

PRELIMINARY

UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

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

TUESDAY, MAY 17, 1977

The House met at 10.00 A.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I have a petition here signed by 1,821 residents concerning the reconstruction and paving of the Witless Bay Line. A portion of this, as some of you may know, because of the way districts have been jimmied up and so on, extends over in the Conception Bay South, some of it into the district of Ferryland obviously, and before I present this may I thank the hon Minister of Finance, who unfortunately is not present this morning, and I believe his executive assistant, Mr. Rockwell, who were kind enough to bring this to my attention.

The petition is "We the undersigned residents of the district of Ferryland, Harbour Main"- Harbour Main being the hon. Minister of Finance's district, of course-"Conception Bay petition the provincial and federal governments through the Department of Highways for the continued upgrading, reconstruction and paving of the Witless Bay Line from the Southern Shore Highway to the Trans-Canada Highway which at present is, and has been for some time, in a deteriorated state and unfit to travel on safely. This road is the only link between the Trans-Canada Highway and the area and if this road were upgraded it would offer a scenic route for short drives from St. John's along the Conception Bay Highway, Holyrood access road, Witless Bay Line, Southern Shore Highway or from any other point or points on the route in the same manner as the scenic drive from St. John's, Logy Bay, Torbay is now available to tourists and residents alike. At present half this road can be travelled approximately seven months of the year and even in the Summer months is often rendered impassable by heavy rains. By having the road upgraded and open year-round it

MR. NOLAN: would afford the residents of the area now working in Long Harbour and Holyrood convenient access between home and work as well as providing year-round access for approximately 160 families to their homes on the Witless Bay Line. The number of trucks hauling freight, gas and fuel across the Witless Bay Line has not been determined, but undoubtedly would be increased considerably from the present number now hauling if the road were upgraded and made safe for year-round driving. Southern Shore frozen fish plants and fish plants in other localities such as Trinity Bay and Bonavista Bay that conduct business in the area are obliged, because of the perishable nature of the product, to haul fish across the Witless Bay Line at great expense to themselves for wear and tear on equipment.

When the Witless Bay Line is completed

Mr. Nolan: the people of Conception Bay could commute to the fish plants in Bay Bulls, Witless Bay, Tors Cove, and Fermeuse and avail themselves of the opportunity for work in the plants where help is a problem at present. The approximate number of pounds of fresh fish hauled yearly to and from the plants, Mr. Speaker, is 15 million pounds. The fish is hauled as far as White Bay seven days a week from May to November each year, road conditions permitting. In addition to fresh fish, this road is used to haul offal to the fish meal plant in Witless Bay from plants in Dildo, Bay de Verde, Harbour Grace and Bonavista Bay. Blueberries, Mr. Speaker, are also transported across the Witless Bay Line in large quantities in season. There is a potential food herring business available to keep the fresh fish plants in this area operating on a year-round basis, if the Witless Bay Line were in a condition to travel year-round to permit transporting of fresh herring.

"We would suggest that if a survey was made of the Witless Bay Line by the appropriate Provincial Government Departments on the points that I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, then we do not hesitate to state that they will agree the Witless Bay Line could be and should be reconstructed and paved and it should be done immediately. We request consideration of your petition."

Now, Mr. Speaker, may I say that I believe this petition in the form that I have here is perhaps one of the finest ever presented in this House. And those residents who went to the trouble to put it together over 1,000 as I mentioned, 1321 names, should certainly be commended for the effort. As I said they are from Calvert, from Harbour Main - I do not want to go through all of the various districts here - Cappahayden, Renew's and so on, but may I also say that it supported too by documentation from various companies, Bonavista Cold Storage Company, Newfoundland Quick Freeze Limited, Bay Bulls Sea Products, Witless Bay Fish Meal Limited, Southern Sand and Gravel Limited; in addition to

Mr. Nolan:

that there are a number of letters here that have been written to the Minister of Transportation that are enclosed, M. A. Powell Limited in Carbonear, the Earle Freighting Service Limited, and Ocean Harvesters Limited in Harbour Grace, and I could go on and on, Mr. Speaker, but I believe it is one of the best petitions, as I said, Southern Construction Limited is another one here, Golden Eagle Canada Limited, R. Clowe Transport Limited, and I only mention these in addition to the 1,821 names contained in this petition.

Now the Witless Bay Line is a historic artery in many ways that many of you would be familiar with. And I would again commend the people who have gone to the trouble to put this presentation together as a petition, I believe one of the best that has ever been presented in this House of Assembly, And I hope that their plea will not go unrecognized by the Minister of Transportation or for that matter because of the interest expressed by the Minister of Fisheries, who I am sure is very, very familiar with it, in fact, I know he is.

So with that in mind, Mr. Speaker, I would like to lay this petition upon the Table of the House for referral to the department to which it relates.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I could not let this opportunity go by, Sir, without supporting the petition so ably presented by my hon. friend and colleague the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan). As the hon. gentleman pointed out, Sir, this is a far-reaching petition inasmuch as it covers three Provincial districts. And I would not be a bit surprised, Sir, if the road is probably used extensively by trucks and vehicles from various other districts here on the Avalon Peninsula. So I would say it involves actually more than three districts, although the petitioners represent people

Mr. Neary:

who live in the three districts of Harbour Main, Bell Island, Ferryland and Conception Bay South.

I would think, Mr. Speaker, that the government would be very anxious to do something about this road before the by-election is called. The Premier indicated to the House last week that the weather is warming up a little bit -

AN HON. MEMBER: It is colder today.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: It is colder today.

MR. NEARY: It is colder today. The temperature is down a little bit today. But any day at all now, Sir, we are likely to wake up with eighty degree temperatures, and the next thing you know we are into a by-election. And I am sure that before the by-election is called in Ferryland and in St. John's West that this road will be started, and the people down there will get their stadium and all the other things that they have been promised.

So I have no hesitation at

MR. NEARY: all, Sir, in supporting the prayer of the petition.

I do hope that the Minister of Transportation and Communications will be able to find the money. And I think the petitioners do not expect the provincial government to do this by themselves; they are asking that this be a joint venture, provincial and federal governments. I presume they are referring to one of the DREE - making it a DREE project under the DREE agreement and I believe that would be a good idea, Mr. Speaker, and I support the prayer of the petition. I hope that the minister will take the appropriate action.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, just to comment on the petition.

Realizing of course the importance of the petition, it is signed apparently by the petitioners from at least three districts, three provincial districts and the fact that I am sure it is quite important to my colleague, the Minister of Fisheries, taking into consideration that it is at least four or possibly five fish plants who are using that road, for example, the Witless Bay fish plant, the Fermeuse fish plant, Tors Cove, Calvert, Fermeuse all these fish plants are either trucking their products from the plants over the road or they are trucking in some cases the - not the final product, the raw product to other larger plants around the Province.

All I can say, Mr. Speaker, as I have said on many occasions in speaking and commenting on petitions, is that petitions of this nature, in fact all petitions brought to the House of Assembly will be given every consideration by the department, and hopefully in this case, because the prayer of the petition is asking that participation be from the federal level as well, that when representations are made or consultations or discussions with the federal level of government, through my colleague the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs that Ottawa will give the same consideration to this request from these

MR. MORGAN: three provincial districts.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if I could say a word or two in support of what is a most excellent and to me a most reasonable petition. I regret we are not allowed to debate petitions, Maybe we should change the rules, because I would like to be able to say that I think the Minister of Transportation is misleading when he advised that Ottawa are going to get involved in this, but I cannot say that. I know the prayer of the petition asks for it and I would dearly love to see it, but I think the minister would be the very first to admit, if he were being truthful, that that is just not going to happen in the foreseeable future.

Now I would hope, Sir, the work is done this year. I will venture to predict that some of it will be done. I know my friend from LaPoile and my friend from Conception Bay South will understand what I am saying when I say that I would not be at all surprised if a start were made on the Eastern end of the Witless Bay Line this year, if certain commitments were made and the work was to be carried on in view of the rise in the temperature to which the gentleman from LaPoile has referred.

I would hope, Sir, the work will be done. I think the Witless Bay Line is an important artery, it has been partially reconstructed and I think the reconstruction ought to be completed and then it ought to be upgraded and paved. I would think, Sir, that people will be watching carefully when the highways money is allocated this year, whether the minister announces it or not, because people will be watching, to be quite candid, to see whether the minister is being partisan in his allocations or whether he is assigning the money in proportion to the needs. If he is assigning it in proportion to the needs, Sir, there can be no doubt that a start ought to be made on the Witless Bay Line this year, an important artery that serves a great number of people, that would provide an alternate road connection between the Southern Shore and the Trans-Canada and thus Conception Bay South and Harbour

MR. ROBERTS:

Main, an artery that serves a number of fish plants, an artery that in every way is an important road and I would venture to say that if the Minister of Transportation is being at all impartial - I do not expect him to be completely impartial, nobody could be - but if he is being at all impartial, if he is being non-partisan, if he is doing something other than merely spending what highway dollars there are in districts which have sent Tory members to the House, if that is the case, if he is to be relatively impartial there will be money allocated this year for the Southern Shore road - there is - I am sorry for the Southern Shore road and for the Witless Bay Line.

There is beginning to get around this Province the feeling that the Minister of Transportation will spend money only in Tory districts. The minister may think that is smart politics, I do not,

Mr. Boberts.

but more than that, I think it is not second class, I think it is fourth class politics. I have had phone calls from the Northern Peninsula. I have had phone calls from other districts. And the minister will be judged by what he does. And we will see what he does this year. It is too early to tell.

MR. MORGAN: Where is that?

MR. ROBERTS: The Northern Peninsula.

The money that is being spent on the Northern Peninsula this year is DREE money, ninety per cent from Ottawa. Ten per cent provincial, ninety per cent federal. Ninety per cent federal, ten per cent provincial. And what we are wondering now is whether some of the by-roads are going to be paved? They have been paved in the St. Barbe district. And the question now is whether they are going to be paved in the Northern part and whether they are going to be paved in Fogo district as well as in Bonavista North district?

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: We will see, Sir. All I say -

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: - Mr. Speaker, am I allowed to say my few remarks without harassment?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I must call to hon. gentleman's attention on both sides that during the procedure for petitions hon. members should speak on the material allegation, and others should not interrupt, and there should not be a process of debate.

The hon. member.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I am of the opinion, the understanding from the rules of the House is that hon. members can comment on a petition, either in support of or just commenting on a petition. But I am now of the impression that the hon. Leader of the Opposition is debating the petition by putting forward arguments regarding certain sections of the Province which are not connected with the petition.

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

I would not attempt to comment on the hon. gentleman's understanding of the rules, because that passeth all understanding. I do not think I was into the area of debate. I was perhaps being led astray by hon. gentlemen opposite who were putting invitations in my way, tending to lead me into debate. But as I heard, Your Honour's ruling did not call me to order for debating the petition. I know that I cannot debate a petition. I began by saying I wish I could, because I could expose what I believe to be the inadequacies of the Minister of Transportation. But I am not allowed to do that. If I may, Your Honour, I would like to finish my brief remarks, because time is going to run out otherwise unless Your Honour wishes to make a further ruling.

MR. SPEAKER: The only thing I would say is actually the hon. gentleman interjected immediately after I had in fact drawn these matters to the House's attention. So nothing transpired between my saying that and the hon. gentleman's submission.

MR. ROBERTS: Well thank you, Sir. As I said, the hon. gentleman's understanding of the rules literally passeth all understanding. I support the petition, Sir. I think it is a very reasonable one, I think it ought to be granted, and I would say, as I have said, that it will be a test of the Minister of Transportation's impartiality and his dedication to proper priorities to see whether work is done on the Witless Bay Line this year.

NOTICES OF MOTION:

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, " An Act To Amend The District Courts Act, 1976." And on behalf of my colleague, the hon. Minister of Health, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Western Memorial Hospital Corporation Act, 1947," and a bill, "An Act To Amend The Hospitals Act, 1971."

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, under that heading, I wonder if the Minister of Mines and Energy is yet in a position to answer the question I asked the other day, which he took as notice, with respect to the wages and salaries and other emoluments paid to the directors and officers of the Hydro Corporation? 'Brian'?

MR. NEARY: Under this heading also, does the same minister have the information concerning the free bus service provided by Newfoundland Hydro from the Avalon Mall to the Donovans Industrial Park?

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, under this heading as well -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I think there would develop quite a change in procedure if under routine Heading V we were to assume one could do the same thing as routine Heading VI. So when one hon. gentleman asked the question, I did not interject. Now that that pattern is developing, I certainly think I should. And since there has been no answer to those, then obviously hon. gentlemen may ask them under Oral Questions. But it will appear to allow that to continue would in a sense have two Oral Question periods; one of unspecified duration and the other thirty minutes. I do not think that would be the intention of the rules.

The hon. minister.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, under

Mr. Maynard:

Item V I would like to table the answer to Question No. 229 asked by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary).

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. ROBERTS: A question for the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture with respect to the advertisements - by the way, I think quite a good programme of advertisements on the spruce budworm and the measures to deal with that particular infestation. Could the minister tell us please who is preparing the advertisements? And growing out of that, are there any agency fees or commissions being paid in respect of these advertisements either for the preparation or for the placing, and if so, to whom?

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

MR. MAYNARD: I would assume the Leader is talking about the newspaper ads?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, but people in the radio (Inaudible).

MR. MAYNARD: Well it is in two parts. The newspaper advertisements and the radio spots are prepared by Newfoundland Information Services, and the television is being prepared by McConnell Advertising of Toronto.

MR. ROBERTS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: Can the minister tell us how much - obviously NIS are not being paid any more than what they get in their normal services - can they tell us how much McConnell will get? And were tenders called? There were proposals invited for this, or is this another patronage appointment?

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

MR. MAYNARD: Proposals were invited for it and McConnell was selected. The exact amount of the television advertising I do not recall, I know that the total programme is around the \$50,000 mark, that is for radio, television, newspaper ads and everything included.

MR. ROBERTS: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the minister may not have this information, but if he does not, will he get it for us. From whom were proposals invited? Will the minister produce a copy of the letter or the request for proposals, and will he indicate who made the selection of McConnell Advertising?

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

MR. MAYNARD: The selection of McConnell Advertising was made by myself, Mr. Speaker. As far as the other documentation, no, I will not produce it. I will produce the figures as to what is being spent on each particular component of the campaign.

MR. ROBERTS: Patronage! Sheer Tory patronage! There were no proposals, none at all.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile followed by the hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice, Sir. Would the minister indicate to the House if in the past twelve months in this Province if any telephones have been authorized to be bugged or tapped by either the minister or his counterpart, the Federal Minister in Ottawa?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: There is a provision for that information under the Criminal Code of Canada, and I follow assiduously that section of the code.

MR. ROBERTS: Can the minister authorize?

MR. HICKMAN: No. The judges authorize.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question?

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, has the minister had any requests from either the RCMP, the Newfoundland Constabulary or from any other law enforcement agency or from anybody in the Province to investigate wiretappings, telephones being tapped and so on? Has there been any complaints to the minister?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, there have been no complaints to me. The requests have not come to me nor would they come to me under the Criminal Code of Canada. There is a provision under the Code where a person or persons are designated as being the persons who can make the application to the courts, and I am not that person. The person, as I recall, is the Director of Public Prosecutions in this Province. There may or may not be but one or two Royal Canadian Mounted Police officers designated by either the Minister of Justice or the Solicitor General, but I am not certain of that. But certainly there have been no complaints, none at all.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question to the Minister of Transportation and Communications, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Will the Minister of Transportation and Communications in his capacity as minister responsible for communications indicate to the House why it was necessary for the minister to request his Director of Communications to ask to have an investigation carried out to see if the minister's telephone was bugged?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the Director of Communications has not asked the telephone company to investigate any potential bugging, but there have been considerable complaints with regards to ministers' telephone lines whereby when the lines are used or in use, by their secretaries or themselves, particularly my own - and a number of my colleagues have noticed this - that when using the phone, they can pick up the recordings of the House of Assembly. And when making a speech in the House, it can be heard when you are calling any of the numbers within the building. So there is an interference on these telephone lines. What is causing the interference we do not know in the Department of Communications. So, therefore, the director has passed this along to the officials to take some corrective action to overcome this problem. There has never been any indication referred to the telephone company that we think there is bugging. But we know there is a problem there, and we want to correct it.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde followed by the hon. gentleman from Conception Bay South.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education, Sir. In view of the fact that during Committee stage, consideration of the Education estimates, three members of the House of Assembly took very strong objections to what the President of the University is quoted to have said, "He would show the budget of the University to the press before he would show it to the politicians." The minister mumbled, when we were speaking to that, that the president had not said that, in fact he told them that he had not said that, would the minister set the record straight on that, because last night during the consideration of the budget the minister did not formally acknowledge the fact that the President of the University denied having said that?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I had said - you said I mumbled it - I said that the president said that he had been misquoted. And he did not intimate that he would give it to the press and not give it to the House of Assembly. That was his statement to me.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. ROWE: What in fact did the President of the University say, Mr. Speaker; concerning the budget?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROWE: The last question was a supplementary. Is there an answer?

MR. HOUSE: I stated that the president said that he had been misquoted. I do not know exactly what he said, but he said that he had been misquoted in saying what he is reputed to have said.

MR. ROWE: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. ROWE: Sir, what representations has the minister made to the President of the University in order to get the detailed budget of the University tabled before this House of Assembly similarly to the new Polytechnical Institute and the College of Trades and Technology? Is there any intention of the minister of bringing in an amendment to the University Act?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. HOUSE: There is a Cabinet Committee that deals with the University budget and the University Board of Regents.

MR. NEARY: Is the minister on the Committee?

MR. HOUSE: Yes.

And representation has been made and requests by letter, but there has just been a very brief breakdown of the budget, about three or four items, and that is all we have received.

MR. ROWE: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary. The hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. ROWE: Does the minister intend to make any further representations to the President of the University or the University Senate or Board of Regents to get a further breakdown of the University's budget before the Committee, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, that decision will have to come from the Cabinet Committee to government.

MR. ROBERTS: The minister - we do not question the Committee, we question the minister!

MR. ROWE: Why does not the minister take the bull by the horns?

MR. HOUSE: The Cabinet Committee, Mr. Speaker, deals with the University and, of course, the financing is put in the Education budget.

MR. ROBERTS: Who is on the Committee then so we can ask them?

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

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary on this line and then the hon. gentleman for Conception Bay South.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister indicate in connection with the University budget, would the minister indicate why the Board of Regents at the University recently authorized a \$15 surcharge for students who are registering or re-registering at the University, and what this surcharge is to be used for?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, that was an internal arrangement, and I have no knowledge of it.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Justice. I am wondering what the minister, or how the minister could respond to the suggestion, I believe, in the news story in yesterday's Daily News by Magistrate Luther concerning the fact that the Department of Justice should have lawyers, I believe, to prosecute in certain cases that were mentioned, I believe, in some detail in yesterday's Daily News report? I would like to have the minister's response to the magistrate's recommendation and suggestion since he seems to be quite upset by the current situation.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I read that in this morning's paper as well and made an inquiry. We do have -

MR. NOLAN: That was yesterday's.

MR. HICKMAN: Yesterday's paper and made an inquiry this morning of the Director of Public Prosecutions. We now have eight Crown Prosecutors plus the director plus the Chief Crown Prosecutor, that is ten and we plan on moving four Crown Prosecutors downtown by the end of this - I think by the end of May, will have offices down there. Whether they will be able to prosecute all breathalyzer cases I do not know, I also am not certain whether it is necessary to have someone prosecuting all breathalyzer cases and in that respect I will take the advice of the Chief Magistrate and the Director of Public Prosecutions.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NOLAN: As a supplementary, yes, Mr. Speaker. Well does the lawyers' welfare package help in this way through Legal Aid? Can that assist at all?

