MR. STRACHAN: I am not saying that. I am saying I have already heard a great deal of discussion on it.

MR. RIDEOUT: What about the fellow down in Exploits?

MR. STRACHAN: The Evening Telegram and The Daily News have been full of it. And what we are saying is instead of the minister opening up information to the public, the minister wants to gain more power to himself, more secrecy, never mind about talking

Mr. Strachan:

about freedom of information. This is opposite with this. Already at the moment he does not give his information to the House. The people of the Province cannot get the information. Now what he is saying is that the members in Cabinet cannot get information.

So we feel totally the bill -

MR. NEARY: Closed shop.

MR. STRACHAN: - is a bad bill.

MR. NEARY: He wants a closed shop down there.

MR. STRACHAN: Closed shop. Unionized. The P.C. Party unionized. Did you ever hear the like?

AN HON. MEMBER: You will have to bring in closure to get this.

MR. STRACHAN: So we are prepared to vote against this bill. I am sure that all other members will agree, and we are prepared to go on and discuss this bill in its entirety, and even if we are charged with wasting the time of the House we feel it is time well worth it, the time that we have taken up, because we feel the whole principle is wrong. And if this continues this way and there are other kinds of programmes like this that there is going to be some real trouble. I will say to the minister this time next year he will regret, if he out votes us and passes this amendment here, by this time next year he will regret the fact that he alone had the authority to do this, and that all loans of any political patronage or any peddling the wares and so on is found out or discovered or brought out to light by the Auditor General or by the Public Accounts Committee or by any other group who want to look at it, then the minister alone will have to bear the brunt, he alone. The Cabinet have got nothing to do with it now. They are let off the hook. Only the minister has set himself up as a fall guy and he is going to take the blow on the head.

So I think it is a foolish piece of legislation, a dangerous piece of legislation, and we on this side will definitely vote against it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. SIMMONS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not really believe what is happening here. The minister somehow feels he can come in with a piece of legislation which has such major implications and tell us that he honestly, sincerely thought it was a piece of housekeeping legislation, a bit of housekeeping legislation! Well my understanding of the term 'housekeeping' is tidying up your house, putting your house in order the way that you would like to see it run, the way that you would like to have it. And that is what is wrong with this piece of legislation.

The minister would have tidied up his house, his Rural Development Authority, the way he would like to have it tidied up. And therein, Mr. Speaker, is the message that he is really not hearing at all from this side of the House, although we have been saying it for three or four years, at least since I have been here, and I am sure before that. That we do not like, Mr. Speaker, his ideas about house tidying. We do not like the kind of house that the Rural Development Authority is. We said it before, and

MR. SIMMONS: We will say it again if we have to. The very first speech that I gave in this House in January or February 1974, a couple of months after my first election in the old district of Hermitage, the very first speech I gave here, indeed, yes, my maiden speech here in this House addressed itself completely to the subject of the Rural Development Authority and at that time I did - or had done for me by an accountant, done for me by an accountant a breakdown, a financial analysis of the disbursements under the Rural Development Authority, the monies that were paid out to various parties, forms of loans and so on, loans actually. And I demonstrated to the House then using information that an accountant had analyzed and categorized for me that this Rural Development Authority was nothing but a pork-barrel operation, strictly a pork-barrel operation. In theory, in definition, under the legislation which set up the Rural Development Authority it was a magnificent idea. I believe I was among one of the first groups to meet with the Premier after he assumed office in January 1972, which groups he informed of his intention to set up a mechanism such as the Rural Development Authority. At that time I was representative of a development association, a rural development association, the Green Bay Development Association. And I, together with the mayors of seven communities in the Green Bay area, met with the Premier on the economic plight which we were then facing in the Green Bay area because of the close down of several mining operations at that time, or just prior to that time, just prior to January and February 1972.

And in February 1972, within three weeks of the Premier assuming office as Premier of this Province, I met with him and Mr. Crosbie, Mr. Aubrey Senior, who was then the Minister of Community and Social Development, and a couple of other ministers, a total of five including the Premier, and we were informed of the government's plans in the area of rural development and the flag ship, Mr. Speaker, the flag ship of that particular plan

MR. SIMMONS: was to be this Rural Development Authority. I am not sure even at that point that it had the particular name it now bears, the RDA, the Rural Development Authority, but it was clear, it was clear that the flag ship of the Rural Development Programme and of the new Department of Rural Development, the then proposed Department of Rural Development, would clearly be an authority which had power in law to grant loans to individuals and companies who and which would seek to stimulate the economy in the rural parts of this Province.

And that, Mr. Speaker, nobody can argue with that concept. It is a magnificent concept. It is the kind of thinking that we need in this Province if we are going to have anything but a couple pseudo-Chicagos, or pseudo-Montreals or pseudo-Torontos. If we are going to have anything in this Province in twenty years from now other than two or three cities or large urban concentrations of populations which are trying hard to be like the plastic cities up-along, if we are going to have anything but that, Mr. Speaker, we need a policy which addresses itself to the continued preservation and the prosperous growth of the small community. And when I heard first about this philosophy and heard about how it was going to be put into law, into practice, how enabling legislation was going to be introduced, I was very happy and I told the Premier at that meeting in February 1972 how pleased I was at that time, and indeed, after the meeting with the Premier, made a public statement on television here in St. John's, much as I have just made in the past moment or so, that I was extremely pleased with the direction that the Premier and his colleagues were proposing to take with respect to rural development.

Mr. Simmons.