MR. HICKMAN: Legal Aid is a great concept of the Progressive Conservative government of Newfoundland -

MR. NOLAN: Nonsense, nonsense, shame -

MR. HICKMAN: -that is designed, that is designed. Well if it is shame I do not apologize for it.

MR. NOLAN: You were not saying that when you were a Liberal!
How hypocritical can a man be! Are you not afraid you will be struck dead?

MR. HICKMAN: I am proud of it, Mr. Speaker, proud that we have a Legal Aid Programme that is designed, and that I had a hand in so designing, that looks after the oppressed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. ROBERTS: It is nice to know the minister had a hand in something beside his own pocket, and I am not allowed to debate the programme so I will not, but I would point out that the Legal Aid Programme is funded almost entirely by the Government of Canada. Now my supplementary -

MR. HICKMAN: I am proud to keep my hand in my own pocket.

Some lawyers may not.

MR. ROBERTS: Well the hon. gentleman practices and if he wants to speak about practice I cannot. But, Mr. Speaker, the supplementary is this; the minister said he was not sure, It was not his opinion that it was necessarily proper to have lawyers prosecuting to represent the Crown, that it was not necessary to have the Crown represented by legal counsel in prosecutions under the criminal code arising out of the breathalyzer sections. He might say prosecutors if necessary but not necessarily prosecutions, to paraphrase a much paraphrased statement.

My question, Sir, is this. Given the fact that almost every defendant, and I would venture to say 99.59 per cent of all people charged with these offences are now being represented by legal counsel, most of whom I gather exercise considerable ingenuity in the devices which they raise quite properly and quite within the rules by way of defence. Given this fact does not the minister perhaps think that the Crown should be represented by legal counsel

MR. ROBERTS:

because what happens is the Crown is represented by non-legally trained police officers, who may or may not be competent in prosecutions, some are assigned to prosecutions some are not, some are just sent in for the day to prosecute these particular sessions, in this light does not the minister think that perhaps he ought to reconsider and the Crown ought to be represented by lawyers as Magistrate Luther has suggested?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: That is a long question so I hope I will be permitted to give the appropriate answer and will not be accused of undue length.

MR. NOLAN: No legal opinions now, and will a day and a half do?

MR. FLIGHT: Just a yes or no, boy!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, we have in this Province now the largest number of Crown Prosecutors that we have ever had in the history of Newfoundland. I repeat -

MR. ROBERTS: And we also got the largest number of lawyers in Newfoundland.

MR. HICKMAN: We have the Director of Public Prosecutions, the Chief Crown Prosecutor and eight other prosecutors. The last three were recently appointed, We were not flooded with applications from within or without Newfoundland for the positions of Crown Prosecutors when we advertised just a few short weeks ago.

MR. NOLAN: Did the minister apply?

Mr. Hickman:

The law provides that the police may prosecute, and realistically there will be police prosecutions in this Province for a long, long time to come.

On the question of breathalyzers, I was not aware that the majority of accused persons on breathalyzer test cases -

MR. ROBERTS: I am told that all of them are now.

MR. HICKMAN: - were defended by solicitors. In fact I would be very surprised if that was the case on breathalyzers because, I think, in most instances obviously there is a plea of guilty on the breathalyzer cases. Insofar as the Crown being represented by Counsel in the prosecution of breathalyzer cases obviously the Director of Public Prosecutions has to.

MR. ROBERTS: Take it as read.

MR. HICKMAN: - make a judgemental decision, and decide on the type of cases that he feels that the Crown should be represented in by

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: An unsuccessful Water Carter.

MR. HICKMAN: Crown Prosecutors. And obviously he has not come to that conclusion with respect to the -

MR. ROBERTS: See what you started, 'Walter' with your answer.

MR. HICKMAN: - I did not ask the lengthy question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOLAN: Is this limited to seventy-five hours, Mr. Speaker?

MR. HICKMAN: - but it evoked a lengthy answer.

MR. ROBERTS: I just asked the minister - is he aware -

MR. HICKMAN: I apologize to the House for the lack of concern on the part of the hon. Leader of the Opposition for time when he asked such a lengthy and provocative question. And, you know, I am humbly trying to succinctly answer it as quickly as I can, but I am being harassed by the hon. gentlemen opposite and I think that it is totally unfair -

MR. NOLAN: God help your clients.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: It is easy to praise -

MR. HICKMAN: (Inaudible) I look to Your Honour for protection from these wild -

MR. NOLAN: God help your clients. They will be in the Hoyles Home before they ever get to court.

MR. HICKMAN: - vicious attack that are coming opposite, and I can see the look of concern on the face of the - the justifiable concern on the face of the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), the Leader opposite.

MR. NOLAN: Raise your hands and roll your eyes heavenward 'Alex'.

MR. HICKMAN: I do not want to do anything, Mr. Speaker, that would in any way offend my hon. friend, the Leader for LaPoile.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is taken as read, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HICKMAN: But, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to comment on the particular case that was in the paper yesterday, because I am advised by the Director of Public Prosecutions that an appeal is being launched forthwith, so that matter is still before the courts. If there is any further clarification necessary I will do my utmost to try and advise the House of the facts.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Before recognizing the hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay I would like to welcome to the House of Assembly thirty-seven students, Grade VIII, from St. Theresa's School in St. John's. they are accompanied by their teachers Mr. Dodd and Miss Walsh. I know all hon. members join me in welcoming these students to the House of Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, we will try another minister now and see what happens. I have a question for the Minister of Tourism.

MR. ROBERTS: You are getting to the top.

MR. RIDEOUT: I wonder if the minister could tell the House, Mr. Speaker, whether or not negotiations are presently underway between game wardens employed by his department and the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: I will have to take that under advisement, Mr. Speaker, I cannot inform the hon. gentleman, especially when it was not brought to my attention.

MR. RIDEOUT: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, is the minister saying he does not know whether the people are working for him or negotiating or what? Is that what the minister is saying?

MR. MORGAN: He took the question under advisement, Leave the man alone.

MR. HICKEY: Repeat the question again.

MR. RIDEOUT: I asked the minister if he could tell the House whether or not negotiations -

MR. HICKEY: No, no, I got that. The last one.

MR. RIDEOUT: Well the last part of the question out of the fact that you took the first one under advisement - does the minister know whether or not his employees, the game wardens, are in contract negotiations?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I do not hover over my staff with a helicopter.

MR. RIDEOUT: That is a very simple question.

MR. HICKEY: This is a very simple question, I gave the hon. gentleman a very simple answer, I will take it under advisement. Would he prefer I give him - what would he prefer I utter an untruth, and say, yes or no, when I am not sure. The hon. gentleman is very sensitive this morning.

MR. RIDEOUT: So is the hon. minister.

MR. HICKEY: Give me twenty-four hours and I will let him know.

MR. RIDEOUT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Eagle River. I cannot see that there could be a supplementary after this, actually.

MR. RIDEOUT: They were told to resign if they did not like the job.

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

MR. STRACHAN: A question for the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy. Could the minister tell us :

MR. STRACHAN: when he would expect a final decision in the courts, a final decision on the recall of power? When he would expect, I am not -

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

MR. PECKFORD: I cannot give a definitive answer to that question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. STRACHAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. STRACHAN: Is the restart on the transmission line now dependent upon a final decision by the courts?

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

MR. PECKFORD: The same answer as to the first question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. STRACHAN: I will try it again. How long does he think it would take, or he should know, it will take to get the completed transmission line into place to take delivery of the power, the recall power, from Churchill Falls?

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

MR. PECKFORD: I am not sure of the exact time, Mr. Speaker. I know it will take a year or two.

MR. STRACHAN: A final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary.

MR. STRACHAN: I will try it another way. If the line is in place, the transmission line is in place, and the court decision is favourable, will we have to wait until October of 1983 before the power is fed into the transmission line?

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

MR. PECKFORD: That depends on a whole lot of factors relating to supply and demand, Mr. Speaker, that I cannot conjecture about right now.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans, followed by the gentleman for LaPoile.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Mines and Energy. Has the minister received the report yet as a result of the meetings held in Grand Falls and attended by some A.D.M's and the resource people that he arranged to send out there?

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

MR. PECKFORD: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. FLIGHT: In view of the fact that the Premier made an undertaking last week to table that report, was the minister prepared to table the report?

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

MR. PECKFORD: I have taken that under advisement, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: The Premier said it would be made public.

MR. PECKFORD: I was not aware of that.

MR. ROBERTS: Well I cannot help what the hon. gentleman is aware of; it was said in the House.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the hon. the Premier, Sir.

MR. ROBERTS: The minister should have been prepared.

MR. NEARY: If we could get a little order restored in the House, Sir, and I could get the attention of the hon. the Premier, I would like to ask the hon. the

MR. NEARY: Premier what transpired at meetings held recently between the hon. the Premier and the officials of Trizec, in connection with the controversial hotel - office building downtown?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Yes, they came in our of courtesy, I suppose, Mr. Speaker, and advised us of what progress they had made to date, what they hoped to do, and basically that is all that transpired at that particular meeting.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Would the courtesy visit involve a request on the part of Trizec to rent office space to the provincial government?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Surprisingly enough, Mr. Speaker, no, it did not. I am sure that will come as a surprise to the hon. gentleman, and the lack of a request came as a very great surprise to me, I might say. But the fact is they came in, as I say, out of courtesy. What they had in mind was - nothing was confidential about the meeting at all. I am sure any progress they make, together with City Council, or themselves and their clients, whoever they may be, I am sure they will be making them public at the appropriate time. But as I say, there is nothing. I am not hiding anything here at all. The fact is, they just came in to give me a briefing on what progress they have made.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: In connection with the rental of office space, would the Premier indicate to the House if the report is yet in, and what action the government are going to take in connection with the office space problem?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: I understand, Mr. Speaker, the report actually arrived either yesterday or will be arriving today. It will take about a week to ten days to analyze it, and hopefully after that there will be some decisions made as to which direction we go.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary. The hon. gentleman for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Well, I will make this a double-barrell, Sir. Would the hon. the Premier indicate to the House that before any commitments are made, either to rent space in Atlantic Place or Trizec or any other company, that a special committee of the House will be established comprising of members of both sides of the House to look into this whole matter of rental of office space for the government?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: No. Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOLAN: The Premier has. He already said so, last year in this House.

PREMIER MOORES: A different thing entirely.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Mines and Energy. Is he prepared to stand up and report to the House as to the contents of that report that he received from his officials with regard to the meeting between ASARCO, Price (Nfld.) and representatives of government? Would the minister care — to give the House a report on that meeting and what the results of the meeting were?

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

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I just read the report earlier this morning, and after I have had a chance to study it I will indicate to the hon. member whether I am willing to undertake what he has asked me to undertake.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. FLIGHT: Well, is the minister prepared to give the House the same undertaking or go along with the commitment that the Premier made, that he will table that report as soon as he is ready to table it. And if so, when shall we expect the report to be tabled?

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

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, that is entirely up to the Premier, and I will be talking to him about it.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Transportation and Communications what is going to be done about the so-called Freedom Road from Goose Bay to Churchill Falls this year? Is it going to be upgraded? Will anything be done with it? Could the minister give us a comment on this controversy that is raging right now in Labrador in connection with this road?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if there is any major controversy on this matter. I have received a telegram from a committee calling themselves the Transport Committee for Labrador. I do not know who they are or who they represent, but they call themselves the Transport Committee. Mr. Herb Brett, Chairman of the Committee, wired asking the department what we intended to do this year. I said in the House of Assembly earlier - and I again repeat it now - that hopefully around the end of this month, or as soon as the House of Assembly will allow me to get away, my colleague, the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) and myself, we intend to travel over that road all the way from Goose Bay to Esker and then I will be in a position to know firsthand the condition and what is required. Of course, I will be accompanied by engineers from the department to assess the situation as to how much it would cost to keep the road open this Summer and how much work is required with regards to maintenance work, etc. So only after I have assessed the situation by travelling over the road myself from Goose to Esker, accompanied by my friend, the member for Naskaupi, will I be in a position to indicate to the committee from Labrador exactly what we intend to do this year.

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

MR. SPEAKER: One supplementary, the hon. gentleman for LaPoile, then the hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister indicate if the road will be - if the minister will get a chance to look at the road and decide whether it will be upgraded before the William Carson makes her first trip to Goose Bay this season?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the inference is, whether or not I have to travel to Goose Bay by the William Carson.

MR. NEARY: Tourists going down.

MR. MORGAN: Last year, Mr. Speaker, that road was not officially opened -

MR. NEARY: But there were quite a few tourists went down.

MR. MORGAN: - or placed in a category as being opened officially by the Newfoundland Government because of the fact that it is a long lonely road. There are no service stations. There are no conveniences at all on that road. It is a dangerous road as it is narrow, no guardrails, etc. But a number of people -

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible).

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, if I could -

MR. NEARY: But there were quite a few tourists -

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman for LaPoile wants information, but the hon. Leader of the Opposition keeps interrupting.

MR. NEARY: There were quite a few tourists went over it last year.

MR. MORGAN: You know, let the real leader get you the information, the real leader on the other side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman for LaPoile did indicate, and rightly so, last year a lot of tourists travelled from Goose over to Churchill Falls. And on the other hand a lot of people working in Wabush Mines and the Iron Ore Company and even in Churchill Falls as well travelled over that road and came down to the Island part of our Province for a vacation. Despite the fact that the road was not officially declared open by the government, they decided to come that route. So recently at a meeting with Wabush Mines they indicated - a number of their employees - indicated this year that they would be doing the same thing. So I am hoping that we can arrange to keep that road in at least a half decent driving condition.

Mr. Morgan.

But again I repeat it is a very hazardous dangerous road because of the nature of the construction of the road itself. It was a development road, not a road really for transport.

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

MR. STRACHAN: Can the minister tell us whether any work is going to be done on the road before he travels over the road?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the earlier question that no decision we made with regards to what work will be carried out until we determine the exact condition of the road right now at the end of the Winter season in the area. For example, I understand a number of culverts, major culverts, the large culverts, have been washed out etc. and there are some very bad sections and depending on how much it will cost to put that road in a drivable, passable condition.

MR. STRACHAN: A final supplementary, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplement. The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. STRACHAN: Could the minister tell us whether he is going to fly over some of the rivers or culverts and so on that are washed out and the bridges which are gone and so on, because he certainly will not be able to travel over the road in order to see what it is like?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I am assuming that in Labrador at least there are vehicles on both ends of the road. So in each case I am sure we can find a means of transport to get over these sections where the rivers are flowing.

MR. STRACHAN: But there are none in the middle section.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the Opposition for a supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: Has the minister any reports from any of his officials with respect to the condition of this road? If not, is he going to get any, or is the decision as to whether or not some money is going to be spent on that road entirely one which will rest upon the minister's personal inspection, are the results of the minister's personal inspection?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. MORGAN: No, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman apparently was not listening when I was replying to the question. I said, I was going to be accompanied by engineers from the department.
The

MR. MORGAN: decisions along the line of what work is required and estimates of cost are very seldom determined by myself, and I am not an engineer, but I am always accompanied on my travels by at least one engineer, and sometimes two, because my Deputy Minister is an engineer himself, a very high calibre engineer, in fact, who is familiar with all the roads around the Province. So, usually, he accompanies me; or if not, my Assistant Deputy who is also an engineer, Mr. White.

MR. ROBERTS: A further supplementary, sir?

MR. SPEAKER: A further and final supplementary .

MR. ROBERTS: I just asked quite generally whether there are any decisions taken within the Department of Transportation & Communications, of any sort, in which the Minister is not personally involved.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. MORGAN: Any decisions of any nature made by the Department of Transportation & Communications, I am always aware of.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY:

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

601-02 - the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Are we off the minister's salary, Sir?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, 601-02.

On motion 601-02, carried.

On motion 602-01 through to 602-02-08, carried.

Shall 603-01 carry?

The hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, if I remember correctly, when you get to a head, you can sort of discuss in a general way the various subheads under that head for the department, if I rightly remember. In other words 603 is called.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. ROWE: Right.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! It is quite difficult to hear the hon. member.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! It is quite difficult to hear the hon. member.

MR. ROWE: I must say I have difficulty in hearing myself, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the only thing that I would like to point out here is that with respect to the cutbacks in scholarships and bursaries, I would submit, is going to downgrade the incentive of many of our students in the schools - that is a pre post-secondary level, if I can use that expression - in this Province and various educators have spoken out against the cutbacks in the Electoral Scholarships and in the Responsible Government's Centenary Scholarships. But, Sir, the minister last night in Committee stage did say, with reference to scholarships to the University, that it does not really matter. It does not really matter because of the Student Aid Programme. Now we have pointed out on this side of the House, Sir, over the past five years the effects that the cutbacks in the Student Aid Programme were having on enrollment at the university. It was in fact causing a reduced enrollment at the University. And now we have a further cutback, as small as it may be, from \$6,000 to \$3,000 in University scholarships, I would assume. But the fact of the matter is that we still have this tuition and allowance problem, or student aid problem where students coming out of the University are left owing huge sums of money, because for everything that they get in the form of what I might mention as a grant they are expected to borrow a fairly large sum of money. And consequently not only have we had a reduction in the student enrollment at the university for reasons other than that, reasons that I mentioned last night - but this University is slowly but surely, if not - it has become a University for the elite in this Province, because there are simply a great number of students who cannot afford to incur this huge debt over four or five or six years. And I have maintained

MR. ROWE: in speeches in committee stage and before the House over the years, that this Administration should take some steps towards standardizing assistance to students and all post-secondary educational institutions, so that a student goes to the Fisheries College, or goes to the vocational schools, or goes to the College of Trades and Technology, or will go to the Polytechnical Institute, if and when it is built, and will go to the University, because he wishes to go to that particular institution out of his pedagogical or educational choice, and not because the choice is made on the basis of how much money that student would receive in the way of aid.

I was wondering if the minister would be kind enough to reply as to whether or not his predecessor handed along any briefs, or his officials have informed him of any particular steps, or direction, or policy, embryonic policy, that has been brought to his attention with respect to trying to work out something with the federal government, as the federal government, as the minister well knows, is largely responsible for the Student Aid that goes to the students of the College of Trades and Technology and Fisheries College, and what have you, and vocational schools, in certain courses. But I think it is high time, Sir, that the federal government, under, I guess, the Manpower Department, and the Minister of Education, probably in co-operation with the Department of Industrial Relations, or whatever our particular provincial department is called, that they sit down and work out some sort of a formula whereby students go to a post-secondary education, or institution of their choice, and not go there because of the amount of dollars that are available to them. Because what we have, basically, Sir, is students being paid to go to some post-secondary institutions, and I do not mean to downgrade the vocational schools and the College of Trades and Technology and the College of Fisheries, because, when we come to that, I am going to be mentioning the fact that there should be greater emphasis in the vocational and technical areas of education in this Province, not only at the post-secondary level, but at the primary, elementary and secondary level. But the fact of the matter is there has been no attempt, to my knowledge, by this Administration, or the Ministers of Education over the years, to attempt to work out some sort of a formula in co-operation with the federal government, whereby students would have equal financial aid

MR. ROWE: opportunity to go to any post-secondary educational institution in this Province.

I think I have made the point as clearly, at least, as I can make it, and I hope the minister responds to it, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, before the minister responds to my hon. friend, Sir, I would like to have a few words about the Student Aid Appeals Board.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: It has been brought to my attention, Mr. Chairman, on a number of occasions over the past several years, by students who have had the experience of having to appeal the decision of the Department in connection with Student Aid by slicing it in half, by cutting it down drastically - the students find the procedure of processing a grievance very frustrating. They claim that the dice are loaded against them. They claim that the cards are stacked, because the Student Appeals Board is top-heavy with bureaucracy, is top-heavy with representatives of the minister's department, and those that are called upon, although I agree, there are two members of the Student Council on the Board, but, nevertheless, Sir, there are one, two, three, four, five - there are two representatives of the Department of Education, one representative of the

MR. NEARY: Treasury Board, two representatives of Memorial University and two student-councils. So they are outweighed, they are outnumbered five to two. The students have been very discouraged in a lot of cases from processing their grievances because they feel that it is just a waste of time. They feel they are not going to get a fair shake. I do not know whether this is correct or not, but I have had students come into my office and sit down and tell me that it is just a useless waste of time, that you are still fighting the bureaucracy, that the person who prepares the submission for the student appeal board is none other than the gentleman that made a decision in the first place.

Members might be interested in knowing that the number of meetings that were held in the calendar year 1974 by the student appeals board was eight; 1975, six meetings were held and in 1976 only five meetings, Mr. Chairman of the student appeals board were held. Only five meetings, which indicates, Sir, which bears out what I am saying. The number of meetings per year is dwindling, is going down. The total number of appeals processed in the calendar year 1976 - or 1974 rather, 1975 and 1976, were 87, a very low number. Out of the many thousands of applications for student aid that were processed in these three years, 1974, 1975, 1976, only 87 cases were brought before the student appeals board. The total number of appeals processed by the board in 1974 were 39, 12 successful and 27 rejected. In 1975 there were 23 processed, 9 successful and 14 rejected. In 1976 the batting average was about fifty-fifty, 13 successful and 12 rejected.

But the students tell me, Sir, that they would not bother to waste their time now bringing matters before the student appeals board even though it is based on the record of 1976. There was a fifty-fifty decision, fifty per cent in favour and fifty per cent against. So I would like to hear the minister's comments on the student aid appeals board, Sir. Is it working? Does it need to be revamped? Does it need to be beefed up? Have the students

MR. NEARY: themselves lost confidence in the board? I would like for the minister to give us a progress report on this. It is very important to the students, Mr. Chairman, it is very important. And will the minister indicate to the House whether or not the representation on the board will be changed so that at least it would appear to the students that they are getting a fair deal, they will get a fair shake if they put their grievance before the board? Is it possible to get this board - get independent people on this board, people from outside the bureaucracy of the university and outside of the bureaucracy in the minister's own department? It is something worth thinking about Sir, and I would like to hear the minister's views on that.

One other matter that I am tremendously interested in, Sir, is the programme that is partly subsidized by the Secretary of State's department. That is the programme that Memorial University operates on the French Island of St. Pierre and Miquelon.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is another head.

MR. NEARY: It is under another head? Well, I thought it would come under student aid because I want to find out in this point in time what aid the students receive and does it come out of this \$10,000 grant from the Secretary of State's Department, and who teaches the course, the courses and so forth and who pays the expenses of the instructors on St. Pierre? I know how many students are enrolled there; there are 30 students enrolled during each semester. But I would like for the minister to give us a run down on this course, because I do not believe the members of the House are really too familiar with this course. Probably a lot of the members do not even know that the university operates a course in French on the Island of St. Pierre & Miquelon. I understand that there is a \$10,000 grant to take care of light and heat. Well, what kind of accommodations, what kind of facilities are we talking about? I saw a tender called recently in the - if it comes under another subhead I just as soon -

MR. HOUSE: Yes, it does.

MR. NEARY:

Well at this point the minister can just indicate the amount of student aid, does that come out of the \$10,000 special grant from the Secretary of State Department, and give us a few more details about this programme on the Islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. minister.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Chairman, with regard to the first question regarding the common grants to students or financing to students attending any post secondary education, the hon. member is aware that the Federal Government through Manpower does buy seats and pay salaries, I suppose you can call it salaries, to people wanting to go into certain trades. This is available only after a person has been out of school for a while or in the work force for a while. Students leaving school for pre-employment programmes, leaving school directly, we are paying \$25 for those staying away from home per month - per week, and \$45 if a person has dependents. With regard to the university, you know, four and five year programmes, we have met with the Secretary of State, met on these kind of programmes, made recommendations - of course, and this has been done by the council of ministers across Canada. And we suggested that no person in Canada who wants to attend a post secondary institution, they should not be barred from it for financial reasons. And we made what I thought was a good request that the Federal Government share with the provinces the grant structures. As it stands now we have one of the best student aid programmes in Canada. And I have been meeting with the student aid people and of course they are quite in agreement that we have one of the best programmes. And you talk about the amount a student will owe when they leave university, the fact is that students have to borrow, through the student aid programme, \$450 per semester which to all intents and purposes on a five year programme that may amount to \$4,500 that they would owe when they came out of university, if they borrow the \$450 per semester. Then, of course, depending on

MR. HOUSE:

their circumstances they could get up to, I believe it is something like \$1,800 per year in direct grants from government, that is if they have total need. The students are quite pleased with that particular arrangement. The only problem with student aid is the fact that when a student makes so much money in the Summer they got to save forty-five per cent of that and that is a federal regulation. And they find that they cannot save forty-five per cent of the money they make on minimum wage, say. It is just impossible to save. Now we have been working on that and we are hoping to get some change made in that particular policy.

The Secretary of State's answer to us when we said that students should not have to pay large sums of money when they come out of university, his answer was this, he said, "I think it is unfair for the people of Canada who are making low wages to be paying taxes to educate people who when these people come out, of course, will be making three times as much as the people who have been putting them through." So his attitude, and the Federal Government's attitude is that let us give them the education, let us give them the wherewithal. But let them pay some of it back when they finish up and start making money. So in Newfoundland, let us put it this way, they have to take \$900 a year, \$450 per semester, and for a five year programme, that means that they will only owe \$4,500 when they complete university.

MR. ROWE: Will the minister permit a question?

MR. HOUSE: Yes.

MR. ROWE: This is a quote coming from the Secretary of State, I understand, is it?

MR. HOUSE: Yes. I may not have paraphrased him right but I -

MR. ROWE: If it did, I am horrified at that kind of a statement in view of the fact that a tremendous number of our university graduates cannot even find jobs, let alone high paying jobs. And I will concede, Mr. Chairman, that doctors and lawyers and dentists and commerce students and engineers

MR. ROWE: could conceivably be in high paying jobs, but certainly art students, and many categories of graduates from the university, certainly do not go into high paying jobs. And in view of the fact that we have an awful lot of unemployed university graduates, not only in Newfoundland but throughout Canada, I find that statement quite amazing. I just hope that the minister is not quoting the Secretary of State accurately, because I find it incomprehensible that such a statement would be made.

MR. HOUSE: I did not quote -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. We are dealing with one of the biggest spending departments of government. There are only four people on the government side of the House, Sir. I believe we should have a quorum call for the sake of the minister who is trying to make a sincere presentation.

MR. MURPHY: Five of us.

MR. NEARY: Five of them. I did not see the hon. member.

MR. MURPHY: The worst part is there is only five of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Well, we are here. It is only right and proper, Sir, for the minister's sake.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Before we can have a quorum call I have to rise the Committee and report to the Speaker.

MR. NEARY: I am not trying to delay the Committee, Sir. I am just trying, for the minister's sake, trying to get a quorum, trying to get a few members in on his own side to hear what the minister is saying.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have been informed, Sir, that there was not a quorum present during Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: We shall now have a quorum call. There is a quorum present.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MR. HOUSE: I was responding to the hon. the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde at the time on the Secretary of State's attitude. That was the gist of his speech to us, and his paper to us. So the students are not - let me put it this way; the students feel that they have a very good programme. There are some changes they would like to see made, and changes that we are working on, changes that we can effect ourselves, and there are changes that they are hoping we will take to the Secretary of State's Department who administers the Student Aid Programme.

The other one, the Student Appeal Board, for the hon. the member for LaPoile, the students claim, of course, that it is loaded against them. We have a brief from these people and one of the things that they are requesting is that the Appeals Officer not be a member of the board. The Appeals Officer is not a member of the board de facto; he presents the case for the board. The student is supposed to present his case or her case, and the Appeals Officer presents his own case. That is being looked into and we think that there will be changes that will remedy this -

MR. NEARY: Badly needed. Badly needed.

MR. HOUSE: Yes. There will be changes made to remedy this situation, perhaps more in personnel

MR. HOUSE:

than anything else.

MR. NEARY: What about the French islands? Are you doing the same for them?

MR. HOUSE: We had two programmes in St. Pierre and Miquelon. One is a private thing where we give bursaries to students going down there, for high school students.

MR. NEARY: No, these are university students.

MR. HOUSE: The other one, the university students, there is an \$80,000 grant given to the university by the Secretary of State to run a programme there. There are about thirty students, I think. And there is another \$100,000 given this year to refurbish their premises.

MR. NEARY: Is it free for the students?

MR. HOUSE: Well it is under university regulations. They still pay their regular tuitions.

MR. NEARY: Their transportation and everything is all paid down there?

MR. HOUSE: Yes, I understand that is so. But that is internal. But I understand that it is the same as if they were at Memorial University. I am not certain on that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the minister say if St. Pierre French is good French?

MR. HOUSE: It is suppose to be pretty well the best, you know -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is French French?

MR. HOUSE: Parisian French.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister permit a question? On what basis are the students selected for these courses on the islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon?

MR. HOUSE: I would imagine it is special interest. It would be of special interest. But usually we have more bursaries and more opportunity to take advantage of French training than we can get students to take advantage of it, usually. I do not have a specific answer though to your

MR. HOUSE:

question. I know it is not specific but -

MR. NEARY: Would these be students who are going to make a career in this sort of thing?

MR. HOUSE: Mainly of students majoring in French.

MR. NEARY: Majoring in French.

MR. HOUSE: Right.

MR. LUSH: Not directly related to this, but just a question, not directly related to this but indirectly. Does the Federal Government still carry on, it used to be called their French monitoring programme for students. I just forget exactly what it is called, but the minister knows what I am talking on.

MR. HOUSE: Yes. Mr. Chairman, that is in another subhead. There is a full page on a subhead here somewhere on French and it is over \$1 million expenditure there.

MR. LUSH: Okay, that is all right, yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest to the minister's comments on student aid. And I was hoping that I would not have to say anything, that the minister might mention student aid as far as the West Coast Regional College is concerned. I have experienced a number of problems this past year with students from my district who attend the West Coast Regional College at Corner Brook and who run into particular problems with student aid. And I think most of those problems are probably related to bureaucracy because the appeals board and so on is in here in St. John's and those people are out there on the West Coast. I am wondering if the minister has anything in mind to overcome the particular problems related to those students who are attending the West Coast Regional College. Maybe it would be worthwhile for two or three weeks in the first part of the semester to have a student aid appeals officer stationed out in Corner Brook so that he can take care of the particular problem that those students are facing right there on the scene. For the minister's information

MR. RIDEOUT:

and just to illustrate to him that there are grave problems experienced by students in the West Coast Regional College, I know of a particular case of a student from my district who went through the appeal process in the first semester last year and was turned down all the way, who the college could not, under regulations, accept in the second semester after Christmas because the bills had not been paid for the first one, on whose behalf I went down to the student appeal people down here and found that there was a whole lot of bologna in the application that the student aid division had dug up on the income of his father. For example, his father ran a little business and the gross income of the business was taken in, not the salary expense and the stock expenses and all this kind of stuff to get down to what the father actually made, which was less than a lot of us makes. The business was not very profitable. And on that basis that student actually was given his ticket and sent out of the West Coast Regional College in Corner Brook. Fortunately I was able to get the thing straightened out. But that is one particular case. I think it is wrong. I hope the minister could insure that early in the semester a student appeals officer travels from St. John's out to the West Coast. I do not know if there is work enough there to appoint a student appeals officer or a student aid officer out there. Maybe there is not. But certainly we should insure that early in the semester, in each semester, that there is an officer sent out there so that those types of discrepancies are not allowed to happen and that students are actually barred from attending the

MR. RIDEOUT: college through no fault of their own.

MR. CHAIRMAN(YOUNG): The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Chairman, as I have mentioned earlier we have had meetings with the student aid. There is a committee on student aid at the university and Dr. Eaton is the faculty member who is heading it up, and then a fellow, Jim Payne, is the representative from the student body. One of the problems raised again was the Corner Brook campus, and of course these are some of the growing pains with a dual campus in Newfoundland, one on the West Coast and one on the East. One of the real problems is the fact that all the applications going through Corner Brook had to be processed here in St. John's. You know, there was one application and what they are doing -they think they can overcome that this year by having an application form specifically for the Corner Brook Junior College and have it processed there. Now there is not a job out there with the limited number of students that the college takes for an appeals officer. That will be done here but it will be -

MR. RIDEOUT: You could probably send one out.

MR. HOUSE: Yes, that is right. There will be some arrangement made to accommodate the problem you are talking about. The other one that you spoke about, the income of the parents, that one did create a lot of problems this year. It was the first year that it was demanded, and it was demanded by Federal Government regulations of course. But we have a lot of people in Newfoundland who have small businesses, as you mentioned, who are not incorporated, who do not take a salary out of the business, and I ran into half a dozen of these and it took some time to get them straightened out. But we did get them straightened out after a time.

There is another problem of course with this student aid and that is the university policy also. A student is not, for instance, accepted fully until after a certain length of time. I do not know, perhaps it is four or five weeks, I am not sure - and we cannot process

MR. HOUSE: the applications until after we know that the students are registered as full-time students. That creates a problem and we are trying to work on that also. I might say that students presented a tremendous brief and were very sensible about it and I think we are going to be able to accommodate a lot of the problems that they are running into in that sort of thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN(YOUNG): The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, while we are on the subject of the regional college here, could the minister tell us now how many students are at the regional college in Corner Brook and how many are getting student aid? How they cover their expenses if they board in, for instance if they live in residences at the regional college, how do they pay for their board and lodgings? Do they have to pay for this out of their own pocket? Is this taken of in their student aid by the university or by the department? And what sort of track record does the regional college have? Is it good or bad? I understand -

MR. HOUSE: Excellent.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman says excellent, but I hear stories to the contrary, that they have a large number of dropouts, and that the students could very easily learn in high school or in grade twelve, if we had it in the schools in this Province, could learn exactly the same thing as they are learning at the regional college. And I am wondering about this extravagant albatross that we have around the necks of the taxpayers in this Province, if it is worth the effort or not. My hon. friend is looking at it probably more out of loyalty and patriotism for his district and for Corner Brook but, Sir, could the minister give us a rundown on it? Is it true that there is a large number of dropouts? Kids who did not make it in Mathematics or English or language go in there for upgrading that they could very easily have gotten in the high school or in grade twelve, and they go in there for a short while and they are discouraged and they drop out. What is the track record now in connection with the regional college? We do not seem to hear much about it and we do not know very much about it. Could the minister give us a report on what is happening there?

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Chairman, the Western Regional Junior College is operated by the university and of course we do not have the statistics about the dropout rate. But first of all, the students where they stay in the university, they stay in residences. It depends on whether they qualify for student aid or not. If they qualify for student aid of course they pay their room and board out of that. If they do not qualify for student aid, and the parents are deemed wealthy enough to pay their room and board, they pay it themselves. That is the answer to the first one, just the same as they would here on this particular campus. The number of dropouts - Of course the other thing is that the university there is offering the same first year

MR. HOUSE: programmes, first year university programmes, and it is coming up the next year there will be second year programmes. I am sorry, there have been first and second year programmes carried on now, and of course this year the pupils will be transferring from the Western college into the Memorial to do third year.

I was out to the first graduation a couple of weeks ago. It was very impressive, and I got the impression from the students and from the faculty there, and of course I guess they would be biased, that everything is operated very well. Now I do not know - the hon. member just mentioned they took students in for upgrading, I do not know to what extent that was done. It was originally intended to have a grade twelve, or a first year programme, or a continuation of high school programme for students for instance from the smaller schools who did not get a good grade eleven.

MR. NEARY: Yes, but the minister knows we do not need a regional college for that. We can do that in the high schools. I mean why waste millions of dollars making Wes Andrews wealthy when we could do it in the high schools.

MR. HOUSE: What we are saying is some of these pupils are in remote communities, and we thought originally that if they could come to a larger centre to do an extended high school programme under the auspices of the junior college it would help them certainly in their future education. But I do not have any figures of what the dropout rate was but all that I have heard about it, it has been a tremendous success.

MR. NEARY: Well you would not expect the bureaucrats to say anything else, would you?

On motion, 603-01 to 603-03-06, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 603-04 carry?

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Chairman, 603-04 - MUN tuition and allowances. I notice there is an increase there. Now what is the minister expecting here, that there is going to be an increase in student enrollment at the university this year to account for the increase in tuition allowances

MR. ROWE: that is budgeted here? It is increased from \$5,230,000 to \$5,440,000. Is the university or the minister projecting or expecting an increase in student enrollment? I would assume that is what this is in there for and if so, in view of the statistics for the last few years, on what basis are they projecting such an increase?

MR. HOUSE: The above figures are based on the assumption that the projected enrollment at Memorial will be increased by between one and two hundred students. Of course we are assuming that the formula, \$450.00 per semester, will remain the same but that is just that - we are assuming that increased enrollment because university has become a little more accessible by virtue of the fact of the West Coast Regional College. So we are anticipating that amount of another hundred to two hundred.

On motion, 603-04, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 604-01, carry?

MR. ROWE: Just one quick question just out of idle curiosity, Mr. Chairman. Could the minister indicate what has happened to the Provincewide educational tv system that was indicated in the Throne Speech debate in 1972?

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Chairman, I do not know if it would come under school supplies now or not. We are not anticipating any provincial tv programmes in the schools. I do not know what will happen when we get the cable television. That will be a matter to be discussed at that time. It will have to depend on costs then, I would submit.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, could the minister now bring us up-to-date on some kind of a weird deal that was made with Atlantic Films back

MR. NEARY: I believe it was in the mid 1960's whereby the government entered into some kind of a loan deal with that outfit. In return they were supposed to do so many films for the Department of Education that were going to be put in the library in the minister's department. There has always been some question about whether or not they have been fulfilling their agreement. Could the minister give a progress report on this deal with - I think it was Atlantic Films, was it not? Atlantic Films? Atlantic Films.

AN. HON. MEMBER: (inaudible)

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon. Have all the terms of the agreement been met and have they repayed the government in coin, I think it was. They were given a loan to set up this Atlantic Films thing to buy the equipment if they needed it. In return they were supposed to - I believe originally they were supposed to pay off the loan, which they have never done. Then it became a pretty dicey situation. They were supposed to, instead of paying off the interest and the principle, they were going to give the government so many films, take it up in kind for the library. What ever became of that? Is the thing settled up? Who is in arrears? Or bring us up to date, tell us what is going on in connection with this weird proposal?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. Minister of Education.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Chairman, I do not have the details of that proposal. I will try to get it to answer the hon. member some time before the time expires.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 604.

MR. RIDEOUT: If that is the case then could we have 604 stand over because I would be interested in hearing the information too. Maybe if it is agreeable we could have 604 stand over and go on with the rest of them.

MR. NEARY: We could cover this down 607 if it alright with my hon. friend. Perhaps that will give the minister time to get the information.

MR. HOUSE: Yes. It is in 607.

On motion 604 -01 carried.

On motion 604-02 -03 carried.

605-03-01

MR. CHAIRMAN: Member for Windsor -Buchans,

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I would presume that it is - the topic will be relevant to the subhead. It is the old question that has been raised in this House on four or five occasions, it is raised throughout the province. I have never yet heard a satisfactory answer from the minister, or from anybody responsible. And that again is the question, is why when we are spending \$273 million, just short of \$274 million on education, why we cannot implement in this province Grade XII in our regional high schools?