Mr. Speaker, early in the game I was publicly identified as being in favour of the approach that this government proposed to take insofar as the development of our rural economy is concerned. And, I repeat, I was particularly attracted to the idea contained in what I call the flag-ship proposal, the proposal to establish a Rural Development Authority which authority would have power in law to make available certain monies to individuals and small companies in the rural sectors of this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the theory. That is the philosophy. That was the stated approach. That is the way we were to have gone. That is the direction that this government was to have taken. We were told in clear, unmistakable terms, not only in private meetings in the Cabinet room but also across this country on the airways, on television, on radio, in the printed media, and indeed in the party propaganda of the party in power - because as we now know, and then suspected, they were getting ready for an election which they subsequently called in a matter of weeks in the month of March - and we were told very clearly that we could depend on a very workable approach, a very palatable approach, a very exciting approach to the development of small rural industries. That is the approach that we were led to expect. That is the philosophy. Now what is the reality, Mr. Speaker? What happened? Well, the legislation got introduced, and while we disagree tonight with the minister on a matter which I want to come to directly very shortly, in principle we have no disagreement with the legislation that set up the Rural Development Authority. Indeed the record will show that we supported that legislation. The legislation came in, Mr. Speaker, but it was never given a chance to work, because as we all know, Mr. Speaker, if there are those who are bent on thwarting, on circumventing the aims

Mr. Simmons.

of legislation, or of circumventing the aims of stated policy, they can do so fairly easily. The world is full of examples of how men have abused authority. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, in our own time in this Province there is no more blatant example of how this government has abused its legislative authority than the Rural Development Authority.

In January or February, 1974 when I gave my first speech in this House, I dwelt in some detail on that subject, as I was saying a moment ago, and in particular I pointed out the blatant pork-barrel aspect of the distribution of the loans. I did it by district, and members will recall that the obvious conclusion which I then read into the record, and which stands in the record and is very easily retrievable if one needs the proof of what I said, the record will clearly show, if retrieved, if looked at, if consulted, that it was clearly demonstrated from the figures -

MR. NEARY: Would my hon. friend permit me for a moment?

In the Ontario election, the PC's leading in twenty-three; Liberals leading in thirteen and the NDP leading in nine.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: The PC's leading in twenty-three; Liberals leading in thirteen and the NDP leading in nine. A minority government.

MR. SIMMONS: I think, Mr. Speaker, that all of us can take encouragement from these figures. All our predictions are right, that the PC's would be first and may well have a majority, that looks in doubt now. But secondly that the Liberals would -

AN HON. MEMBER: The P.C.'s are in.

MR. SIMMONS: No, it is still in doubt. Let us be clear about it. We are talking about 125 seats so the results are pretty preliminary at this point in time. And the Liberals are going to replace the NDP once again as the official Opposition, which they have been down through the years with the exception of the last three or four. All right? So it goes to show that when we want to arrive at a consensus in this House even on a far removed matter, we can do so.

Mr. Simmons.

But what plagues all our concensuses, all our attempts to get a concensus is the kind of thing that happened here in this House tonight when the Minister of Forestry in speaking to Bill No. 67 made a vicious, vicious, vicious, irresponsible attack

MR. SIMMONS: on a part of rural Newfoundland that is pretty close to me. And when he stands in this House, Mr. Speaker, and tells me that in his opinion the major factor, I believe I have his actual words here retrieved from the Hansard record - no, I am sorry I do not. I requested them earlier but I do not have them yet. The words, as I remember them, subject to checking with the Hansard record, is that he said, "The major factor contributing to the problems with the Ralland operation is management." Now, Mr. Speaker, first of all let me reject that as being completely irresponsible, completely untrue -

MR. HICKMAN: A point of order.

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

MR. HICKMAN: Bill 67 has been debated, passed second reading and is certainly not appropriate to be debated in this debate or even referred thereto.

MR. SIMMONS: Okay.

MR. HICKMAN: The rule is very clear on it.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the minister is again right and I was just so perturbed by the remarks of the Minister of Forestry! I realize that in Committee we shall have full opportunity to discuss that subject so I shall get back to something else that is very dear to my heart and that is the subject of this Rural Development Authority, the subject of the amendment now before the House on second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: On the point of order, there appears to be no need for the Chair to give any detailed judgement. The point raised by the hon. Minister of Justice is acceded to by the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) and the matter can rest there.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, as I was saying a moment ago before I got off on my tangent about the forestry legislation, that the record

MR. SIMMONS: of February 1974 would indicate that I had done an analysis which demonstrated that the Rural Development Authority was even then, three years ago, being used as one of, if not the chief pork-barrel arm of the government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the information I used was information that was supplied to me in answer to questions put to the then Minister of Rural Development, Mr. James Reid, then the member for Trinity South. He gave me the information in answers to some questions. It is worth noting that the present minister has refused to follow that precedent, Mr. Speaker, has refused to follow the precedent set by his predecessor, the then hon. James Reid, who gave me the information, the details on the loans that had been distributed to various companies and individuals. The charge has been made, again irresponsibly, that we had some malicious use for these bits of information. The record again will show that I, nor any colleague of mine in the official Opposition, and I believe the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) as well, have ever used the names or the details of that information, with three exceptions; and we did that, we used those three names to demonstrate the very statement I have made a moment ago and the very charge I have repeated again, and that is that the RDA was being used for purely political purposes for pork-barrel purposes and you will remember the names of the individuals we singled out as falling well within that category. I do not think it is fair to the House or fair to the schedule we are wanting to keep here to go over that at any length, but let the record show that we have said now for three years plus, three years plus, Madam Speaker, that this is a pork barrel operation.

Now, Madam Speaker, I believe that. Madam Speaker. I believe that. But let us suppose, let us take two possibilities. I believe it, I believe it to be true. But there are two possibilities; either it is true or it is not true. If it is true, which I believe it to be, it follows that the onus is on the government to do something to clean up their act insofar as

MR. SIMMONS:

RDA is concerned. If it is not true, and I believe it to be true, but if it is not true then the minister is inviting real trouble with his amendment tonight, because he is putting himself in the position of becoming the fall guy. He is putting himself in the position for all kinds of additional charges from the Opposition, as an extension of the charges we have already made and documented on this particular subject.