Mr. Chairman, the need is becoming greater and greater all the time. We have got into a situation where I would believe, and the minister can confirm, that the average age of a student graduating from Grade XI is now 16 years old. I contend, Mr. Chairman, that 16 years old is too young to send a child, a boy at sixteen or a girl at sixteen, to university from rural Newfoundland. Mr. Chairman, the cost, today it is costing around \$2,500 to \$3,000 to send a student to university. That \$2,500 some of it can be made up, if we want to leave the student in debt, as another hon. member said, for the rest of his life, it can be made up of student aid loans. However there is no way - the parents are still going to have to come up with anywhere from \$1,200 to \$1,500. Now that in itself is discriminatory.

On the mainland, I would presume pretty well dominion-wide, the regional high schools on the mainland of Canada today are teaching Grade XII and Grade XIII, and the student enters university with credit for his first year. If we had that here, Mr. Chairman, we would have a situation where the student would be home for another year, and that is one of the most crucial years that year. Here we are in Newfoundland, and I submit to the minister, Sir, that we have the facilities,

MR. FLIGHT:

the regional high schools in this Province are capable of providing the space for Grade XII . We have the qualified staff. In our regional high schools right now there is not a teacher who is not degreed; in most cases, Masters Degrees and Doctors Degrees. Mr. Chairman, it is nothing short of an injustice, and it has not been answered, why is it that we cannot implement a programme now, a Grade XII programme? And another thing we say is it does could be mark down the cost but, Mr. Chairman, it is also a fact whether we like to admit it or not that a lot of our university students are dropping out after one year or two years. So in funding the University, we have to make the funds available. We just saw there where you have increased the grant for the university by \$200,000 because you anticipate a higher enrollment. Out of that enrollment - I do not know what the percentage is, maybe the minister should tell us - will be drop-outs. Now would it not have been better if those students would have stayed home and taken Grade XII at home rather than have gone to the university and dropped out. Because if they dropped out the chances are that anything they got in university is of no benefit to them anyway whereas at home they would have had the benefit of getting Grade XII. They would have been in a position to have been under parental control and guidance and more matured. And another reason - it is all coming back, it is all coming full circle, Mr. Chairman - one of the reasons that we are having so many drop-outs is that we are seeing students going into that university younger and younger. They are not matured to the point where they go in and accept the responsibilities in university. They come out of a high school system and into the university at sixteen years old.

Mr. Chairman, our Newfoundland boys and girls are disadvantaged today compared to their mainland counterparts. Now a lot of our students are not going to university. They are not going into the trade schools. And if they were going to go into the trade schools - never mind university - if they were going to go into the trade schools,

Mr. Flight.

they would be a lot more qualified, a lot more able to handle the courses and the responsibilities that they are going to undertake with Grade XII. If they did not go to the trade school at all - and it is getting more and more, it is harder and harder to get entrance into the trades and technology schools, or the vocational schools - if they went directly into the labour force, then they would be that much more valuable a citizen, they would be that much more prepared to accept anything they would have to accept.

And, Mr. Chairman, I do not see any justification - when I go back - we can go back to the 1950's, in the early 1950's in mainland Canada, the regional high schools taught and had a curriculum for Grade XII. And I would like when the minister stands up to explain how we can continue to justify not implementing Grade XII into our curriculum in Newfoundland.

Mr. Chairman, there is nowhere in Newfoundland right now - or I doubt if there is anywhere in Newfoundland, I am not suggesting that we should have Grade XII in every high school in Newfoundland - but there is nowhere in Newfoundland today that is more than fifty to sixty miles from a regional high school that has got the facilities and the qualified staff. Now the difference in my son having to come to St. John's from Buchans to attend first year university, as applied to having to go to Grand Falls, would at least mean that he would be home every weekend. It is possible, if I wanted to make the sacrifice, that he could be home every night. You know, we are busing students for twenty miles. I would prefer to bus a seventeen year old fifty miles than I would bus a five or six or eight or nine year old twenty miles. So, Mr. Chairman, it is time - and I am surprised that we are not getting more people standing up, more members of this House, more members of school boards, more parents standing up and demanding and asking why? Why is it that we are put into the position of having to send our children to university at fifteen and sixteen years old? And the more we protest the

Mr. Flight.

way we are going, the more younger our graduating students, the more pressure on them when they attend university. If they drop out for a year they may not indeed go back. Most parents want their children to get into university or get their Grade XII immediately, as soon as they finished Grade XI, because they are that much more prepared, they are that much more ready. So, Mr. Chairman, again I would hope that the minister - because this is not the last that we are going to hear on this. The pressure is coming on. I believe we are short-changing our young people in this Province today. I believe we are short-changing the parents. We are short-changing the students. We are short-changing ourselves. And again, to make the point of disadvantage, anything that a student, anything, any way of life that a student decides to make for himself after he continues his high school training - you know, if a student has not got the academic wherewithal to attend university then he is going to go into trade school. Going into trade school, Mr. Chairman, with Grade XII or Grade XIII, he is going to be a lot more prepared, a lot better to compete. A lot of our students today, our young men and women, are joining the Armed Forces. Now, Mr. Chairman, the minute that one of our students, one of our young men or women join the Armed Forces in Newfoundland, he is immediately put at a disadvantage to anyone else joining from across Canada, because they are going in with Grade XII and Grade XIII. Our young men and young women, boys and girls, are going in with Grade XI. Taking all that into consideration, Mr. Chairman, I believe it is time for this Province with the kind of expenditure we are looking at into Education to start implementing a Grade XII programme. And if we are not going to, if there are no plans to, then I would like to hear the minister stand up and tell us why.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, under heading 605, I will just speak once to it unless we can get some more information from the Minister than we have gotten so far. Sir, I must say I am extremely disappointed in the lack of information that the Minister is supplying to this Committee here this morning and, in fact, last night. I thought after last night that the Minister might bone up, do a bit of homework, get a few of his officials together and get some statistics, and some figures, and some information before him, because my colleagues on this side have asked questions, and we are just not getting answers, Sir, and what answers we are getting are rather contradictory and confusing. I would just like to make that point, And I am not attacking the Minister personally, but the fact of the matter is that he has not come up with the information that we have been asking, and the Minister should be a little better prepared for his particular estimates.

Now, sir, under this heading "Services to School Boards", we have six subs, and I intend to deal with just all of them really in one short speech. Hopefully, the Minister will answer and bring forth some information.

The first one, sir, is the more questions we asked about School Tax Authorities last night, Mr. Chairman, the more confusing the whole situation became. The Minister for Rural and Industrial Development, the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan), tried to justify his stand against School Tax Authorities by weaseling his way out of it and attributing a press release to me that was, in fact, attributed to him in error on radio and T.V. The fact of the matter is that the Minister did go to Cabinet and talk about the unfairness of School Tax Authorities in Grand Falls and Exploits Valley area. You would not know but Exploits Valley area and Grand Falls were unique. Does the hon. Minister, or either Minister, think — that Grand Falls and the Exploits Valley area - do they think it is the only jurisdiction where school taxes are inequitable or unfair or unjust? Well, if they do, sir, they are dead wrong. Dead wrong.

MR. ROWE: I pointed out, and there is a Private Member's bill on the order paper pointing out some of the reasons why we calling for the abolition of School Tax Authorities. Sir, a minister indicated last night that \$7 million was being collected by the School Tax Authorities, and left the impression that we could not get that \$7 million unless we had School Tax Authorities, left the impression -

AN HON. MEMBER: Forty-five employees.

MR. ROWE: Forty-five employees. And he admitted, sir, that there is an eleven per cent, or an eleven and one-half per cent administration cost. In other words, in collecting that \$7 million, Mr. Chairman, it costs, in administrative costs - it costs School Tax Authorities \$770,000 - almost a million dollars - well, \$800,000. It took 45 people to administer School Tax Authorities throughout this Province. Sir, that same amount of money and more can be raised by the Government itself. It can be done, based on a person's ability to pay, namely the personal income tax, and the Government - the hon. members opposite - can rant and roar about the Opposition calling for increases of personal income tax, or retail tax, or tobacco tax, or any kind of a tax. The fact of the matter is, a tax is a tax whether it is administered by this Government, or by School Tax Authorities,

MR. ROWE: or by municipalities. The only difference is that this government does not have the intestinal fortitude to collect this money for educational purposes themselves. They are reneging on their responsibility in raising money for educational purposes, and they are pushing it at dedicated people who are serving on these School Tax Authorities.

MR. MORGAN: One-tenth of the (inaudible).

MR. ROWE: I am not going - that is where the - I do not have the Civil Service that the Minister of Finance has, that the Minister of Education has, that the government has, and I cannot give the details to this Committee, Sir, about how you would go about adjusting the income tax, retail tax, sales tax, or tobacco tax and liquor tax, or any other kind of tax. All I am saying is this - is that the government can collect that money at reduced cost to the taxpayers by eliminating School Tax Authorities. And the minister mentioned 11 per cent administration. I would submit, Mr. Chairman, to this Committee, that the minister, in that 11 per cent, did not count the money that goes to collection agencies, in order to collect -

MR. LUSH: The 11 per cent is for administration.

MR. ROWE: It is for pure administration of School Tax Authorities?

MR. LUSH: I have made some enquiry about that when I was in it and I found out that for collection of fees and arrears. was 14 per cent.

MR. ROWE: Was 14 per cent?

MR. LUSH: Yes.

MR. ROWE: Three years ago, Sir, when I conducted some research, I had the figure around 15 per cent. Now the minister, for some mysterious reason, has it down to 11 per cent, and I would submit, Sir, that when you add up the notices that are going to widows, old age pensioners in error, people on Social Services, people who should not be included for purposes of paying school taxes or assessments, the Court costs involved, lawyers' fees, travel back and forth to the Courts, phone calls trying to collect this money, that the true administrative cost, I would submit, Sir, is in the order of 25 per cent. So for every \$100 that the government is collecting, they have to pay out \$25. So they are getting 75 per cent. Look, the Minister of Justice can say that I am not right, or it is wrong, or it is untrue. But I am certainly not telling a lie. I am saying what I believe in, the same as the minister is saying what he believes in, and I am saying the minister is inaccurate,

MR. ROWE: he is incorrect, he is not telling the truth. But it does not mean that he is deliberately lying. And I am saying that this money can be collected by this Administration, if they had the guts to do so, and accept the responsibility to do so instead of having the people of this Province on the backs of School Tax Authorities.

MR. LUSH: : Manipulating the statistics.

MR. ROWE: Manipulating the statistics. Look, Mr. Chairman, I have talked about this before, Mr. Chairman, for four years, and it is obvious that the government are not going to change their mind. A few glimmers of hope are starting to show through now, by at least one backbencher and one cabinet minister who have indicated their disagreement with the School Tax Authorities concept. Now, Mr. Chairman, the minister, last night, did not answer the question as it relates to student/teacher ratios. I have specifically put it to the minister to give the reasons why the third phase of the student/teacher ratio has not been brought in.

MR. HICKMAN: (Inaudible).

MR. ROWE: Look, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Justice has the same opportunity as any other member of this Committee to stand and make a point, if he wishes, instead of sniping from his seat there in his usual manner, trying to distract -

MR. HICKMAN: You asked the question, and I want to give -

MR. ROWE: Well, I am asking, Mr. Chairman - the question is being put to the Minister of Education. And if the Minister of Education is incapable or unable to answer the question, I would submit that probably the Minister of Justice might go down and consult with and advise the Minister of Education if he feels that the answers would be -

MR. NEARY: The member for St. John's South-or St. John's Centre is going to kiss him there now I believe.

MR. ROWE: Unlikely bedfellows.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, last night I mentioned - any chance of some order Mr. Chairman, it is difficult enough as it is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. ROWE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Last night, Sir, I indicated to the Minister of Education that there are hundreds of teachers on the unemployment insurance payroll. There are 157,000 students in this province which is far in excess -

MR. MURPHY: How many?

MR. ROWE: - 157,000 students.

MR. MURPHY: I thought there were over 180,000.

MR. ROWE: I thought it was 186,000, but the minister corrected me and said it was 157,000. So let us say somewhere between 157,000 and 186,000. Whatever figure we use -

MR. HOUSE: Could I straighten this out?

MR. ROWE: Sure.

MR. HOUSE: I said there was 157,000 in primary, elementary and high school, and 17,000 in post secondary education. That added up to 185,000 or 186,000.

MR. ROWE: Right. I thank the minister for his explanation, Sir.

And it does not deviate from the point that I wish to make and that is that is the highest number of students per capita of any province in Canada. Now when you take these two factors together, the number of teachers on the unemployment insurance rolls and the fact that we have these great number of students, I would submit that it is high time, this is the right time to bring in the third phase of the student-teacher ratio.

Now I know that it is going to cost a few cents to employ additional teachers, a few dollars, a few million dollars possibly, but let us look at the thing realistically. If teachers are on the unemployment insurance rolls or receiving benefits, the money is coming from the unemployment insurance commission may come under federal jurisdiction, when the federal government collects money, you might say federally but they collect it from this province, they collect it from this province as well as every other province. So the money is still coming out of these teachers out of the taxpayers pockets.

MR. ROWE: We do have educators who have expressed some concern and anxiety over the quality of education in this province. The minister, I would not say misquoted me last night, but indicated something to the effect that I had charged the administration with reducing the quality of education in this province. If I said that, Sir, I retract it. If I implied it, I retract it. If I gave that impression, I certainly did not mean to give that impression because there is no doubt about the fact that no matter what the administration that we have in this province, year by year we are seeing an increase in the quality of education in this province. But educators are extremely concerned about the rate of increase of quality of education in this province.

The rate of increase, because of the fact that we have had insufficient operating grants, insufficient capital grants to the school boards. The educators, the chairman of the federation of school boards and other leading educators have expressed extreme anxiety over what is likely to happen to the quality of education in this province. I would submit that if we do not have the money for the building of grandiose buildings, not necessary directly correlated with the quality of education, if we do not have the money for certain operating expenses and certain capital expenditures, then I think money for the rehiring or the hiring of these unemployed teachers would go a long way towards improving the quality of education in this province, a long, long ways, and I would invite the minister, and ask the minister to reconsider the possibility. In fact, the minister said in this very House Sir, not in committee stage, but in this very House, something to the effect that bringing in the third phase of the student-teacher ratio would not make that much difference to the unemployment rate anyway, so that would indicate that there would not be that great number of additional teachers added to the payroll, which is a huge sum of money, \$139 million. What a hefty slice out of the education budget!

May 17, 1977

Tape 2834

LB-3.

MR. ROWE: That is part of the problem with the educational budget in this province, so much of it is going out to paying teachers. That is the nature of the animal, something we will never be able to get away from, it is as simple as that. But if there are only a few teachers that are required to bring in the third phase of the student-teacher ratio, and educators are insisting that this would greatly increase the quality of education

MR. ROWE: in this Province, I would submit that the minister should give serious consideration to bringing in the third phase of the student-teacher ratio.

Now, Sir, I have mentioned there is no sense, Mr. Chairman, in my getting into operating and capital grants. I think the minister has justified himself in saying that they just cannot find any more money for operating and capital grants. The minister has adequately explained that. The only two comments I can make about that is that this is a direct result of five and a half years of fiscal blundering and bungling on the part of this administration, and question the force with which the minister defended his educational estimates before the Cabinet, and thence to Treasury Board. These are the only two comments. I can only accept the minister's word that you have to share equally and fairly among the various departments. We are in a period of restraint and this is all we can come up with this year. I will have to accept that for this year, but I will have to remind the Committee, Mr. Chairman, that this is the direct result of fiscal mismanagement on the part of this administration.

MR. ROUSSEAU: He put up one hell of a battle, too.

MR. ROWE: Who is keeping up?

MR. ROUSSEAU: I said he put up a hell of a battle.

MR. ROWE: Well perhaps the minister is kicking up a hell of a battle, as the minister indicates, but, Sir, from what we have seen in this Committee stage, when various colleagues on this side of the House put questions to the Minister of Education, he does not have the information, he does not know, he is not sure. When we ask specific - we are only getting into generalities

MR. ROWE: because of the time limitation on the estimates, seventy-five miserable hours. If we had unlimited time we could get down to the details, and the minister would really look sick. We are in, more or less, generalities now and the minister cannot answer these generalities. What would the minister do if specific questions were put to him?

MR. HOUSE: What generalities? What specifics have you asked this morning?

MR. ROWE: Well, my colleague from - I did not note them all down, All that sprung in my mind is that when the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) asked questions, and when the member for - you spoke and asked specifics this morning - my colleague from Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) asked questions, the standard reply was that, I will try to get the information, or I do not have the information readily available, or something along these lines. That was the general answer. Now I did not keep score over here.

MR. HOUSE: One question.

MR. ROWE: I did not keep score over - I think my colleague will support me when I submit that the hon. gentleman did not answer the majority of the questions with any accuracy this morning, during this Committee stage.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to give some of my other colleagues an opportunity to speak on this particular Heading, or the minister an opportunity to answer.

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to delay the House too long on these estimates, but I think, Mr. Chairman, that a few words are warranted. First of all, I would like to compliment my colleague,

MR. MORGAN: the Minister of Education, for bringing to the department the vast background knowledge of education throughout the Province, in his field, prior to becoming involved in politics. We are fortunate to have a man, heading up the Education Department, of that calibre.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman who just sat down and then left the House, I think maybe he is predicting what I am going to say and he left the House for that reason. It is really amazing, when you look at the hon. gentleman and his colleagues talking so much about school taxes. There has been more debate in this estimate heading along the lines of school taxes than any other issue. Last night in the House I heard the hon. gentleman from Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout), the hon. gentleman from Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan), the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. Last night as well, the hon. gentleman for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. Rowe), and again this morning the hon. gentleman from Trinity - Bay de Verde.

Mr. Chairman, a question was asked, more or less in a casual

MR. MORGAN.

way across the House to the last speaker, What would be your alternative to abolishing the existing School Tax Authorities as they exist throughout the Province? And the answer was, He did not have any alternatives. He merely wanted to see the school taxes abolished. And a point has been put forward quite strongly that there is a tremendous cost in collecting these school taxes. The hon. members of the Opposition say, it is fourteen per cent in administration costs of School Tax Authorities. My hon. colleague says, eleven per cent. Well, Mr. Chairman, administration costs almost automatically tie into the cost of collecting these fees. And I would say that the greatest disservice done to this Province with regards to education has been done in the last few debates in the House of Assembly on this estimate by the hon. gentlemen from the Opposition. And it was done during the last election campaign. And I can realize the frustrations of the hon. gentlemen who got elected in their respective districts on the premise and on a promise to people that they were going to do two things: The big campaign issue was, We are going to abolish school taxes in the Province, and we are going to bring back mothers' allowances. And now, Mr. Chairman, they find themselves elected, in some cases re-elected, and the people who elected them are saying, You promised us during the last election campaign that you were going to abolish school taxes, you promised that you were going to bring back mothers' allowances. They do not realize, Mr. Chairman - when I say, 'they; the people, that because they are in Opposition, although they are members of the House of Assembly, they have not got the power to make the necessary changes. But the promise was made, Mr. Chairman, by these same gentlemen who now stand and do the greatest disservice -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: - who do the greatest disservice -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, they do the greatest disservice to every school board in this Province which has financial difficulties, because the present system of collecting monies to pay for education is through School Tax Authorities. And until the government of the day, whether this party or some other party, changes that system, the only system right now is through School Tax Authorities. And it is a great disservice to the educators, to the school boards and to School Tax Authorities around the Province to stand up in the House and say, Abolish school taxes; we do not believe in school taxes. What in essence they are saying is do not pay your taxes. Do not pay your taxes.