Now, Madam Speaker, let us dismiss this nonsense about it being a housekeeping bill. The only way this is a housekeeping bill, as I said a moment ago, is that the minister is trying to put the house in order in the way he would like to see it in order. Well, Madam Speaker, that is what we object to, the way he keeps this house, this house called the Rural Development Authority. It is fast becoming, Madam Speaker, a house of ill repute, a house with a very bad reputation. Madam Speaker, this Rural Development Authority is fast becoming, across this Province, a house with a very bad reputation, and I speak figuratively, not of the House of Assembly, of course, but of the house which I have categorized as the Rural Development Authority, it is fast becoming a house with a very poor reputation. If the minister wants to keep house there I would suggest that he has to do more than go through the pretences of tidying up the act. What he has to do, Madam Speaker, is keep his department and the operations and decisions of the Rural Development Authority very open to the scrutiny of all this Province and, in particular, the scrutiny of this House of Assembly.

What he is doing tonight, Madam Speaker, is taking a step in the opposite direction. He is taking a step which will place in the hands of a

MR. SIMMONS: minister, out of the hands of a cabinet - does he not trust his own fellows? Is he having trouble getting things through Cabinet, as we have been hearing? Is that the problem? He does not have the clout in Cabinet he thought he was going to have when he came into this job? That somehow when he came back from Ottawa he thought that he would just dictate his wishes and they would automatically be swallowed and jumped at? That they would dance to his every tune and spring to his every command? And now he finds out that he is, at best, a junior member of Cabinet, basically, mainly, chiefly, firstly because he has never gotten rid of the opposition complex that he operated under so well while in Ottawa.

MR. DOODY: You would have disappeared.

MR. SIMMONS: There is my good friend, the Minister of Finance. How we missed him when he was on his rest. How we missed him. There was no candy being passed around at night. No candy, no! Well, there was wit but not of the calibre that the Minister of Finance is so adept at. The reports on the Waterford Hospital were few and far between, and not so nearly as well informed as the minister is so capable of giving. We welcome him back, Madam Speaker. We are always glad to see a fellow well rested from the rigors of battle and back to do some more battle. And that minister, the Minister of Finance, has never been one to shy away from a good exchange. And in almost any exchange he has, he carries at least half it, both in terms of quantity and quality. So we are very glad, Madam Speaker, that the minister has injected himself, although briefly, into the debate tonight, the Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: You have defused me.

MR. SIMMONS: Having defused the minister, which

MR. SIMMONS: in itself is a monumental assignment, a monumental assignment to say the least, and to be able to do so, at the minister's admission, so quickly, is no mean feat.

MR. DOODY: It is the bit of flattery. I have never had any.

MR. SIMMONS: I see. The minister is always open to a little flattery, but I can think of no other that is more deserving of a little from time to time, considering the particularly onerous burdens which he has to bear in the administration.

But I want to talk about another minister. Not about a minister, but about the actions of another minister, the actions of the Minister of Rural Development in bringing this amendment, this so-called minor housekeeping amendment into this House here tonight.

I hope by now, Madam Speaker, and I am prepared to quit talking, and my colleagues are prepared to quit talking or not get into debate -

MR. HICKMAN: There is no one there to quit talking.

MR. SIMMONS: Oh, they

Mr. Simmons:

are gone out, Madam Speaker, to get their notes. And I can give them the signal; I have to cough three times two minutes before I am ready to sit down, and they will be then back into the House in a rush, and in no time at all, Madam Speaker, they will be here with their volumes of notes to speak to this issue. But, Madam Speaker, they will not need -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: They will not need, Madam Speaker - they are expert enough to know phoney coughs from the real thing. But before I get to my three ceremonial coughs, Madam Speaker, let me say that this entire debate can be brought very quickly to an end, if we could get an indication from the minister, who is absent from the Chamber at the moment, or from the Government House Leader, that the government have heard the argument that we put tonight, realize now that the bill is one that has considerably deeper implications than the ministry thought, and is prepared now to withdraw it, Madam Speaker, and let the authority continue to rest where it has rested since this Rural Development Authority was established with the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, with the Cabinet, not with one minister.

MR. DOODY: Can the hon. member wait until the gentleman brings in a drop of cough medicine. The minister is outside - oh, no he is back. It is okay. Carry on.

MR. SIMMONS: The Minister of Rural Development is in good shape.

MR. DINN: A false alarm, it was me. I coughed twice.

MR. SIMMONS: No doubts about the Minister of Rural Development. No doubts at all.

Madam Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER: What is the delay?

MR. SIMMONS: I am sorry?

AN HON. MEMBER: What is hanging things up?

MR. SIMMONS: I am doing fine actually. I just had a little request from the Minister of Finance that we give somebody a breather,

Mr. Simmons:

I am not sure who. But I am ready to proceed. All ready, are we?

Now, Madam Speaker, the solution here is very simple, very simple. The minister can now withdraw this bill, withdraw it and still retain a little honour on the subject; withdraw it before he legitimizes, before he proceeds to legitimize the racket which goes on in this house of ill-repute, the Rural Development Authority, before he legitimizes, Madam Speaker, the unseemly goings on in this house of ill-repute, the Rural Development Authority. This is a scandalous piece of legislation, Madam Speaker, It would give to the minister authority that is now vested in the Cabinet. I can think, Madam Speaker, of no good reason why that kind of a move can be justified.

Now the minister a moment ago, interjecting himself into the debate at the moment when my colleague from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) was speaking, pointed out or said to the House that, in fact, the municipal capital grants programme was decided upon by the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Well, of course, Madam Speaker, that is not the case, and let us for the record correct that. That is not the case. The minister is misleading the House. I do not say he is doing it deliberately, but he is misleading the House when he says, that the Minister of Municipal Affairs has final jurisdiction in respect to municipal capital grants. Indeed, one of the big excuses we have gotten from this minister, in particular, this present Minister of Municipal Affairs, whenever we ask questions about capital programmes is that the decision, is that the decision -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Did you say I misled the House?

MR. SIMMONS: I did not say the Minister of Rural Development deliberately misled the House. I said in fact he misled by giving incorrect information.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. If I have given misleading information, and the member carefully did say it was not deliberate.

MR. SIMMONS: No, no.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I will have to withdraw, and I will equally expect the member to withdraw these, misrepresenting my remarks because it is my understanding that the municipal special grants which the minister can address his remarks to do not have to go to Cabinet. Once the House approves -

AN HON. MEMBER: Special grants.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Yes. Once the House approves the \$1 million or \$2 million for that particular vote the department has the authority within the government to make a decision, I do not think it has to go to Cabinet, If it does I have not heard of it.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Is that correct? I have never heard of a special grant going to Cabinet.