MR. NEARY: You are making an ass of yourself.

MR. MORGAN: In essence you are saying it. And then on the other hand they get up and complain and say, Oh, it costs so much to go out. We have got to get collection agencies, etc., involved to collect the fees, got to involve collection agencies and other agencies to collect the money. At the same time -

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. member permit a question?

MR. MORGAN: Sure.

MR. NEARY: When the hon. gentleman first ran in politics for the Tory Party, did not the hon. gentleman promise the people in Bonavista South that if he was elected he would abolish School Tax Authorities?

MR. MORGAN: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY: Oh, yes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: No. I say to the hon. gentleman that if I ran in an election, I made no promises, none whatsoever. I stand on that record today in the House of Assembly. There was never a promise

MR. MORGAN.

made by this gentleman in any election campaign. But the last election, it was not a policy of one individual member, it was a policy of the Liberal Party to abolish school taxes. And they have the gall, the nerve, to stand up in the House of Assembly and say, Well, look, we believe in abolishing school taxes, but we cannot recommend, Mr. Chairman -

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible).

MR. MORGAN: If the hon. gentleman from Exploits (Dr. Twomey) could keep his yap shut -

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

I would ask hon. members if they want to interrupt the speaker, they must rise on a point of order.

MR. HICKMAN: The hon. gentleman for Exploits (Dr. Twomey) is as quiet as a mouse.

MR. MORGAN: I am sorry - the hon. gentleman for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight).

I apologise to the hon. gentleman for Exploits.

MR. FLIGHT: He made more sense than you are making.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, if I could be given the same courtesy as I gave the hon. gentlemen from the other side - I listened to what they had to say. I did not even interrupt one of the speakers. What I am saying is that the present educational system today is financed primarily, the operations, etc. through the taxes collected by School Tax Authorities. And I am saying it is a great disservice to the educational system we now have in the Province for any member of the Opposition to stand up and say, I do not believe in these taxes; the people should not pay these taxes; they should be abolished. Unless on the other hand - and I think only one speaker has done this to date, the hon. gentleman for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) - they put forward alternate suggestions as to what this administration should do to find means of paying for education. But the hon. gentleman for Trinity - Bay de Verde

Mr. Morgan.

when I questioned him a few minutes ago, he did not care how they found the money, just abolish the school taxes.

MR. ROWE: On a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

A point of order has been raised.

MR. ROWE: The hon. gentleman, Mr. Chairman, for quite some time now - and I did not know whether it was worth raising a point of order or not - but the minister is misquoting me absolutely and completely. Now to explain to the hon. gentleman: I said that the alternative to the abolition of School Tax Authorities would obviously mean an increase in some form of provincial tax, and more importantly related to the ability to pay, and I referred specifically to the personal income tax of this Province, And I said that probably adjustments would have to be made possibly in tobacco, liquor and/or retail sales tax. And I said I cannot go into the specifics because I do not have a great civil service force behind me to advise me. Now I did indicate and I had the guts to do so in front of this Committee -

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I am not finished my point of order yet.

MR. MORGAN: State your point of order.

MR. ROWE: - I had the guts, which this administration does not have guts, to say that we would be fair to the people of this Province, and we would take it as our responsibility to increase taxes if these taxes are fair.

MR. MORGAN: State your point of order.

MR. ROWE: And I am not going to stand here and listen to the minister misquote me -

MR. MORGAN: State your point of order.

MR. ROWE: - and misrepresent me in this Committee, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HICKMAN To the point of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. HICKMAN: To the point of order.

At the very most there may be a disagreement of opinion, at the very most, but certainly no more than that. That is not a point of order. It is frivolous, vexatious, time consuming, delaying the works of the Committee -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKMAN: And I am being again harassed by a gentleman who is not even in his seat.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

I would submit, Your Honour, that it is more than just a matter of opinion between two members of this hon. House, one member on that side and one member on this side. It is more than that, Sir. It is a very serious violation of the rules of this hon. House inasmuch as when a member on either side is quoting another member then it is the responsibility - as a matter of fact, Sir, it is incumbent on that member that he quote the hon. gentleman correctly and not misquote the hon. gentleman. And that is what my hon. friend, the Minister of Transportation, is doing. He is misquoting my hon. friend, the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. Rowe) and my hon. friend rose on a point of order, quite rightly so, Sir. And I would submit Your Honour either make the gentleman quote the member correctly or not refer to what the hon. gentleman said at all.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

First I would like to draw to the hon. members' attention - I do not know if it is unparliamentary or not - but some of the words that are being used such as, guts, bloody and damn in the debate, I think, is lowering the calibre of debate.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

I am making my ruling, please.

MR. ROWE: I never used the word 'damn'.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Excuse me. I did not imply that the hon.

member was, but I said that it had been used quite frequently during the debate, these words.

MR. ROWE: By whom?

MR. CHAIRMAN: By other members.

In future I am going to ask that they be withdrawn.

My ruling on that point of order, I feel it is quite impossible for me to do it because if these remarks were made outside the House I have no way of saying they are correct or not.

AN HON. MEMBER: In the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

And I think it is only a difference of opinion.

The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. MORGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman .

MR. ROWE: On a point of privilege.

MR. MORGAN: Point of what?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Point of privilege.

MR. MORGAN: House privilege or personal privilege?

MR. ROWE: Personal privilege or privilege of the House.

Mr. Chairman, I am not arguing Your ruling. But just in case the impression gets about that I have been using the words that Your Honour -

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, no!

MR. ROWE: - used in this Committee stage, I would like for Your Honour to straighten that matter out please. I admit saying 'guts'. I could have used 'intestinal fortitude' or what have you, but I did not use the other two words that the hon. Chairman mentioned.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, I pointed that out to the hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. NOLAN: Would Your Honour permit a question? In His ruling the Chairman made reference to comments made outside the House.

Mr. Nolan.

We are talking, I thought, about what was said in the House, and I am a bit puzzled as to the ruling on this situation, because it is matters stated by members in the House, whether one goes with them or not is not the point here, but we are not talking, I did not think, about things said outside the House. We are talking about things said within the confines of this Chamber.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I do not know if the hon. member was in the House or not, but at the time the question was asked if the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications made the statement outside the House of Assembly when he was campaigning.

MR. ROWE: No, no!

MR. CHAIRMAN: That was the first point.

MR. NOLAN: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MORGAN: A good ruling. Thank you, for your ruling.

Mr. Chairman.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am going to just continue my few remarks with regards to the school tax issue which apparently has been made an issue, not by this side of the House of Assembly but by the other side. And the impression is left - I heard this morning the comments in the media which went across the Province that the Opposition spokesman was

Mr. Morgan:

entirely dissatisfied with the school taxes, etc. Now the impression was left throughout the Province that people should not be paying their school taxes. Now whether that was said directly by the people from the other side of the House, I am not saying that, but the impression was left quite clearly throughout the Province, Do not pay your school taxes. And that is a great disservice to the educators and to the educational system of this Province.

MR. F. ROWE: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (MR. YOUNG): Order, please! A point of order has been raised.

MR. F. ROWE: I do not care whether I said it directly or indirectly, but for the Minister of the Crown to stand up and say that any member of the House of Assembly is leaving the impression with the general public of this Province not to pay their taxes, Sir, is inexcusable for the minister to say that -

MR. MORGAN: The impression is firmly left!

MR. ROWE: - and I ask him to make an unqualified withdrawal of that statement.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: He never said that about what you said. He said the impression was left.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, on that point of order, if you would call it a point of order, I did not say that the hon. gentleman on the opposite side of the House made that statement. I said the impression, in my view, was left in the eyes of the public of this Province that the attitude is do not pay your school taxes. That is the impression left. Mr. Chairman, there is no point of order anyway.

MR. ROWE: That is the kind of stuff you get away with.

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

MR. ROWE: You can get away with that.

MR. CHAIRMAN (MR. YOUNG): Order, please! I feel that it is just a difference of opinion and not a point of order.

The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. MORGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY: A point of information, Mr. Chairman. Are points of order and points of privilege are they -

MR. MORGAN: Taken out of my time, yes.

MR. NEARY: - taking out of the hon. gentleman's time or is the clock stopped?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. NEARY: No. The clock is not stopped, so the hon. gentleman loses that much time.

AN HON. MEMBER: There is no one voting for you now.

MR. MORGAN: So, Mr. Chairman, again on the same topic, the fact is that education today is, as I said earlier, financed, a large aspect of it, through the means of a local input by means of School Tax Authorities. And these School Tax Authorities are properly formed, legalized bodies in this Province, and they are making every effort to collect their taxes. And the reason why there are such a large cost in collecting these fees, and many of them as was referred last night by the hon. member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan), who are not paying their taxes because of, again I repeat, the impression left by members of this Assembly and by the people involved in the Liberal Party campaign in the last election that they wanted to abolish all School Tax Authorities, they were unfair, should never been brought in etc. They failed out point out that they were brought in by the same party, that was never pointed out. The fact is, I am not saying whether they are fair or unfair. There is a difference of opinion among different members of the House of Assembly. But the fact is, it is a legal system today in our Province, and no one should go out and even give the impression you should defy the present laws of the Province. And the School Tax Authorities are properly set up bodies in this Province. They are properly set up and why should anybody attempt to give that impression to the public of our Province, that is not what we call leadership, Mr. Chairman, that is a great disservice, it is a great disservice, We in this House of Assembly should be showing the people out there leadership.

Mr. Morgan:

That is not leadership, Mr. Chairman. That is a great disservice to our educational system.

I am making these comments because I feel that my colleague, the Minister of Education, as I said earlier in my few remarks, we are fortunate today to have as head of the Education Department a man of the experience and the calibre that my hon colleague is. And he would probably, not being much a partisan as I am, would probably not say what I am saying, but it is true, Mr. Chairman, that this impression was left quite firmly this morning through all the media in this Province that the Opposition people do not want the people to pay their school taxes. Yet on the other hand they do not come along and give this administration any alternative how to pay for education.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: Are they advocating, Mr. Chairman, free education?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: The impression was left through comments in the media this morning, taken from various speeches made and quotes from various speeches made and primarily from the Opposition benches last in the House of Assembly.

So, Mr. Chairman, I can realize the frustrations of those

MR. MORGAN: people who found themselves re-elected in the House of Assembly primarily, primarily under one issue, If you vote for me I will abolish your school taxes and bring back Mother's Allowances. That was a major issue in rural Newfoundland, it was a major issue in my district; the major issue was if you vote for a Liberal candidate you will have no more school taxes and you will get back Mother's Allowances. And I can realize the frustrations today, Mr. Chairman, of these same gentlemen who find themselves re-elected to the House of Assembly and they are going back to their districts and the people are saying to them, "Look, I am still getting the bills from the School Tax Authority but you promised me that you were going to abolish the school tax." It is frustration, it is frustration. I can realize their venting their frustrations last night here in the House of Assembly and again this morning.

But again I repeat, before sitting down, Mr. Chairman, that I feel it is a great disservice to a properly legalized system of collecting funds to pay for education. The statements made are an outright great disservice to that means of collecting funds, in fact to the whole education system in this Province, and I think it is disgraceful on the part of the opposition members.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of interest to what the hon Minister of Transportation had to say about School Tax Authorities, Sir, and I must say that I never in my life heard a more ridiculous justification for this undemocratic, for this bureaucracy, another level of bureaucracy set up by the Department of Education and by the government. I never heard in my life such ridiculous justification for taxation without representation than I just heard -

MR. MORGAN: Who brought it in? You were in the Cabinet!

MR. NEARY: than I just heard from the hon. minister. And I am sure that some of the hon. gentleman's colleagues and supporters on the government benches must have cringed when they heard the hon. gentleman make some foolish and stund statements. There is no justification for it, Sir, none at all and the argument, Mr. Chairman, is this. Actually what the hon. gentleman was trying to do was trying to twist and turn, but the argument is this, there is a difference of philosophy between the Tory philosophy and between the Liberal philosophy.

The Liberals have adopted as a matter of policy that they would find the money for education through some other method, by either changing the income tax by a point or a percentage point, whatever is necessary, and abolish the School Tax Authorities which is another level of bureaucracy which cost 14 per cent of the amount collected in administration costs. That is the philosophy of the Liberal party as apposed to the philosophy of the Tory party where they are going to persist, they are going to be stubborn, they are going to insist that the school taxes - the School Tax Authority, as undemocratic as they are, will remain in being. Now I am inclined myself, from my vantage point here in an independant position, to go along with the Liberal philosophy as apposed to the Tory philosophy because, Mr. Chairman, hon. gentlemen know that this is a sore spot and it is even a sorer spot in our educational system today, Sir, than the failure of the schools to produce adequate performance in the three r's. And that is the imposition of the School Tax Authorities, that is even a sorer spot than the fact that the schools - that we are turning out functional illiterates in this Province by the hundreds, by the thousands every year as it was admitted by the Minister of Education last year.

The School Tax Authorities are even a sorer spot than that, obviously the hon. gentleman is completely out of touch with reality, Sir,

MR. NEARY: completely out of touch with the ordinary people.

Nobody, but nobody in this Province, except the hon. gentleman, agrees with School Tax Authorities.

MR. MORGAN: Was it tried in the beginning?

MR. NEARY: I do not know, Sir, it was -

MR. MORGAN: You were in the Cabinet at the time.

MR. ROWE: No, he was not!

MR. NEARY: It was a snow - I was not in Cabinet at the time and I might point out for the benefit of the House -

MR. SMALLWOOD: I was and I will tell the story.

MR. NEARY: I might point out for the benefit of the hon members of the House that when my hon friend, who just got up supporting the School Tax Authority contrary to the wishes of the hon gentleman's constituents, that the first time that the hon. gentleman campaigned in an election in this Province in the district of Bonavista South the hon gentleman told his constituents that if he was elected he would abolish School Tax Authorities.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame, shame!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the set-up is absolutely undemocratic, it is taxation without representation, and all it does is create another level of bureaucracy and is a highly -

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of personal privilege. The hon. gentleman referred to what he apparently has understood to be statements by me outside the House of Assembly. I said earlier in the same debate that at no time did I even comment on the school taxes during the election campaign, and I again repeat in my election campaign in Bonavista South, in two election campaigns - in fact in three, the first one I lost, and the last two I won - I made no promises whatsoever, I stood on the platform and made no promises of any kind, so I would like the hon gentleman to be made clear - a clarification point - and therefore now that the point is clarified I would like for him to retract and indicate, unless

May 17, 1977

Tape 2839

AH-4

MR. MORGAN: otherwise, indicate clearly the understanding he has that I made that statement.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, this is not a point of order, It is just a matter of opinion.

MR. MORGAN: It is a point of privilege.

MR. NEARY: It is a matter of opinion between me and another hon. gentleman and I contend, Sir, that the hon gentleman is

MR. NEARY: on the public record as telling his constituents that he would abolish the School Tax Authority, and therefore I -

MR. MORGAN: That is not true.

MR. NEARY: - withdraw nothing, except to say that it is true. It is a matter of public record in this Province, sir.

MR. MORGAN: You cannot prove these charges.

MR. NEARY: No, hold on now, the Chairman has to rule.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the matter is a difference of opinion which took place in an election campaign many years ago, and it has no bearing on this estimate.

MR. MORGAN: Thank you.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Chairman, how do we deal with this distasteful, undemocratic, unfair system of raising forms for education in this Province? The solution, Sir, that has been recommended from this side of the House is simple. What we are saying, sir, is that the fairest way to do it is to add a point or a fraction of a point to the Provincial income tax. I will even go further than that, Mr. Chairman, and my hon. friend rightly points out that then everybody will pay according to his or her ability to pay, I would even go further than that, sir. I would also submit that if we do abolish the School Tax Authorities and add another point or a fraction of a point to the Provincial income tax, that when the School Boards present their budgets that they be compelled to present their budgets to a standing committee on Education, made up jointly from the staff of the Provincial Department of Finance, from the Department of Education, and augmented by three M.H.A.'s, of whom one would be designated chairman.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not have to go back over the reasons that have been put forward by my hon. friend, the member for Bay de Verde (Mr. Rowe), in recent years about the unfairness of this system. The unfairest aspect of the present system, the school taxes, the School Tax Authority, is that the childless family - man and wife working - have to pay \$150 a year, \$75. each - whereas the wealthy

MR. NEARY: household with only one member working gets away for \$75 a year.

MR. MORGAN: That is fair.

MR. NEARY: According to the Minister of Transportation, this is fair and equitable -

MR. MORGAN: Nothing wrong with it.

MR. NEARY: -and the way that it should be done. Sock it to the ordinary people. Sock it to the people that can ill-afford it, and in the case where the woman can go off curling and golfing, and travelling all over Canada sometimes at public expense -

MR. MORGAN: No tax is fair, no tax is fair.

MR. NEARY: \$75 a year.

MR. MORGAN: No tax is fair.

MR. NEARY: Two people struggling, trying to keep body and soul together, to keep their children in school - \$150 a year. So, what we are saying, Mr. Chairman, with one swoop we would have taxation then based on representation if we changed the income tax, and contributions then proportioned to the real ability of people to pay. The only real ability, as my hon. friend from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) knows, the only fair way to do it, Sir, is to adjust the personal income tax. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is enough about that, and I hope, sir, that I have shown the House the difference between policy on this side, policy on that side; the philosophy on this side, the philosophy on that side.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: This is where you separate Toryism from Liberalism.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: Is that so? Is your policy -

MR. NEARY: The Tories' philosophy is to continue with this non-democratic, with this unfair, distasteful system of taxation. We say over here, do it fairly and squarely, change the income tax by a point or a percentage of a point, make it fair for everybody. Everybody pays.

DR. FARRELL: The guy in the middle gets it every time.

MR. NEARY: The wealthy then will contribute more than the poor fellow that can ill-afford it. It would be proportioned, Sir, according to your ability to pay, and that is the way it should be.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Equality of sacrifice.

MR. NEARY: Equality of sacrifice, my hon. gentleman friend from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) says.

Mr. Neary:

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to deal with another aspect of this heading - School Boards. Up to now only one-third of the members of the school boards in this Province are elected; the rest are appointed by the Department of Education, by the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council, I presume, by the minister. One-third are elected, two-thirds are appointed. Again we have a gross example of a non-democratic procedure. Now I have heard the argument put forward that you cannot even get people to go out and vote for the one-third. I have heard that argument. They said, Well why elect 100 per cent of the members of school boards when you cannot even get people to go out and vote for the one-third? What I would submit, Mr. Chairman, is that is part of the problem; that the government in its wisdom, and I do not know why they did this, would prefer to appoint two-thirds of the members of school boards. It is undemocratic, and it should not be allowed to stand on the record. It should be abolished. And if only a handful of people go out and vote so be it, but do not use it as an excuse for not setting up a democratic process, a democratic procedure in this Province, and allow dictatorship to rule within our democratic system.

The minister should tell us here in this House now while we are doing the minister's estimates, if and when the process of electing members to school boards is going to be made democratic, and the people themselves, if they want to, and if they do not want to that is it, But I am sure with a little bit of PR work, with a little bit of organization, with a little bit of motivation that people would rise to the occasion that they would respond and they would go out and elect their members to school boards and not have them appointed by the minister. How hypocritical and undemocratic can we be? And I hope I do not hear the minister get up and make the excuse that I have heard so often -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: No. Well then they are allowed to elect a third now, but they will not turn out.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: That is not. That is a false statement. Make it democratic, give the people their rights. Let them elect their members by secret ballot, and I am sure that you will get candidates to come forward and offer themselves as candidates to serve on school boards, and that you will get the people to turn out and vote for the candidates of their choice. It works in every other phase of society, why would it not work in the election of members of school boards? It worked for the Lion's Club, it works for Kiwanis, it works for Rotary, it works for the Trade Union Movement, it works for the Board of Trade, it works for the House of Assembly, it works for the House of Commons, but the minister will tell us it will not work for school boards. Well if it does not there is something wrong. What makes it so different?