MR. DOODY: It is not the same thing as we discussed today in Committee. They are different.

MR. SPEAKER (MRS. MACISSAC): The minister has agreed to withdraw. The point of order has been disposed of.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: No, I did. I said if I am wrong.

MR. SPEAKER (MRS. MACISSAC): You did not?

MR. SIMMONS: Madam Speaker, I congratulate you on an excellent ruling.

MR. SPEAKER (MRS. MACISSAC): Order, please! The minister agreed if he was wrong to withdraw.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Most of the minister's withdrawals are conditional and I am not surprised at that one. The minister either - all right, Madam Speaker, we will say it - let me say it another way so as not to -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: You are absolutely wrong, totally wrong. Aside from arrogant, you are wrong.

MR. SIMMONS: We want to talk about arrogance now do we, Madam Speaker? We want to talk about arrogance now do we. Madam Speaker? Well have a look, have a look, Madam Speaker, if you want to see a good example of arrogance, arrogance at its utmost -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Look. Look. Look. Your arrogance cannot accept your ignorance.

MR. SIMMONS: - that is most flagrant, Mr. Speaker, did you ever see anything so flagrant?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Being a teacher you arrogance -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Look, he is losing his -

MR. SPEAKER: It is just a difference of opinion. Continue, please.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Madam Speaker, not only a difference of opinion but we disagree only who is arrogant, I believe.

Madam Speaker, to get back to the trend of thought that I was pursuing before I was so rudely interrupted by the Minister of Rural Development; either the minister had given misleading information in saying - the Minister of Rural Development, either he has given misleading information to this House in saying that the Minister of Municipal Affairs can make the decisions on his own in respect to municipal grants, or the Minister of Municipal Affairs has been giving misleading information to this House by telling us every time we ask a question it has got to go to Cabinet or something to that effect.

MR. RIDEOUT: Hear! Hear!

MR. SIMMONS: Now one or the other, Madam Speaker, one or the other. They cannot have it both ways tonight. Either the Minister of Rural Development is misleading us or the Minister of Municipal Affairs has been misleading us, one or the other, Madam Speaker. They cannot have it both ways. One or the other.

MR. DINN: A point of order.

Mr. Speaker, the point made by the hon. member as to whether the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing was misleading the House, we were talking specifically with respect to grants, special grants to councils for different items and they at this present time go to the Finance Committee of my department, from there to me and I approve of them. It is left up to the discretion of the minister in this case.

MR. SIMMONS: Madam Speaker, with that in mind, because I think that is important to get into the record what the minister has just said, and he will have reason to be reminded of what he just said many times during many question periods in this House, with that in mind, Madam Speaker, I withdraw just as profusely, as abjectly, as humbly as one could ever withdraw anything in this House. I withdraw, withdraw, withdraw.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SIMMONS: Because, Madam Speaker, what has just been achieved is more important than the charge I made. We have now an admission into the record from the Minister of Municipal Affairs that from now on he can never again honestly, from his heart, tell us, give us the dodge in Question Period, that the whole thing rests on Cabinet's decision. We now know the buck stops with him on all those municipal capital grants and we will expect some answers from the minister on that subject.

MR. DOODY: That is not what the minister said, Madam Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS: We will expect some answers on that subject from now on, answers we have not been able to get because of the old dodge that he had to go to Cabinet and talk to his buddies in Cabinet.

MR. RIDEOUT: That is what he tells us all the time.

MP. NEARY: To that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (MRS. MACISSAC): A point of order.

MR. NEARY: I believe this is just a difference of opinion between two members, Your Honour, and I believe Your Honour should rule that way.

MR. SPEAKER (MRS. MACISSAC): I believe the point of order has been disposed of since the member withdrew his comments. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. PECKFORD: Might I ask the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir a question?

MR. SIMMONS: I recognize the hon. gentleman for LaPoile first.

MR. NEARY: Take your seat. I just want to give the latest count in the Ontario election, PC's - 39 elected, leading in 17, for a total of 56; Liberals - 20 elected, leading in 14, for a total of 34; NDP - 18 elected, leading in 13, for a total of 31. If the present trend continues there will be a PC minority government in Ontario. Minority.

MR. SIMMONS: I think the Minister of Mines and Energy wanted a question, sure.

MR. PECKFORD: The question to the hon. member is this; does the hon. member understand

Mr. Peckford.

that there is a major difference between municipal capital projects which involve guaranteed loans which are, therefore, not classified or phrased as municipal grants, on the one hand, and on the other that there is such a thing as municipal grants within the department which are handled internally by the department? The ones that come to Cabinet, if the hon. understands, are the municipal capital projects and are subject to guaranteed loans which is a big difference between that and grant.

MR. SIMMONS: Madam Speaker, that is why I am always especially happy to yield for a question from the member for Green Bay (Mr. Peckford), because he can always be depended on to set this House right on a matter of information.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: Now he sits, Madam Speaker, next to the Minister of Rural Development and it always puzzles me, because I served on a teaching staff with that gentleman from Green Bay, and we had, I believe, a good relationship, and I learned a lot from him, Madam Speaker, and what puzzles me and continues to puzzle me in this House is how the Minister of Rural Development can sit so near him and never learn a thing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: How he can get up in this House tonight, Madam Speaker, and tell us information sitting right next to his buddy from Green Bay, information which is contrary to the record, contrary to the reality, and his colleague who sits six inches from him has to get up and put it stright. Now that is where this is entire thing, Madam Speaker, got off track in the first place tonight. That the Minister of Rural Development in a mad, desperate attempt to con us into voting for this piece of nonsense that we have here, called for dignity's sake, Bill No. 39, in the interest of getting us to vote for that, he drags in all kinds of examples that have nothing to do with the price of fish in China at all, nothing to do at all with what we are talking about. There is not a parallel there.

Mr. Simmons.