Let us do it now while we are doing these estimates. Let us show the people of this Province that we are prepared to elect our members to school boards in a democratic way by secret ballot, and no more of these political appointments. Let us eliminate the hypocrisy and the buddy-buddy and the sweetheart -the buddy-buddy deals and the sweetheart deals that are made, Let us get rid of that and let people go out in a democratic way by secret ballot and elect the members of the school boards.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is another matter here that I want to refer to and that is the matter of transportation of school children. Yesterday I had three owners of school bus companies here on the Avalon Peninsula come to see me to tell me that they are struggling for survival, that they cannot make a go of it, they have not had an increase, and I believe, I am not sure, but one or two of them were from my hon. friend's district, St. Mary's and the Capes (Mr. W. Carter), and I believe the other one was from Ferryland district. They cannot make a go of it, they have not had an increase - they have not had an increase for several years. The school boards tell the bus operators when they approach the school board that they cannot afford to pay them any more,

MR. NEARY:

Unless and until the government give them more money, there is nothing they can do. This is what the school boards say. So they send the bus operators in to see the minister's officials, and the minister's officials say, "It is not up to us; it is up to the school board." So it becomes a vicious circle. Around and around it goes, like a merry-go-round.

MR. RIDEOUT: Just like building schools.

MR. NEARY: It is just like building schools, my hon. friend says. But this is even worse, because the school bus operators are getting desperate because of the increase in gasoline, in labour costs and in oil and so forth, and they cannot cope, and they are all just about on the brink of bankruptcy. And when they go to the school board, they say, "Go and see the government. We cannot give you an increase until the government gives us more money." They come into the government and they say, "It is not our responsibility - back to the school board." And the poor old school bus operators are completely frustrated.

Now we either do something about it or we wipe out school buses altogether, one thing or the other. You just cannot do that to people, Sir. I do not care who they are. You cannot treat people like that, whether they are school bus operators or no matter who they are, whether they are the drivers, whether they are the kids they are transporting, You do not treat people like that, you give it to them straight. And right now they are not getting a straight answer. They are getting the run-around. And it is not good enough, and something has to be done about it.

And, Mr. Chairman, the minister might also tell us, when the hon. gentleman stands up, what is going to be done about the social security tax that is paid by school boards on electricity that is used to heat schools? That was a proposal that was put forward to the government recently by the various school boards throughout the Province. The cost of electricity is escalating

Mr. Neary.

almost every month in this Province, and those school boards - and in fact the people who were encouraged to heat their homes by electricity now find that they cannot cope - and the school boards have asked to be exempt from the sales tax on electricity for heating schools. And so far they have got a negative response from the administration. They have stone-walled - they are running right up against a brick wall. The answer is, no, so far. And if this administration really wants to help school boards and are sincere, well then they would exempt, not only the school boards, but exempt all homes that are electrically heated.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Provincial tax?

MR. NEARY: That is a provincial sales tax of ten per cent paid by school boards. We exempt coal, we exempt furnace oil and stove oil when it is used for cooking or heating, but we do not exempt electricity. Why not? Why cannot we do it? Mr. Chairman, the hon. Premier in answer to a question that I put to the hon. gentleman several times last year and the year before indicated that the government, his administration, was going to give this matter a very sympathetic hearing. Does the hon. Premier -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: We have to study it.

MR. NEARY: Well maybe it is in the hands of the -

MR. SIMMONS: Planning and Priorities.

MR. NEARY: - Planning and Priorities Secretariat.

I would like to hear the hon. Premier now tell us whether or not the government has this under active consideration and whether the school boards can look forward, and indeed all those people who have electrically heated homes, who do their cooking and heat their homes by electricity, can they look forward to the day when they will be treated as equals to those who burn coal and furnace oil and stove oil? That is a fair question, Sir. It is something I would like to hear the reaction of the Minister of Education on. Indeed I would like to hear the reaction of the Premier.

Mr. Neary.

Mr. Chairman, I am sitting down here in my little vantage point as an Independent, and it would be a stroke of genius, Sir, for the hon. Premier to stand in this House and say, Yes, we are going to give the people who were encouraged to heat their homes by electricity, we are going to exempt them from the sales

MR. NEARY: tax and we are going to exempt school boards from the sales tax. It will not cost the government that much, and it would be a wonderful thing. Probably the government could do the same thing with insurance, I do not know. I am not as hepped up on insurance as I am with electricity, but it is certainly something that could be kept in mind. If the school boards gets strapped and the government want to come to their rescue, just eliminate the sales tax on electricity and on the insurance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!
The hon. member's time has expired.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The time, how much do we have?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have about twenty minutes on this Heading.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I should like to say firstly, that if the hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. Rowe) gave the impression that the people ought not pay their taxes imposed by law, by this House, then he was wrong. But what evidence do we have that he did so? The minister says that he left the impression on the minds of the people. But how does the minister know that? All the minister can know is the impression that was left on his mind, and he can identify that with the opinion of the entire population and come thereby to the conclusion that that was the impression left on the minds of the Newfoundland people. Well I do not believe that, I do not accept it.

There have been times in history when it was right and proper to advocate the non-payment of taxes. There have been historic occasions when -

MR. J. NOLAN: Some ministers have preached civil disobedience.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, there have been occasions in history when statesmen said to the people, Do not pay that tax, that is an unjust tax. And they have advocated non-compliance with the law. But that is a rare thing to happen. I do not know of any case in Newfoundland where any responsibly minded, public man has ever publicly advocated the non-payment of taxes that have been properly, legally, constitutionally imposed. In other words, imposed by the people's House. This House has the right to impose certain kinds of taxation. It must be direct taxation within the Province, and once the House does that, it is lawful and it is right that it should be paid.

Now it is also right, if the House wishes to do it, to abolish the law itself that requires the payment of a tax. Then it would be silly to pay a tax which was not obligated by the law.

Now may I say in passing that I am a strong advocate of abolishing the school tax. I am an equally strong advocate of the idea that the cost of education ought to be borne by the general public of the whole Province, and through regular taxation. It might be income tax, it might be corporation tax, or it might be a straight education tax imposed by this House and collected by the Minister of Finance. But whatever the particular form it took, it seems to me that the cost, the financial burden of educating the youth of this Province ought to be imposed by this House on the entire population, following the principle that — the best people to pay it are those who can best afford to pay it, and following the great British principle, that there ought to be equality of sacrifice in paying taxes.

AN HON. MEMBER: The rich -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well there ought to be equality

MR. SMALLWOOD: of sacrifice. It is a sacrifice to pay taxes. If you did not pay taxes you would have that money left in your own pocket. So when you pay the tax you are making a sacrifice, but the sacrifice should be equally made, and not unequally or inequitably.

Now may I take a moment to tell the Committee how the school tax came into existence. In the twenty-three years that I was in the government of this Province, something between 500 and 1,000 delegations came to see me. Some of them were one and two and three people, and some of them were ten or a dozen, some were twenty or thirty. By far the largest delegation that ever came to see me was one that came from the

Mr. Smallwood:

city of Corner Brook, and that was the largest delegation, I believe, ever to come to St. John's, to any Premier, to any government. The largest delegation. It came from Corner Brook at their own request and every church in Corner Brook was represented. I believe all the unions were represented. I believe the Chamber of Commerce was represented. I believe that all the Service Clubs were represented. I believe that all of the Fraternal Societies were represented. It was the most represented as well as being the largest delegation ever to originate anywhere in this Province since 1949. And I would go so far as to guess long before 1949 and long before we were a Province.

What was the purpose of their visit? The purpose of their visit was to advocate the passing of a law by the House of Assembly to give them the right to impose a school tax, to give them the right, not that delegation, but a school tax authority that would be set up by law. So when they came in and told me this I looked at them in amazement. I said, "Gentlemen," there were clergymen, there were priests, there were all kinds of people, there must have been well over a hundred members of that delegation, I said, "Gentlemen, you amaze me. You are actually asking me to introduce into the House of Assembly legislation which, if it were passed by the House, would give authority to impose direct cash taxation on the people of Corner Brook for school purposes?" "Yes, exactly!" that was their answer. Well I said, "I do not doubt that you are a very representative committee, very representative indeed. But I would never ask my associates in the government to introduce legislation to the House of Assembly putting compulsory taxation on the people of Corner Brook for school purposes unless and until the people of Corner Brook say so. Not you as a delegation, but the people say so." And they agreed to that.

And so there was a referendum held in Corner Brook.

DR. FARRELL: Would the hon. gentleman permit a question?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes. Of course, yes.

DR. FARRELL: I would like to ask why this delegation came in asking for this privilege?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes. Of course I will.

The theory was and the principle that they advocated was this, that Corner Brook was a very modern town, very modern, very up-to-date, very progressive minded and they wanted things for their schools that they could not get from the government, They wanted special departments, the parents wanted these advantages to be given, to be provided in the schools for their children that they could not get from the government grants, and the government took the position, "Look, we are going to treat everybody alike." The present government does the same thing; it is the proper way in this matter. "We are not going to give you extra money, additional money to give your youngsters in Corner Brook extra opportunities. We are not going to do that." And they said, "Right. We would like our people to be taxed to provide the additional money for the schools, to enable the schools to give the children of Corner Brook advantages that they are not now getting, and which the the government are not prepared to pay for. We will tax ourselves to give the schools in Corner Brook additional facilities and advantages of one kind or another."

All right. So they went back to Corner Brook, and so we brought legislation in here to the House and so it was debated and so I believe it was unanimously adopted. Now what did the legislation provide for? The legislation that we brought in and that the House passed unanimously provided that in any area of the Province where the people by referendum,

Mr. Smallwood.

secret ballot referendum, decided that they wanted a school tax to be imposed, then the government by virtue of the authority of that act would set up a School Tax Authority. Now there was another proviso. In the Constitution of Canada, the Terms of Union, all religious denominations recognized by law had to have equality of treatment of the money for education. And we believed, and I still believe, that just as the money that this House votes for school purposes must be done on a certain basis as laid down in the Terms of Union, which is now part of the Constitution of Canada, so also any money that this House authorized someone else to raise shall be equally spent on a basis of nondiscrimination as between the denominations, and so the act provides. I think the Committee will find if it looks up the act - the act that I am talking about - will find that the money collected, (a) there is a referendum and the people decide that they are going to have a school tax; (b) the government then appoint a School Tax Authority; (c) that School Tax Authority must divide the money between the denominations according to Term 18 - is it? - whatever is the term in the Terms of Union.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Chairman -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. NOLAN: - I wonder if the hon. member is aware that the hon. minister has now about five minutes to reply to all the questions.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, that is not my fault.

MR. MURPHY: Hear, hear!

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is not my fault. I have something to say, and I want to say it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SMALLWOOD: After all, the Committee of the House has a remedy in this. It is not to shut me up -

MR. MURPHY: That is right.

MR. SMALLWOOD: - when I am putting something on the record that needs to be put on the record. Now I would be all in favour of the minister being given additional time to answer. I favour that strongly.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Point of order.

MR. NOLAN: The hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) knows that we have arrived at a schedule of which he was aware of allocating a certain number of hours for a specific department. In this particular instance I believe it was five so it is no news to him. I am merely pointing out that the minister has now about four minutes if he is going to have an opportunity to reply at all. And the member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) knows that.

MR. MURPHY: I am sure he does. Everybody knows that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! To that point of order, as you are aware the Committee only has authority to - the hon. member has twenty minutes to speak.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: And in no way can I rule him out of order if he does not want to yield to the hon. minister.

The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I deeply regret if the minister is not going to be given an opportunity to address the Committee, and if the Committee are not to have the opportunity to hear the minister. Surely that is within our power. The House makes its own rules, is the master of its own procedures.

I wanted to go on record that what was done in connection with the School Tax Authority law was done at the request of the people of Corner Brook expressed in a secret ballot referendum, and that it was carried out because it was the wish of the people there. Now subsequently I believe the people around

Mr. Smallwood.

Lewisporte, and I think maybe the next one is Grand Falls, and in a number of other places there was a positive request.

AN HON. MEMBER: Deer Lake was the second one.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Deer Lake was the second one. But again, that was at the request of the people of Deer Lake. The Liberal administration did introduce that law, but it did so with the unanimous consent of the House and at the request of the people who were going to be called on to pay the tax. I do believe that the government now ought to find a way of doing away with it and substituting for it a far more equitable and a far more practical way of paying the cost of education.

MR. MURPHY: Would the hon. member permit one question before sitting down, please? At a conference we held with reference to education did we not put one or two per cent on sales tax for the purpose of education at that great conference at that time?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think so.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, I was just wondering.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think that is so.

MR. MURPHY: We increased the sales tax from six to eight per cent - two per cent was for great educational -

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. minister has two minutes.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Chairman -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Chairman, I can only answer one quick question and that was with regard to school busing. There are a number here I could answer if I had the time. But one of the things about school busing is that it is done totally by tender and people are permitted to tender every year. We give people the - sometimes boards give a contract for three years to allow people to get

MR. HOUSE: funding for to buy buses but that contract can be opened at the end of each year and then it will have to go to public tender again. So I do not see any other fairer way we can do it. There have been a number of other things suggested—perhaps we go with a policy of giving a person a franchise and having them defend it before a public utilities board, but we think in the spirit of the tendering act, we think that the best way so far is the public tender.

Just another comment regarding the implementation of the third phase of the pupil-teacher ratio. I think now by virtue of the fact we have a number of teachers, one way we can solve the unemployment problem, of course, is to take all the teachers there are, all the educated people they are, and put them doing some useful work—I think that has been said before— but you know, we have to look at the cost. The fact is that the third phase was a one to twenty-five ratio, whereas there is a one to twenty-six now. And clause thirteen states that no board will lose teachers unless their board drops below that one to twenty-five ratio, and now we have a number of boards having a one to twenty-five ratio and it would be about just around one hundred teachers needed to implement the one to twenty-five ratio. And I stated earlier that that would not have a very big impact on the quality of education, I did not think, when you consider that it would be mainly the larger boards for growing populations that would get these teachers and there would be boards that would not get them at all.

So if we are talking about what impact the one to twenty-five ratio is going to have, I think it would be very little.

On motion, Item VI, Education, all subheads, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Rural Development, page 101. Head XVI.

The hon. Minister of Rural Development.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, this is something I have been looking forward to for quite some time to get the opportunity to make, first of all, a brief presentation to the members of the

MR. LUNDRIGAN: legislature regarding Rural Development, and unfortunately look forward to only four hours of debate and discussion. I believe last year if hon. members will recall we had some excellent debates on Rural Development. We had the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir making some very constructive comments. I am looking forward this year to my colleague, the member for Bellevue, who is going to be - he is my shadow, I believe, and I am sure that he has got some very enlightening observations to make and I am sure very useful suggestions along the lines of what the department should or could be doing in the event that he is not satisfied with the programme.

I remember last year as well the member for Twillingate, and I believe the member for Placentia getting embroiled in a rather heated debate over resettlement which is always a topic of - what would you call it - general inspiration to members on various sides of the legislature. And I am looking forward this year to some participation - the only thing I regret is that unfortunately in confining to the rules that we set down we have only got four hours and that places some limitation on the ability of the House to react, because I would like to have about seventy-five hours for Rural Development because I do believe that there is enough happening in that department to be able to justify literally weeks of debate on this legislature.

Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to indicate to the legislature that when we are discussing Rural Development we must recognize that this is a relatively new programme. It is a programme that was instituted in 1972, I believe, as a general outgrowth of a philosophy of the government that I am a member of, suggesting and stating and finally coming through with a department on a programme that there was a future in the rural parts of our Province. I believe it grew out of the fact that for quite a

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

number of years there was a general feeling, and a general kind of thrust of the government that there was no future in rural Newfoundland and that the answer to the rural community was to resettle the population from small towns and move them into larger centers.

This programme was demonstrated by the fact that in 1954, I believe, I am advised by officials in the department that have certainly a longer involvement in Rural Development in the Province than I have had, they have indicated that the general intention back in 1954, which was the early parts of my hon. colleague from Twillingate's reign, the intention was to reduce the number of communities in our Province from approximately eleven hundred down to around four hundred and fifty communities.

I believe at that time there was an intention as well in the minds of some

MR. LUNDRIGAN: top bureaucrats, federal and provincial, that there be a massive sort of resettlement programme or redistribution of population of the whole of the Atlantic region. I have heard comments which are not substantiated by the evidence in the department or in the files that some bureaucrats were looking at some four or five major centres of population in the Atlantic Centres. And that that inevitable flow towards the urban setting should be recognized and accommodated. In fact that type of thrust from 1954 until 1972 was largely achieved, Mr. Chairman, because the evidence that we have indicates that from 1954 and until 1972 the communities in our province reduced from approximately 1100 to approximately 800 communities. I believe it is a fair comment that there was a general apathy and a general feeling that the rural community with its "disadvantage", the transportation difficulties, again the problem of lack of "opportunity" was such that we had to have some kind of a move to settle our people into "productivity areas".

This was the general feeling. The funny thing that has happened in the last number of years, as my colleague the Minister of Fisheries will attest in great detail when his estimates are brought forward, is that the areas of greatest prosperity today - I say this with no great feeling of relaxation or the feeling that we have anything to be totally satisfied with because we do have some major problems - but the areas of greatest prosperity today are in the rural communities. The people that are most insulated from, isolated from, protected from and secure from some of the tremendous vagaries and the uncertainties of the society that we are living into today, are in the smaller towns. I am sure that members among our various coastlines and from our various constituencies can stand up today and talk about success stories in many of the smaller communities that were before now considered of no avail in terms of economic development and prosperity.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: This is the biggest achievement, in my opinion, of the present government, the fact that we have turned around the attitude in a lot of rural communities. No great magnificent ventures, no great structures that we can brag about, as a matter of fact such a low profile and such a lack of awareness exists in the House and in the province about some of the rural development that is taking place, some of it with credit to the department, others with credit to various departments. Some of it because of the new-found insights on the part of the public that I would say that the members of the legislature were not generally aware of what is happening in many of our smaller communities. I hope in the next few hours to be able to debate back and forth across the House to give members some indication of some of the things that we have been responsible for in terms of the developments that are relevant to rural development.

Mr. Chairman, the estimates of course outline some \$6.5 million of expenditure, and I want to begin by saying that that expenditure, even though it is a very small amount compared with an in excess of a \$1 billion budget, in my opinion, and as the minister I am quite satisfied that that is adequate for us this year to do the job. We are not looking at rural development as some kind of a system of expenditure that can create a lot of momentum in a hurry. We are looking at rural development as a process whereby we can, with a tremendous number of rural development associations, a very small but very dedicated staff of people in the department, a number of very simple, not very complicated programmes turning around the attitude of a lot of our rural communities, reinforcing the kinds of things that are existing in the communities and bringing the people back to life again. I will outline this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, some of the programmes and I will just very quickly in the next

MR. LUNDRIGAN: sixty seconds give an indication of the headings that we have to deal with, and I hope members will get a chance to deal with these in some specific form other than general debate. We have the first heading of any substance is that community consolidation programme. I will give members a rundown on the resettlement programme, where it stands today. The reason why we are looking at \$20,000 in the estimates for that particular project this year, the resettlement programme in the past, the number of communities that have been resettled, the number of communities that are now being settled, the fact that we have turned this programme - instead of a resettlement programme it is a settlement programme.

Mr. Chairman, I will indicate in some detail the details of the promotion and training votes, which indicate of course the areas where we have the development associations coming in the community project funding which is one of the areas I am very interested in. Of all of the votes here this is one of the most exciting one, the types of things that are happening in quite a number of the

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

communities as it relates to community projects as the members can vouch for as they speak themselves. The next is the rural development planning with the pilot action research which is again a local area of the estimates in that particular vote, and the home industries and then getting down as we do into Labrador services. And I am looking forward to continuing this in the next ten minutes after lunch and the next three and a half hours.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! It now being one o'clock I leave the Chair until three o'clock.

On motion the House adjourned until 3:00 p.m.

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

MAY 17, 1977

MAY 17 1977

Question #229

Mr. Neary (LaPoile) - To ask the Honourable the Minister of Forestry & Agriculture to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

- (a) How many new jobs were created as a result of the Federal-Provincial ARDA 1972 (Newfoundland Agricultural Programme) Agreement involving an expenditure of some sixteen million dollars?
- (b) How many jobs have been created indirectly as a result of this Agreement?
- (c) What notable increases have been recorded in Province's agricultural production resulting from ARDA since 1972? (List products, such as turnips, broilers, greenhouse tomatoes, strawberries, blueberries, potatoes, cabbage, etc., separately.)
- (d) Have production targets outlined in the program been met by March 31, 1977, and if not, why not?
- (e) Provide the House with all reports on the program including any changes made in production targets.
- (f) Supply the House with details of expenditures on the Program to date.

ANSWER

- (a) 88 new farms were established as a direct result of the ARDA III Program. This represents approximately 100 new jobs. It should be also noted that increased production

on existing farms as a result of ARDA III may have necessitated the hiring of more full time and part-time help. *

- (b) It is difficult to state definite indirect employment but is estimated to be between 50 -70 new jobs. *

*These do not include jobs that are being maintained by the ARDA III Program.

- (c) Attached is a table showing increases by producers assisted under the ARDA III Program. It should be noted that ARDA III Program was also geared for increased farm efficiency.
- (d) Production targets have not been met in many instances. The reasons for discrepancies are stated in the two evaluations and include:
- (1) The original commodity goals and program benefits appear overly optimistic for the Province's first cost-shared program for agriculture development.
 - (2) Staff shortages and Provincial budget limitations.
 - (3) Insufficient criteria and program specifics.
 - (4) Late start-up and start-up problems.
- (e) See attached summary.

(f) ARDA III expenditures to December 31, 1976:

Land Use Survey	105,251.15
Western Agricultural Center	138,078.66
Farm Management Consultation	495,811.22
Western Swine Breeding Station	157,137.99
Pastures	308,300.00
Sheep Breeding Station	402,517.32
Marketing	56,020.93
Capital Assistance	1,152,407.37
Workshops	15,765.63
Field Days	1,839.92
Travel and Exchange	19,818.58
Pilot Projects	72,894.59
Small Fruit Demonstrations	3,176.66
Staff Training	6,761.65
Access Roads and Flood Control	271,584.14
Potato Seed Farm	139,013.81
Youth Projects	11,992.40
	<hr/>
	3,358,372.00

Increases in Production and Farm Gate
Value for Producers Assisted Under ARDA III

Dairy	37% increase in cattle numbers 56% increase in farm gate value
Beef	44% increase in cattle numbers 5% decrease in farm gate value
Sheep	59% increase in ewe numbers 70% increase in farm gate value
Poultry	114% increase in bird numbers 264% increase in farm gate value
Swine	2% increase in sow numbers 25% increase in farm gate value
Vegetable	52% increase in acres 107% increase in farm gate value

Summary of ARDA III, Agriculture Sector, Evaluation

The following is a summary of the ARDA III, Agriculture Sector, evaluation.

The achievements of the Program are outlined as well as identification of some constraints which prohibited attainment of some of the objectives.

The ARDA III Program permitted different types of projects but it did not require the inclusion of specific detailed programs as must now be submitted under the current DREE agreements. This made monitoring and adjustments difficult and, even though it was determined part way through the Program that the objectives were overly optimistic, detailed changes were not made.

As of March, 1976 approximately \$3.3 million had been spent on the five sub-programs under this Agreement. It provided assistance to 340 farmers (88 of whom were new entrants). Despite constraints on Provincial funding, staff shortages, and start-up problems, the ARDA III Program has met with adequate success in most areas.

Under the Capital Assistance Program, 88 new and 252 existing farmers received capital assistance and consequently, increased their production units. For instance, from 1973 to 1975 inclusive, these farmers increased dairy cow numbers by 37 percent, sheep (ewes) by 59 percent, poultry by 114 percent, sows by 2 percent and acres in vegetable production increased by 52 percent. Farm gate sales increased from \$2.4 million in 1973 to \$4.5 million in 1975. In spite of these increases for farmers receiving capital assistance, the total volume of provincial agriculture production did not significantly increase. Thus, some farmers are increasing production and improving the viability of their farm units while other small producers are reducing or going out of production. Therefore, the Capital Assistance Program should continue with some modifications. Restraint in provincial funding and the slowness in implementation of the Land Consolidation Program were constraints on the Capital Assistance Program.

Detailed soil, land use and ownership surveys must precede the implementation of a Land Consolidation Program. Land Use surveys were completed for the St. John's area and will be finished for the Cormack area in the 1976-77 fiscal year.

Work is progressing in the Codroy and Robinsons areas. Work progressed slowly due to staff shortages and the first land use plan, for St. John's South, was not finished until 1976. This slowness, combined with difficulty in choosing a policy, prevented implementation of the Land Consolidation Program. Even so, a land development program must continue, since it is basic to an agriculture industry.

The Human Resource Program, designed to teach farm management practices, achieved only moderate success. A resource center was established in the Western Region. The main thrust was to come from the hiring of seven farm management specialists but instead, existing staff were assigned to these positions.

Under the Market Program, seven agricultural commodity studies were completed. Only 15 percent of the funds budgeted under ARDA were spent because of lack of staff, lack of provincial funds and the production response was insufficient to warrant some market development expenditures.

Finally, the Farm Support Program resulted in establishment of the Western Swine Station, the Sheep Breeding Station, and the Potato Seed Farm. The benefits are not yet measurable because the facilities have been functional for only a short period.

ARDA was the first comprehensive, cost-shared agricultural program undertaken in Newfoundland and as such, it achieved moderate success. There is still opportunity for agriculture development, and resulting benefits to the provincial economy remain. In fact, because of higher energy and transportation costs and higher unemployment, the need for and benefits from agriculture development have increased.

Unfortunately, the goals of the ARDA III Program are now considered to have been overly optimistic and it is realized that insufficient emphasis had been placed on identifying basic soil resources so that development funds could have been channelled to areas having the greatest potential for increasing returns.

PRELIMINARY

UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.

TUESDAY, MAY 17, 1977

The Committee resumed at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Chairman in the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, I will just finish off my few general remarks because I will refrain from getting involved in any specific detail as we go through the preliminary comments because I believe as we get involved in the specific votes we can have questions raised appropriately. Maybe, Mr. Chairman, the thing I would like to do just in a nutshell is to indicate something about the philosophy of rural development. The first thing, Mr. Chairman, must be recognized, and I suggest this to hon. members across the way, is that I would be very disappointed if hon. members were to judge rural development on the basis of the number of rural development loans or the basis of the number of successful loans. We have all the information because the money and the dollars and the loans and things of that nature might be very secondary to the most important thing and that is the process of trying to regain among our public in various communities the confidence, the sense of direction, working together to identify their needs and looking to government only as some kind of a system to reinforce their own aspirations.

I believe what we have tried to do, Mr. Chairman, in the last number of years as a department is to try to rid ourselves of the paternalism that has characterized the Province for quite a number of years where it was considered by government to be a major achievement if government were to do for people what they perceived needed to be done. And this has been the number one thing which has done the most damage to our public: To sit back and expect a government to do the things that the public require and the public perceive that needs to be done, is the best way to destroy a people. To make a people dependent on a government and for the government in its own sense of satisfaction to glory and bathe in the fact that they have had great achievements is a self-destructive force, and this is the thing that I would throw across

MR. LUNDRIGAN: the bows of hon. gentleman. It is a thing that we have to try to change about. We believe very, very firmly that in order for a programme to succeed you have to have the public involvement.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, another truism is the fact that rural development or development is a very, very slow process. In order to take the Province and the communities, the various communities, a lot of which became rather dependent on government for direction, change the thing around until the public themselves are able to get involved, identify their own needs, look at their own areas of achievement and then look to government for some levels of assistance is a very slow process. I predict that it will take us as a department ten years to get fully airborne to the point where we make the impact we desire and want to make. And we have been at this only for four years and I am quite pleased that the staff we have been able to acquire, the people that we have been able to bring into the department with the dedication, the philosophy, the kinds of output of energies has really enabled us to help turn around the rural economy of this Province.

The unfortunate thing is that very frequently there is a mixed sense of values that seems to emanate from spokesmen across the way when they talk about, "What have been your major achievements?"

MR. LUNDRIGAN: We have no specific identifiable major achievements if you measure them in multimillions of dollars and graded the facilities and things of that nature. If you measure what has happened in the rural community in terms of the change of attitude, in terms of the general buoyancy in the local economy, in terms of the fact that it is more of a feeling of independence on the part of the public, in terms of the fact that there is more of a feeling that we will paddle our own canoe, then I feel, Mr. Chairman, there has been a major contribution made to a lot of our communities. We have in our Province today some thirty development associations as independent of government as it is possible to be, so independent of government, Mr. Chairman, that I remember last year rather a unique kind of a little experience for me that my director got a real charge out of when I had talked to the development co-ordinator, that is the person hired by the association, to tell him I was unhappy with some of the comments he had made to the media because of the fact that he had given the impression an industry would start that I knew, because I knew the industry, was not going to get off the ground and I said, "You should be a bit more careful." I was reminded by the Chairman - or by the president of the association that I had no role to play, keep your nose out of our affairs, it is our association, you provide the bit of funds but we have our own constitution, our own autonomy and he told me in other words to mind my own business.

Can you imagine years ago, or not too many years ago, a development association funded by the government having that kind of - what would you call it? - the kind of stature, determination and kind of conviction and independence to talk that way to a minister? I said to my director after I got my anger subsidied a bit that this was the most encouraging thing I had experienced as a minister when we could see at a local level despite the fact that we underscore the associations with a small grant that they have

MR. LUNDRIGAN: reached this level of freedom and independence in their own planning and their own thinking.

We have plans this year for two or three more associations to be funded. Hopefully there will be many more go through the stage of gestation and get off the ground, but in terms of funding we require for funding an association that they do and they have reached the stage where they can perceive a programme that can be carried out in a local area.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I will just sort of touch on a number of things that I would like to elaborate on as we go through. The Rural Development Council which is sort of the governing body of the associations, with the executive director, Mr. John Curren, is one of the things that we have been funding and one of the processes we have been supporting. And the Rural Development Council is carrying out its work very effectively. It has a small grant from the department to publish the Rounder and I do not know how many members get the Rounder. I hope they all get the Rounder. I am meeting with Mr. Curran shortly and hope to be able to find ways and means to use the Rounder in a more effective way. We publish six times a year some 4,000 copies bimonthly or every second month and I am a little concerned that the quality of it and the kind of message is not getting to enough people and consequently maybe the effectiveness is not being felt to the extent it should because it is a marvellous production and it is certainly portraying a lot of things that are happening in rural Newfoundland and Labrador that the public should become more aware of.

The Community Project Funding I will touch on that in some detail and perhaps I will highlight it by talking about the community project that we have on the West Coast at Doyles with the wool carding mill which I will mention in some detail as we get involved. The craft development is something which is a new kind of emergence in the department as far as I am concerned, although I

MR. LUNDRIGAN: believe the department did have a craft co-ordinator for a couple of years some years back. But we have emerged on a craft programme which is getting airborne. It is a slow process. I think we have a realism in our approach to it that it is going to take us some years before the economic and social and cultural values of craft programmes are fully felt in the Province. Although I believe now there is enough momentum in the craft area that even without any government support you will see the kind of resurgence of craft activity in the Province even almost on its own.

I will mention home economics and some of the work we have done and that we are doing in this particular field as well. Project planning, Mr. Chairman, we will touch on. I hope to get a chance to elaborate on the proposal that we have prepared jointly with my colleague, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, in presenting to the Federal Government a proposal to enlarge on and expand on and build on the

Mr. Lundrigan: programme of Rural Development that we have had for the last number of years. Our programme under the ARDA III agreement expires in the Spring of 1978. We have had for a year now Mr. John Murray, who is a very excellent person in his field and his staff have built and put together a programme that we are looking to Ottawa for assistance. I do not perceive any problem or any kind of a danger of being rejected at the Federal level. And really what we are doing is expanding and building on the programme that we have had for the last number of years, and that I believe, I can have this confirmed by my colleague, is just about ready for submission to Cabinet, Once it clears that hurdle it will be negotiated with the Federal Government.

The Home Industries Division, Mr. Chairman, again I am just skipping through very quickly aside from the various responsibilities that are itemized in the estimates is the one division that has within its boundary the Rural Development Authority. This, I believe, is the only programme of its kind in Canada where we do have budgeted this year \$1.7 millions for the Rural Development Authority loans. Last year we made 112 loans. We put out about \$1.4 millions. I believe we have had approximately 3,000 jobs created during the lifetime of the programme; that would mean about 4,400 man-years of employment since the beginning of that programme. Last year we had \$800,000 repayment into that programme, by the way, which goes back into consolidated revenue. This year I expect we will increase the amount of funds that will come back into the programme maybe by 50,000 more dollars. We have put out about \$7 million, we have had about \$2 million repayment, Mr. Chairman, And that does not suggest we have only had one-third of the repayment that is required; it means that we have had \$2 million repayment of the total that has been put out, and of course a lot of these loans have as high as ten years to go for repayment.

We are very pleased with it. It is a programme that is going to remain somewhat controversial because when you look at it, it is a very, very flexible programme. As a matter of fact, in the last

Mr. Lundrigan: meeting which we had which was on the 4th. of May, which I intended to announce today in the form of a ministerial statement, we had forty-four applications. Of the forty-four applications there might have been one hundred enquiries over a period of three weeks. Of the forty-four we had, twenty-six of them were approved, over \$200,000 in funds for very small little industries around the Province, and these would have roughly about a hundred jobs created. Again not a big input, none of them are going to rival Come By Chance or Lab Linerboard or any of the great industries.

AN HON. MEMBER: Come By Chance that is.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: But if you analyze them all, and go throughout the whole Province you will find that a tremendous number of those little industries have been very, very successful. I can pinpoint some that we are very, very pleased with as I go through the estimates and get an opportunity to discuss this with members across the way.

Mr. Chairman, the failure rate is something that we are pleased with in the sense that it is not as high as one would expect, bearing in mind the flexibility, bearing in mind the fact that we turn around applications on the average under a month, and that is compared with, if you are dealing with DREE, and I am not knocking DREE, but I would suggest that you might be talking about five or six months. The hon. gentleman across the way have been raising questions about the failure rate. We have, out of 900 applications that we had approved, Mr. Chairman, I think we had about 289 that we have considered failures; of the rest, some of these are not going to succeed as well, because we do have some of them that are in a state of suspended animation, if you want, and they are really that productive, but we have had less than 33 per cent that we could consider failures. And I would say that if you look at the statistics and read your industry magazines, you would find that even without government involvement, which this programme tends to assist industries that normally would not get off the ground without some level of government participation, which means that

Mr. Lundrigan: they start off at a disadvantage, they are not the real easy-smooth, easy-going guaranteed investment; they are shakey, they are risky. They are areas that we have to take a chance and risk in a small way with the free enterpriser as it might be. And if you look at your statistics you will find that in small industries across our country in the first five years of operation About 50 per cent of small industries fail. And we are very pleased with the fact that we have a failure rate of only one-third of the industries, or even less than the third.

The member asked me for the number of repossessions. Mr. Chairman, we had sixty repossessions where the acquired

Mr. Lundrigan:

- what would you call the repossessed goods? - whatever these are had been sold prior to 1976. We had fourteen outstanding during that period that have not been sold, and we had sixty that were repossessed in 1976. I believe there is a total of 104 that have been repossessed during the lifetime of the programme of the Rural Development Authority. Now that does not mean that is the only industries that have failed, because we have quite a number of them where there was no repossession for a variety of reasons where there still might be a failure as rated by our field people in the department.

So we are pleased with it. Last year we had, as I indicated, 112 small industries that we provided assistance ranging from maybe as low as \$1,000 to \$20,000. And I will challenge any member across the way to look across at me with honesty now and say they have not received good co-operation from the staff, tremendous co-operation. I have instructed my people in the department to always bend over backwards. The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) shakes his head, He is one of the characters who unfortunately has not recognized that politeness and good human relations -

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible).

MR. LUNDRIGAN: - the hon. member, good human relations is essential even with the omnipotence of being a politician, and having reached the height of being a member representing a constituency.

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible).

MR. LUNDRIGAN: But we have had - I am not interested in good nature here today, let us have a good debate.

MR. FLIGHT: You done all right -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, the various members across the way will admit that they get tremendous co-operation. And I have gone as far, and I will say this publicly, that I think it is important for the department, it is important for me as a minister, to take some

Mr. Lundrigan:

guidance from members, if they have recommendations about their constituents. Certainly if a member does not have the right to say to my department and to me that I do not think that this individual is a good individual, or I think we would go with him, I think he is the type of person we should be supporting, if I cannot take some guidance from that, not to allow it to be the dominating kind of decision, but if I cannot take some guidance what is the good of having members elected? And I do say in all honesty without hesitation, that I take guidance from members.

The hon. my alter ego from Bellevue (Mr. Callan) will admit that only just a year ago he came to me when we had rejected an application, if he recalls, and it was for a sawmill or a planer, was it not for a planer? - and we were able to take that loan and even though it had been rejected bring it back before the board, we argued strenuously we had reservations, and I believe, if I am not mistaken, that he got satisfaction as a result. Now we do not always bend over backwards to that extent because of the fact that we have to look at economics as a fairly dominant role in making the decision, do we not? If we are going to fund an operation just because we happen to be a friend of, or we like or we feel sort of some kind of an emotional attachment to an individual or an industry, then that is a bad kind of reason to make a decision. But we do take a lot of guidance from members and I expect members as well to go out on a little limb if they want to themselves in recommending an individual, because if they do, of course, they give us a bit of guidance that we welcome.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there are a whole pile of areas, but maybe the most important thing I want to say just in sort of - not the final thing, but it is at the end of the estimates - is the fact that in the last number of months I have been responsible as a result of the decision of government to administer the Labrador Services Division.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is news, is it?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: If there is any division of government that has come under more fire unnecessarily, then I will have to say I do not know about it, any division of any department. Labrador Services for the last number of years -

AN HON. MEMBER: Who from? Who from?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Oh from all across the way, and not from the hon. member who has been very kind, but even internally there has always been the feeling that Labrador Services has been dragging its feet on this, it has not satisfied this, Springtime comes and there is a problem with fuel delivery, there is a problem with food, there is a problem with transportation, and they have had a responsibility and it goes back quite some years. I believe as early as 1942 when the Hudson Bay Company served notice on the then government that they were going to pull out and there was a joint relationship established between the government. Subsequently since 1942, I believe, there has emerged a much more sophisticated role for what is now called Labrador Services.