It has nothing to do with it at all. He drags in examples about municipal affairs and that kind of thing, Madam Speaker.

MR. DOODY: What is the price of fish in China?

MR. SIMMONS: I am not sure, Madam Speaker. I am not very sure, but I am sure if the minister were interested in going I could get a good price for him. I could get a good price for him, Madam Speaker. There is no question about it. Indeed if he decides to go, I hope he will need an ADC, and I hope he will talk to me on the subject. Because his great, eternal wit, Madam Speaker, is something that I would like to the company of on a fairly regular basis. I might also learn some other tricks of the trade from him too, Madam Speaker, in the process. Think of all the issues we could talk about on the road to China, including, Madam Speaker, why his colleague - I would hope at that point his then colleague - his then colleague, had the audacity and at once the nonsense to bring into this House a bill which says, in effect, Madam Speaker, which says in effect, I, John Lundrigan, want complete control. I do not even want to talk to my buddies in Cabinet about it. I want to be the king in the castle. I want to have the final say on this. Forget the controversy that has been raging about the Rural Development Authority, forget the suspicion in which it is being held because of the pork-barrel fashion in which it has administered its funds over the past three or four years, forget its complete abrogation of its responsibilities under the legislation, forget all that, and just give me the power, because I like power. I like making decisions. I do not care if they are responsible decisions, he says. I just want decisions, and I want to be covered. I want to be covered by law. I want this House not only to recognize that I should make all kinds of decisions, but I want the House to vote so that I am covered on the subject. He will be covered. He is now continuing - I was going to say beginning, but

Mr. Simmons.

that would be incorrect in terms of the record historically.- the sequence of events is that he is not beginning to bury himself six feet deep, he is just continuing the process. But why he insists, Madam Speaker, on using so large a shovel I do not know. Why he insists on using so large a shovel, Madam Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Young) I would ask the hon. member to withdraw his remarks.

MR. SIMMONS: I withdraw the inference.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, I always had some doubt about

Mr. Doody:

the hon. gentleman's judgment, but now it is gone completely.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): The point of order is well taken.

MR. SIMMONS: I believe though, Mr. Speaker, to give me the benefit of the doubt, you were subconsciously on my mind because I began talking about digging and being six feet under at the very moment you entered the Chair.

MR. DOODY: A sentiment we all heartily endorse.

MR. SIMMONS: I believe the Minister of Finance forgot who it was I was referring to when I was talking about -

MR. DOODY: I thought it was you.

MR. SIMMONS: No, no, no I have no intention. I am going to China, the minister is going six feet under. The minister confuses -

MR. DOODY: While I was listening to you, the reason I forget -

MR. SIMMONS: - the illustrations are rushing so fast and furious through my head tonight, Mr. Speaker, I had difficulty explaining even to the intelligent Minister of Finance, that we are going to China, the Minister of Rural Development, the minister of - what is he so far? The minister responsible for the concealment of information.

MR. DOODY: Now! Now!

MR. SIMMONS: Now the minister -

MR. DOODY: Now! Now!

MR. HICKMAN: On a point of order!

MR. DOODY: On a point of order.

MR. HICKMAN: The hon. gentleman will either have to be named or withdraw unequivocally.

MR. SIMMONS: I am sorry?

MR. HICKMAN: Oh yes, that is the most serious accusation that can be made of any hon. member, one that brings on naming, namely, that he is the hon. minister of concealment.

MR. SIMMONS: I can give you an example of it. I could give -

MR. SPEAKER : Order, please!

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

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

MR. SIMMONS: Well, to the point of order, of course, I can give all kinds of examples where the Minister of Rural Development has concealed information. For example, he has concealed from this House the information that his predecessor, Mr. Reid, made available to the House for a number of years.

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

MR. SIMMONS: And definitely in my mind the minister is -

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

MR. SIMMONS: - responsible for the concealment of information.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): Order, please! I feel that the hon. member should withdraw the remark, He must refer to the member by his district or his portfolio.

MR. SIMMONS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have not at all any compunction about that matter, I am always glad to refer to the Minister for Rural Development because I think it should be clearly understood -

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): I asked you to withdraw the remarks, please.

MR. SIMMONS: Which remarks, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): The remark that you -

MR. SIMMONS: Oh, the minister! Mr. Speaker, I will not say - I withdraw saying that the minister is responsible for the concealment of information. I withdraw saying that he is the minister responsible for the concealment of information. I will say, which is equally an indictment, that he is the Minister of Rural Development. Mr. Speaker, there can be no bigger indictment in this Province than that a man is responsible for the mess that is going on in Rural Development in the name of developing the economy. Do you want to hear some sawmill stories? That will excite you right to the depths of your soul, what this crowd has done for the sawmill industry, particularly since this minister came in. It would be the height of

Mr. Simmons:

shame, the height of shame to be known at this particular time in this administration as the minister responsible for Rural Development. I can think of no tag, I can think of no tag that is more disgusting in its connotation in terms of what it says to the people of Rural Newfoundland. And I can understand why he rather grandly refers to himself as the Minister of Development, because thereby, Mr. Speaker, he ignores to make reference to rural or industrial. And we all know, Mr. Speaker, that in addition to being the minister responsible for the rural development mess we have, he is the minister responsible for the pork barrel Rural Development Authority. He is a busy minister, a busy minister, this fellow! The minister responsible for Rural Development, such as it is, the minister responsible for pork barrelling in the Rural Development Authority.

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

MR. SIMMONS: The minister responsible for industrial shut-downs.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): Order, please! I asked the hon. member just now to refer to the minister by his correct portfolio, and I am sure there is no portfolio as was just referred to.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, without my questioning Mr. Speaker's ruling, I said clearly that the Minister of Rural Development, his clear title, can obviously, in language as I understand it, be referred to without insisting it is his title. I can say that he is responsible for - I can say that the minister is responsible for his children. That does not make him the Minister of Children. I would submit that I am allowed to say that he is responsible for decisions made in Cabinet, That does not make him the Minister of Cabinet decisions.

AN HON. MEMBER: You are allowed to destroy a person.

MR. SIMMONS: I can say he is the minister responsible for this bill, That does not mean that he is the Minister of Bills, Mr. Speaker. This minister, this fellow, this hon. fellow, this hon. fellow, busy fellow, busy fellow, run right ragged.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Opposition Cabinet Minister.

MR. SIMMONS: The minister in charge of Opposition complexes,
the minister in charge of Rural Development, such as it is, the
Minister in charge of industrial shut-downs, the minister who
carries out in reality, in practice, carries out the industrial
shut down

Mr. Simmons.

programme of this government, the minister in whose department - the Industrial Development Department - has a vote called Industrial Shutdowns. They even spend money on it now, Mr. Speaker. And in another day or so, do you know what we are going to be asked to do in this House? We are going to be asked to discuss the Linerboard Bill. Now they have done some checking, Mr. Speaker. They do not need \$75 million now. They only need \$40 million now, because

it only takes \$40 million to shut her down. Now you got to hand it to them, Mr. Speaker, a crowd that can achieve that kind of economy. Since they brought the bill in, Mr. Speaker, they shaved her down by \$35 million and now, boy, they tell us she is only going to cost \$40 million to close down, another \$40 million, not \$75 million. I am sure that the people in Stephenville must be dancing in the streets tonight. I say to the member for Stephenville (Mr. McNeil) they must be tickled, the cockles of their heart must be tickled that it is only going to take \$40 million of their tax money and my tax money to shut her down. The minister in charge of Industrial Shutdowns.

Now in addition to all that, he is responsible for opposition complexes, for rural development, such as it is, for the pork-barrel Rural Development Authority, for industrial shutdowns. Now on top of all that he wants to make the Rural Development Authority into a legitimate, legalized brothel, a legitimized house of ill-repute. He wants to legitimize the unseemly goings on in the Rural Development Authority, and not only legitimize them, Mr. Speaker, but keep them all to himself, not even tell his buddies in Cabinet.

Now I hear great stories these days, Mr. Speaker, that half the crowd in Cabinet are wondering what the other half are doing. You hear all kinds of stories about that. But surely it has not got to be carried to the extremity where a minister has to get written into law that he has not got to tell his buddies in Cabinet. Is it that bad over there, Mr. Speaker? Are

Mr. Simmons.

they that washed up over there? Are they so looking over the shoulder at each other over there, Mr. Speaker, that they want legislation to protect themselves from each other? Is that what they are asking this House for, legislation to protect themselves one against the other, one from the other? That is what this bill would do for the minister. The minister in charge of rural development and industrial shutdowns and opposition complexes, now he wants also to be the minister who, like no other minister, does not have to condescend to go to Cabinet to get decisions. Well, my heart bleeds for him! My advice to that minister is to quit while he is behind before he gets further behind, because if he gets this authority, the shovel he has been using so far to dig himself under, Mr. Speaker, will be a teaspoon, an ornamental souvenir little teaspoon, the small kind that you save for old time's sake, if he pursues this madness and gets this bill through the House, uses his government majority to ram in through. The only saving grace, Mr. Speaker, I say in closing, the only saving grace is that some of his colleagues on his own side of the House may quickly come to the conclusion that we have come to a long time ago, that this minister is dangerous with too much power in his hands, and the less power they give him, Mr. Speaker, the better for all concerned. And even more important, Mr. Speaker, let us keep it equal, Mr. Speaker. Let us at least see to it that all the fellows in the Cabinet are equal. Let us not create ministers who have to go to Cabinet for decisions and then another echelon of fellows who can do what they like without even checking it out with their buddies in Cabinet. That is a disgraceful precedent, Mr. Speaker, and we on this side of the House cannot support it. The solution now is to withdraw the bill, I say to the Government House Leader, withdraw it, rewrite it, tear it up, have a public burning outside, tear it up, do something with it, but get rid of it now before it disgraces this administration with this latest

Mr. Simmons.

little curb, this latest little innovation of assigning to ministers these kinds of responsibilities. We will get to the point where they will not need two or three Cabinet meetings as they had today, Mr. Speaker - three, I believe today. They need three. They will not even need one. They will not need one a week, because you will have fifteen, or sixteen or seventeen fellows going off in all directions, Mr. Speaker, without consultation with each other, and what is at best now the skeleton of a policy will be no policy at all, because the fellows will not even be talking to each other. I have got to be against the amendment, Mr. Speaker. The simplest way to get rid of it is to withdraw it so that we can get on with the business of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DOODY: Best man in the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure what the hon. Minister of Finance will say before eleven o'clock, but it may not be the comment he just made.

Mr. Speaker, I sort of fell back in my Chair because having listened to my colleague on this side of the House speak for - what? - the last two hours, I suppose, on this particular bill -

MR. DOODY: It seemed like two hours -

MR. RIDEOUT: No, truthfully now, Mr. Speaker -

MR. DOODY: - You mean the member for -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. member should be in his seat when he is speaking.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, is very much alert tonight, I will say. I thank the Speaker for being so alert. But having listened to the comments of the Opposition spokesmen so far, I had thought at least, Mr. Speaker, that there would be somebody - because you see, Mr. Speaker, what happens in this particular debate is that when the minister gets up he closes the debate. So I had thought that there would be somebody from the government side of the House get up and say a few words in defence of this absolutely ridiculous amendment that the Minister of Rural Development has brought before us tonight.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is another one of those cases, I suppose, where they had it on the Order Paper - I do not know - five or six weeks ago. I was aware of it. As soon as I saw it I said, Well now, that is going to be quite the dilly when this comes up for debate, no doubt about that. But it is is another one of those cases, I suppose, Mr. Speaker, where the Government House Leader and the government figure that nine or nine thirty in the night, drawing up close to the middle of June, that this type of amendment could drive through, you know, drive through the House and become law without any sort of debate. But I would hope that the -

MR. HICKMAN: You were complaining this afternoon that we were not giving you enough time to read them, Now you have had since April to study this one.

MR. RIDEOUT Mr. Speaker, I do not care about enough time to read it. Mr. Speaker, the Government House Leader is just as foolish now as he was there this afternoon.

MR. HICKMAN: Yes, I know.

MR. RIDEOUT: Enough time to read it.

Mr. Speaker, it does not take very long to read one clause.

MR. HICKMAN: Well, now -

MR. RIDEOUT: Yes, one clause in this bill, and anybody that got either bit of sense in their head at all can see what this particular bill is going to do to the Rural Development Authority. Mr. Speaker, I would say to you here tonight in this House that if this particular peice of legislation passes the House, if we make this law, that this will be a dark day in the history of democracy in this Province. Now the Minister of Transportation, Mr. Speaker, can hum and he can haw and he can do all he likes, but that does not impress one bit. We will listen to him, but, you know, it does not impress us one bit. But it will be a dark day for democracy in this Province, because, Mr. Speaker, this subject is so important that the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) can even laugh at it. He can even laugh at the statements that I am making so that is how important this particular piece of legislation is.

MR. MORGAN : I am laughing at my colleague over here.

MR. RIDEOUT: Oh, the minister is laughing at his colleague. It must be the Minister of Finance that you are laughing at, is it?

MR. HICKMAN: Let me see what Beauchesne says about that.

MR. RIDEOUT: Well, I do not know what - you know, some people may call it Joechesne and other people Beauchesne. I do not know what he might have to say about it, but I am sure that there will be something in there somewhere. Mr. Speaker, as I was about to say - I believe that this - you know, this is a very - you would look at it on the surface, Mr. Speaker, and you would think that this is a very minor

Mr. Rideout.

little housekeeping piece of legislation. That is what the minister told us when he got up to introduce this amendment, very minor, just a housekeeping piece of legislation, nothing important about it, not going to change anything very much, very minor in every aspect. So when you look at the amendment itself you strike out 'the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council' altogether. That means, Mr. Speaker, that the minister who today happens to be the hon. member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) - tomorrow he may be somebody else - but the minister -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The hon. member has made it clear that that is the biggest argument to get rid of that act.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, the biggest argument I can see to get rid of the act is the member for Grand Falls, you know.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Come on, now! Do not start an argument like your buddy there did.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman, I am sure, is trying to throw me off. I am not a bit worried about that, so I will jib and jab with the hon. member. I will tit and tat with him all night and finally before my forty-five minutes are up, Mr. Speaker, I will get back to the point I am trying to make. You know, that does not worry me one bit. I have got a lot more time at my disposal in speaking on the principle of this bill than I need. So if the minister wants to tit and tat with me that is good enough. I do not mind that at all.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. RIDEOUT: I must say I appreciate the minister's advice. There is nothing turns me on more than the minister's advice. I really appreciate it. Because if I could pattern myself as an Opposition member after the minister

Mr. Rideout:

then I will have no worries as an Opposition member at least. But, Mr. Speaker, you know, this particular amendment reminds me of the old cliché of "power corrupts". Now there is nothing more corruptive from the information that I have heard from the member of LaPoile (Mr. Neary) tonight, from my colleague for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) who has done intimate research into the Rural Development Authority. There is nothing more corrupt - and from the information that was tabled in this House, what? three, four or five years ago, my friend from Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. Rowe) knows more about it than I do, there is nothing more corrupt on the surface, it may not be corrupt in principle, Mr. Speaker, I am not suggesting that, but there is nothing more corrupt on the surface than the Rural Development Authority, when you are talking about the rural development of Newfoundland, and of course you include in that, Mr. Speaker, floral shops, mortuaries, morgues, all this kind of stuff that does so much for the rural development of Newfoundland. The minister has refused time after time, plea after plea, on both sides of the House, but the minister has refused to tell us whether this money is going.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you that I find out by accident whether or not there is either bit of rural development money spent in my district. I find out by accident.

MR. HICKMAN: Let me in on it, will you?

MR. RIDEOUT: Well, there may be none spent in the hon. member's riding, but, I mean, you compensate for that by a courthouse, you know, so what is the difference.

AN HON. MEMBER: The minister is getting a courthouse?

MR. RIDEOUT: I am not against the minister's courthouse, I am just against the minister, courthouse or no courthouse.

But what I was saving, is that you find out by accident what is happening with regards to the Rural Development Authority, its loans and grants in the rural parts of this

Mr. Rideout:

Province, especially if you happen to be representing a district on the opposite side of the House. Now I am sure, I feel very confident in saying, Mr. Speaker, that any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House whose constituent may inform him that he has an application pending before RDA, I am very sure that that hon. gentleman will be informed and that he can accordingly inform his constituents. I have no doubts about that. But I find out by accident. If I do not drive down the Fleur-de-Lys Road and drop in on the Burton's, who may be operating a sawmill industry on Pollard's Ridge on the Fleur-de-Lys Road, and they will say to me, "Well, boy, remember that application I called you about a couple of months ago, and you made some representation to RDA, well we finally got that the other day," I would never know anything about it. You talk about a cover-up, Mr. Speaker. It is not enough to even bring it before the House so that it can be discussed in detail what has been approved. That is not bad enough, but you do not even know what has been approved or what has not. You can make all kinds of representation you like to the RDA, to the minister, to anybody. You know, the minister will say, well now I will make sure that this gets before the RDA Board, and the RDA Committee the next time around. The minister will make sure of that. Maybe he does. But we never - I can only speak for myself, but I never hear anything about it after. I do not know if it went before the Board. I do not know what the decision is. I do not know if it is approved. I may run into it by accident, Mr. Speaker, and that is the way that I find out whether or not the Rural Development Authority has dealt fairly and squarely with applications that come before them from my district.

And that is why I said, Mr. Speaker, in the initial remarks that I made that power corrupts. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. Rideout: But now, Mr. Speaker, the minister in this particular amendment, the minister is asking for the right by legislation to have it passed into law into this Province to not only -

MR. HICKMAN: Carried.

MR. RIDEOUT: It will not be carried, Mr. Speaker. Let me say to the hon. gentleman opposite, the hon. Government House Leader, it may be carried, but it will be carried over our objection, and this bill has yet to go before a Committee. There is one clause in this bill, Mr. Speaker, and the forty-five minute speech that I will make tonight can be made again and again and again and again, and if the hon. Government House Leader wants to stay here until Regetta Day or Labour Day, I could not care less, Mr. Speaker. I could not be bothered less because I have nothing else to do only to sit in this hon. House and represent the people who sent me here. I have no ministerial responsibilities. I have all kinds of constituent responsibilities, Mr. Speaker, but I do not mind travelling on weekends. I do not mind travelling this district that was Frankie-mandered. I do not mind travelling, this flying to Deer Lake and driving nine hours down the Northern Peninsula and then across to Englee, like I did last weekend. I do not mind that in the world, Mr. Speaker, I will do that weekend, after weekend. It does not bother me. And I can answer my telephone

MR. RIDEOUT: messages, I can answer my mail. It does not bother me in the least. I am just as happy here in St. John's, sitting in this House as if I were home sitting in my living room in Baie Verte. It does not bother me in the least. And I would suggest that most of the - 99.9 per cent of the members of the Opposition have nothing else to do. We would just as soon be here all Summer, Mr. Speaker, as home, you know, out in the bay fishing. It does not bother us in the least.

AN HCN. MEMBER: Right. Right. Right.

MR. RIDEOUT: So if the Minister of Justice is concerned about us being worried about getting out of here, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice might as well go behind Your Honour's chair and take a flying dive out of the window, because it does not bother me in the least whether I get out of here this week, next week. The only thing that bothers me, Mr. Speaker, is that the lease has run out on the house and the wife has to go home this weekend so I will only see her on weekends. Now that is the only thing that bothers me. But if I understood that the House was going to be open from now until August, well, I may renegotiate another lease with somebody else and stay here a little longer.

MR. HICKMAN: Carried.

MR. RIDEOUT: And it is not carried. And I can assure the hon. minister that before this amendment gets through Committee stage, the hon. gentleman will be grey.

MR. HICKMAN: Yes.

MR. RIDEOUT: Unless he is prepared to take up the little blue book and follow closure.

MR. HICKMAN: Fortunately there is only one clause and there cannot be an amendment which would destroy the bill.

MR. RIDEOUT: I am not worried about amendments, Mr. Speaker. If I understand the rules correctly - and I admit I am green, I have only been here a year and a half - but when we get into Committee of the Whole on this particular bill I can speak for forty-five minutes and sit down and my friend can speak for forty-five minutes and

MR. RIDEOUT: I can get up and speak for another forty-five. And there is only one clause to the bill, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HICKMAN: You need to move an amendment.

MR. RIDEOUT: We do not have to move an amendment.

MR. HICKMAN: Yes you do.

MR. RIDEOUT: We will move deletion of the clause and we will do it time and time again when it is voted down. Let us see the hon. gentleman get up with his *Jeauchesne*, or *Beauchesne* whatever he calls it and try to rule us out of order. Mr. Speaker, this is ridiculous because the minister is asking for absolute authority. You will have an application come in, go before the Rural Development Authority, they can recommend it, not recommend it, but the minister has the final approval.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Look at calm nights down around LaScie.

MR. RIDEOUT: A lovely night out. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the Minister of Rural Development that this is the kind of night that he should be down around LaScie.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The moon shines down on LaScie.

MR. RIDEOUT: I am sure though, Mr. Speaker, that the minister would not want to be in LaScie for political reasons. Because the minister was in LaScie during the last election and he knows what LaScie is like.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I got a great reception there.

MR. RIDEOUT: The minister got a great reception? The minister possibly influenced ten or fifteen people to save the nomination fee of his colleague who ran in that particular election. So the minister knows all about LaScie. There is no doubt about that. But, Mr. Speaker, he could not change them from 350 to 35 or 40 - you know 350 Liberals, 35 or 40 PC's. He could not change it very much, Mr. Speaker. It only was something about 375 to 8 or 10 the other way. You know.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Out of 700 at that meeting, 600 wanted me to start an evangelist movement. They were carried away with me.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I can see why the minister should start an evangelist movement. Because it would not hurt the minister to start an evangelist movement to sell rural development around this Province. That, Mr. Speaker, that I would submit to the minister would be something worthwhile. Because rural development in this Province, in the way it has been operated in the past, the way it has continued to operate under it, and I am disappointed in the minister because I have heard the minister get up here in this House, Mr. Speaker, and defend his estimates - well two years in a row now. I believe the minister's estimates came up last year briefly. They came up this year for a couple of hours, heard the minister get up and defend his estimates with all kinds of - you know the eloquent language that is flowing out of him. I really expected some real advances. But, Mr. Speaker, the minister is only talking in theory. The minister apparently does not have any real plans or any real ideas as to what we are supposed to do in rural development in this Province. You know, it is great to get up and spend two hours talking about it but we have got to see some action sooner or later.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is a disaster.

MR. RIDEOUT: I would not call the minister a disaster. I think the minister is a fairly good fellow.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Many thanks!

MR. RIDEOUT: I think the minister is a fairly good fellow, Mr. Speaker. I would not call him a disaster but as Minister of Rural Development I would say he is a double disaster.

MR. SIMMONS: That is right.

MR. RIDEOUT: And, Mr. Speaker, if it is agreeable to the House I would agree to call it eleven o'clock. If not, I am prepared to go until whenever my forty-five minutes run out.

AN HON. MEMBER: By leave we carry on.

MR. RIDEOUT: Do we want to adjourn at eleven o'clock or go on? I mean, I do not care.

MR. DOODY: I am going home at eleven o'clock. I do not know what the rest of you are doing.

MR. RIDEOUT: What do the Government House Leader have to say? Are we calling it eleven o'clock?

MR. HICKMAN: Adjourn the debate.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I will adjourn the debate. If it goes on now another minute or so I am willing to come right back at it.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman is moving the adjournment of the debate. It being eleven o'clock this House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Friday at 10:00 A.M.

This House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, at 10:00 A.M. This House is adjourned until Friday, tomorrow, 10:00 A.M.