But over a period of years, and I have just gotten involved with Labrador Services in the last number of months. I believe it is factual to say that it has been unfortunate that they have not had the adequate staff to carry out their own only responsibility. They have had a tremendous coastline, and I sometimes believe listening to my colleagues from Labrador that we have not been as aware as we should

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

have been of the fact that they have a geographic problem alone. It makes the role an immense one. And when we deal with estimates and budgets and you get a minister going up to Treasury Board talking about travelling allowances, travelling expense, you are talking about a whole different ball game. And when you are talking about the normal business practices, the normal decision making procedures, the normal bureaucracy, you are talking about a whole different ball game. Even with all of the problems that we have encountered and the types of kinds of almost annual perennial criticism that you get, especially during the Spring of the year and your ice blockades and your food shortages, I believe that the handful of people that have been responsible for Labrador Services have done a tremendous job. Now if you look in the estimates, hon. members will see that there is revision this year for the creation of, for the first time I do believe, of the position of Assistant Deputy Minister for the Labrador area who will be responsible for administering all of the responsibilities of rural development in Labrador. On tomorrow the Deputy Minister of Rural Development, an appointee of the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations, or the Minister of Labour I think he now calls himself, his deputy I do believe and a representative of Planning and Priorities will do the preliminary review of the applications we have received for that position. We have done a tremendous amount of departmental work - I will just take another ten seconds, Mr. Chairman - we have done a tremendous amount of departmental work in preparing types of programmes and personnel that can assist whoever this person may be in carrying on this present year. I hope in the next number of weeks to be able to announce the name of the new A.D.M. for Labrador. In essence that is what the person's role will be. And as we go through the estimates I will give some indication of what has been done in the last twelve months with respect to Labrador Services and also what is planned for the present year. And I am very, very pleased that that division and the whole thrust of the department in Labrador is emerging effectively.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, it would seem to me from the introductory remarks given by the hon. gentleman, Sir, that the hon. gentleman started out by baiting the Opposition. The hon. gentleman obviously is looking for a lot of action during the discussion of the hon. gentleman's estimates. I would submit, Mr. Chairman, that if the hon. gentleman was doing Industrial Development maybe I could give him a good run for his money. But on rural development I am afraid that I cannot get psyched up as much as I could if we were doing the other department that the minister is responsible for. Rural Development, Sir, has turned out to be one of the great disappointments of this administration. A few years ago when a Mr. Reid was the Minister of Rural Development, if the hon. gentleman would go back and look at Hansard the hon. gentleman would see that I, on two occasions I think it was in this hon. House praised the government for its rural development policy. And I think the Opposition of the day was quite prepared to give the new department a chance to see what good they would do, to give the minister a chance. But it has turned out, Mr. Chairman, to be one of the great disappointments of this administration. I do not know now, Sir, if it is after sliding, deteriorating to the extent that it cannot be saved. I have a feeling that the enthusiasm and the burst of energy, the initial burst of energy that the department had originally is now filtered out, petered out, and the department seems to be grinding to a halt. It is rather unfortunate, Sir, because the minister is quite right that it could be one of the best departments of government. But somehow or other they seem now to have run out of ideas. The initial burst of energy is over and they seem to have lost their initiative. And that is rather tragic and unfortunate indeed. Now, of course, Mr. Chairman, let me say straight away that one of the strong condemnations that we have of the minister and the policy that has been adopted by the minister since he took over that department is the fact that they

May 17, 1977.

Tape 2853

PH - 3

MR. NEARY:

will not give us a list of names of those who receive loans from the Rural Development Authority.

Mr. Chairman, some time ago, I think it was back in March, on March 2, I put a question on the Order Paper,

MR. NEARY: and I asked the Minister of Industrial & Rural Development to lay upon the table of the House a list of all loans made by the Rural Development Authority, outstanding as of the 30th September, 1975 - also, all loans outstanding by the Newfoundland & Labrador Development Corporation. I got the answer back, but there was no list. All that it gave me was the date the loans were made, the amounts of the loan, the interest rate, schedule of payment and security held, etcetera. The minister up to now, Sir, has refused to give this House the authority for voting the money to the minister's department to loan out, to spend. The minister has refused to give the House information that it has been asking for in connection with these loans, namely, a list of all the individuals, of all the companies and all the businesses and industry that have received loans from the Rural Development Authority. And the minister has refused point-blank, claiming that the Rural Development Authority is like a bank, and I say that is hogwash! It is not like a bank, it is the people's money, and I am surprised, Sir, that the Auditor-General of this Province has not picked the minister up on his refusal to give this information to the House. Now, the Auditor-General may have access to the minister's records, I do not know. The Auditor-General may be able to go in and examine the records and look at the names of the people who got the loans, and so forth, but it is this House, Sir, that should have the information. And let the word go out today to the Auditor-General of this Province, that the people, the people's House, cannot get the information that it wants in connection with the list of names of those people who have received loans from the Rural Development Authority.

We are not saying, Mr. Chairman, that there is any skullduggery going on. We are not accusing the minister of political patronage. We are not saying, Mr. Chairman, that the minister is porkbarrelling with the Rural Development Authority. We are not making any charges, or any claims, because we do not know. And, until we have the list in front of us, Sir, we can only reserve judgement, and I am going to call upon the minister again, Mr. Chairman, There is no excuse in this world for the minister withholding that information from the House. The House is entitled to have the information, and everything else the minister does on his estimates - no matter how much flack the minister gets from the Opposition - how much action, and the minister may get more publicity than the Minister of Education got in putting his estimates through, because the

MR. NEARY: minister is sharper, can motivate the Opposition, and bait them and stir them up, and the minister may get more publicity than my hon. friend, the Minister of Forestry & Agriculture (Mr. Maynard) may get in putting his estimates through. The minister is a live-wire, high visibility, and knows how to cheese off the Opposition, and no doubt the minister will get lots of flack and lots of action. But it will all be in vain, if the minister continues to refuse to give the House the information that it wants in connection with the loans that are made by the Rural Development Authority. And it is illegal, Sir, and I tell you if we do not get the information this year, Sir, I do not know if there is any way we can get an injunction against the minister and the department, and have the minister barred from - no, we cannot impeach the minister, we do not have the - maybe if we had the list of names we might be able to impeach the minister. But -

MR. RIDEOUT: We have not got the evidence.

MR. NEARY: We do not have the evidence - we cannot make a prima facie case. And, as my hon. friend, the Minister of Justice, is aware, if we do not have the list in front of us and we cannot go over it with a fine-tooth comb, to see how much political patronage, and how much porkbarrelling, and how much skull-duggery, and how much under-the-table wheeling and dealing is going on, then there is nothing we can do except we can just use our imagination. And the people of this Province are entitled to have that information, and I hope that the minister will agree to provide the House with the information in this session.

Now, Mr. Chairman, earlier on, the minister had an ARDA Agreement signed by the minister's department. I believe, now, it has been transferred. Is the minister listening to me? The ARDA 1972 Agreement. The ARDA 1972 Agreement used to come out of the minister's department. I believe it has since been

MR. NEARY:

transferred over to the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: This part is -

MR. NEARY: Oh, well the hon. gentleman still has a part of it. Well, Sir, I want to know from the minister because we heard great things about this ARDA 1972 agreement, it was supposed to involve an expenditure of \$16 million. Hon. gentlemen should keep that figure in the back of their minds. And it was suppose to create so many jobs. It was suppose to produce so many tomatoes and turnips and broilers and strawberries and blueberries and potatoes and what have you over a given period of time. I think they had a time, they even had a timetable drawn up. And so I am going to - I put this question to the minister before and the minister did not give me a satisfactory answer - I am going to put the question to the minister again and I hope the minister will make a few notes when I ask him to give me this information. How many jobs have been created directly and indirectly resulting from this agreement? What notable increases have been recorded in the Province's agricultural production resulting from the -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Well, the hon. gentleman tells me part of it comes under his -

MR. MAYNARD: I gave you that this morning.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, I did not get it this morning. In what?

MR. MAYNARD: The answer to the question I tabled this morning. All that information is there.

MR. NEARY: Oh! Well I have not got the answer yet.

MR. MAYNARD: Well you should get it from the clerk.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the clerk of the House could get me the information, Sir? Well, okay, I will just let that one ride for the time being until I get a chance to have a look at the answer.

MR. MAYNARD: That is the agricultural part. The other part I -

MR. NEARY: Well what part is the hon. minister responsible for? I presume - I cannot see it here. The agricultural part includes broilers, greenhouses, tomatoes, strawberries, blueberries, potatoes, cabbage, etc.

MR. MAYNARD: Right.

MR. NEARY: What part is the minister responsible for?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Explain all of that to the hon. gentleman. Then he will know what he is talking about.

MR. NEARY: Right. Well okay. I mean, how can I know that there is divided responsibility here? The agreement was signed by the hon. gentleman.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: What about your usual reliable sources?

MR. NEARY: My usual reliable sources of information tell me, Sir, that there has not been one new job created, that there has not been one pound increase in the number of potatoes, blueberries, broilers, greenhouses, tomatoes, strawberries, cabbage and so forth, not one.

MR. MAYNARD: Oh, you are wrong. You are wrong.

MR. NEARY: I am right. I am right, Sir.

MR. MORGAN: Your source is not reliable, I would say.

MR. NEARY: My sources are reliable.

MR. MAYNARD: Your source just went off base.

MR. NEARY: And when I get the information I will take a look at it. But that is what my sources tell me. And there have been no new jobs created as a result of this 1972 APDA agreement involving an expenditure of \$16 million. But I will certainly be interested in taking a look at it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I was interested in what the hon. gentleman had to say about Labrador affairs. Labrador, Sir, is a subject that has been debated and bandied back and forth in this hon. House now for the last couple of years. And everybody is concerned about Labrador. I suppose the whole of Labrador can be considered as a rural part of the

MR. NEARY:

Province including the industrial part. The hon. gentleman dismissed Come By Chance when he is comparing industries and so forth. Well Come By Chance is located in a rural part of this Province. Mr. Chairman, that brings to mind another point, Sir, and I have to mention it at this stage. Somebody asked a question down there about repossession, repossessions. Well we have heard a lot in this House since this session started about repossessing equipment and so forth by the Rural Development Authority. And then we see the ads. Now they have a sneaky way of doing it. The ads appear in the newspaper, not under the name of the minister or the Rural Development Authority. They appear in the newspaper under the Department of Public Works and Services. They are the ones who auction them off or call tenders or whatever they do. So you do not see, you do not know - it is sort of camouflaged, you do not know it is repossessed equipment. Only those who are astute enough to keep an eye on it would realize that all of these ads that appear in the newspaper are a result of equipment that have been repossessed by the Rural Development Department - sort of a cover-up, a camouflage so that it will not look bad. And the minister told us there a couple of weeks ago about the equipment that was repossessed on, I think it was the Gander - was it Gander Bay Lumber Company? Anyway it was this lumber company out there in Gander where the owners of the company charged the minister

MR. NEARY: with repossessing the equipment too fast, too quick, put him out of business, practically put him out of business; they are not out of business yet. The university, the - let me see, who else apart from the university, the university, the federal people are now taking a look at that operation to see if there is any way they can rehabilitate it and put it back on its feet. And I am told that they are going to put it on a solid foundation despite the fact that the minister's department repossessed the equipment and pulled the carpet out from under their feet before they had a chance. Oh that is so, Sir!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I explained that privately to the member and he still does not understand it.

MR. NEARY: And then -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: And so that is being looked at now but no thanks to the minister's department. The minister whipped the carpet right out from under their feet and the minister did not explain it to me privately. I asked the minister a question in the House.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I explained it as well behind the curtain and he still does not understand it.

MR. NEARY: Well I have it explained to me from another source now and I am told that the people who are looking at it now are determined to rehabilitate that industry and without any involvement at all from the Department of Rural Development. And so there have been a great number of repossessions and sometimes I suppose the minister could be accused of not moving fast enough in a case like this and in other cases moving too fast.

But, Sir, we will never know because we do not have the list in front of us and we do not know the companies who got the loan. Mr. Chairman, the minister says that their success

MR. NEARY: rate is fairly high. Well, Sir, I hope their success rate is higher than the governments track record in connection with the Linerboard mill and the Come By Chance oil refinery.

Mr. Chairman, you know for years one of the big criticisms of the former Premier of this Province, the hon. member for Twillingate, one of the big criticism was that he went around this Province with a golden shovel turning over sods. Every time he came into the House, every year he came into the House they were poking fun at the hon. gentleman going around with his golden shovel turning over sods. Well the hon. gentleman might have went around with his golden shovel but this crowd go around with their golden padlock closing up industries, putting the padlock on the doors. And there is the difference, Sir, in that administration and the previous administration. There is always hope, The hon. gentleman despite all the criticism that has been flung at him, the hon. gentleman always managed to hold out some hope for the Newfoundland people, and we were hoping that there would be something in the Rural Development to look forward to but we can see now, Sir, that this too is going the way of all flesh.

But in connection with Labrador, Sir, which has concerned people so much in this Province for the last few years, if the hon. members will remember during the debate on the resolution that was brought in by my hon friend from Eagle River asking for a special committee - a select committee, to be set up to study the affairs of Labradorians, speaking in that debate - and I know I can not refer to previous debates, Mr. Speaker, but I volunteered, if hon. gentlemen will remember to do a survey, to send a questionnaire to various communities in Labrador to find out what the real wants and needs and what the problems were in Labrador and what the Labrador people

MR. NEARY:

thought were their problems and I am happy to say now, Sir, that on April 27th I mailed out a letter and a questionnaire to four hundred residents in various districts in Labrador, in different communities in the various districts. I will read the letter for the - that I sent along with the the questionnaire for the benefit of hon members of the House. It is dated April 27th - and I might say that so far I have about, as of today, about 135 replies, about 135 questionnaires have come -back out of 400. And I will table this information, Mr. Chairman, when I read it and the minister might pay attention to this because I think it will be beneficial it will be a positive thing and it might be able to help the minister in developing policy for Labrador when I get the report compiled and I may have a preliminary report by the end of this week.

"As one of the few members of your House of Assembly who has visited practically every part of Labrador, I am frequently called upon by individuals, groups, and communities to assist with a wide variety of problems.

MR. NEARY: "These problems have ranged all the way from helping resolve labour disputes in Labrador City and Happy Valley to securing the cancellation of unjust fines imposed on hard working citizens in L'Anse-a-Loup for shooting a dangerous wolf. As a result I have a very special interest in getting something positive done for you so that you will feel that you have at least equal rights with other citizens in our Province.

"I am also convinced that high paid royal commissions, eight volume reports and more committee studies are not what you want and need. Usually such reports and studies reflect only the interests and lobbies of the few, the few who have the time and inclination to appear at hearings held at hours when ordinary people have to work.

"Accordingly, to find out what you really need in Labrador, I have set up a sample of four hundred names carefully selected to represent in the right proportion each of the four electoral districts in Labrador, and each of the polls in each district.

"You are important in that sample. For your own benefit please complete the enclosed question sheet. When your answers are put together with those of the three hundred and ninety-nine others, I shall be able to present to the provincial government the first real picture of the needs, wants, hopes and complaints of the people of Labrador.

"Now will you please, right away, look over the enclosed question sheet, complete it and mail it to me in the special return address, postage-paid envelope enclosed. Remember, the sooner you get your ideas back to me the sooner I shall be able to go to work for you and your fellow Labradorians."

MR. NEARY: And the questionnaire, Sir, I will just run through it briefly for the benefit of the House, and especially for the minister. The first question is the sex; the second question is age; Annual income; Education; Occupation, such as fishing, hunting, mining, others, (please describe); Resident of Labrador - this is very important - less than two years, two to five years, more than five years; Preferred language, English, French, Indian, Eskimo, other; Please rank (1) for most important, (2) for ~~not~~ more important etc.; Which of the following represent the five most urgent needs of your community? Water supply and sewerage; Medical services; Lower Taxes; Sport and recreation facilities; More jobs and better educational facilities; Improved radio and television; Better air service; A highway across Labrador; A railway across Labrador; Improved coastal boat service; More aid for fishery; Better senior citizen's homes; Other. Please write on reverse side if necessary."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could I table this, Mr. Chairman, before I take my seat?

MR. R. MOORES: I would like a copy of that, if you would.

MR. NEARY: I will keep it until I speak again, Mr. Chairman. I will keep it until I speak again, then I will table it.

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

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Chairman, I have a few questions to ask the minister in response to his few words of introduction there regarding the Department of Rural Development. I was a little bit disappointed, Mr. Chairman, to hear the minister once again, as he did last week and as he often does, in my opinion, talk in

MR. CALLAN: . . . philosophical terms.

MR. FLIGHT: The big philosopher.

MR. CALLAN: He talks about the attitude, and how the attitude has changed in our smaller communities in the rural areas of the Province. These philosophical statements and pious platitudes are all very nice to listen to, and people sitting by, I suppose, enjoy hearing them. Everybody enjoys hearing a good orator. But, Mr. Chairman, it does not get to the root of the problem and the questions that are continually asked regarding the Department of Rural Development.

I do not know where the minister gets his information, Mr. Chairman, regarding the confidence that is restored and the attitude that is changed in the rural areas of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN: The feedback that I get, and this not only pertains to the Department of Rural Development, but to the whole political scene and the whole economic scene of this Province, is that the people are turned off. They are turned off and they are so mixed up and bemuddled that they do not know what to say or what to think of the whole mess.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN: People are turned off because back five or six years ago the propaganda that was on the go persuaded the people that things could be better in the province. Things could be better in the rural areas of the province and province-wide. So they listened to the propaganda and they got a change of government. They got what they voted for. It is gone to the point today, Mr. Chairman, where the people in the rural areas of this province— I know them because there are 36 such communities in my district, The second largest number of communities in any district in the province — the people are, as I said, so mixed up, disheartened, disillusioned they believe nobody any more. So where all this information is coming from it sounds nice to hear it but you know too, where is the proof, that is the question that I ask.

Mr. Chairman, regarding the Department of Rural Development it is a little bit difficult for me I suppose or anybody else to make comments about it or to comment on any aspects of it in very much detail because there are so many questions that are unanswered. We have no facts and we have no figures. The minister refuses to give them. So how can you talk intelligently about a department when you do not know anything about it the minister refuses to give the facts and figures? How can the general public have a feeling of either they think it is a good department or they think it is a bad department, how can they know how to decide and how to make up their minds about a department when they do not know anything about it?

You hear the people talking about the department of fisheries because they know about the department of fisheries. They know what monies are given. They know about the fisheries scandal and so on. But the department of rural development, nobody knows anything, not even the members of this House of Assembly, So how can you talk about it?

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible)

MR. FLIGHT: including the minister of transport.

MR. RIDEOUT: The Minister of Transport knows about every department except his own.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Chairman, I want to quote from a newspaper clipping. It goes back to May 15, 1970. Mr. Chairman, if I could carry on without interruptions!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! The hon. member is having difficulty being heard.

MR. CALLAN: I go back to the newspaper clipping. I go back to May 15, 1970, when a gentleman who now leads this government, this administration, was quoted as saying: "Our best possible role in the future may be as the home for cottage industries. Moores said: To me Newfoundland is going to have to develop excellence in what we do know and what we can be better at, everything from logging mining, fish processing, to sheep raising." Again high sounding, good philosophical stuff. But so far six years later, seven years later still no sign of any of that, even with the brand new department of rural development that was created back in 1972.

On June 2, 1971 the Premier surfaced at the Newfoundland and Labrador Press Club to make his famous promise to reduce the size of the Cabinet from 19 to 12 members. He was going to hold weekly caucus meetings in which backbenchers would be included, and institute a full standing committee system in the legislature. As it turned out Moores' first Cabinet formed the night of January 18, 1971 had 15 members, including himself, and that is the smallest it has ever been.

Mr. Chairman, I contend, and this is the point that I am trying to get at. I contend Mr. Chairman, that there is nothing happening in the department of rural development, this brand

MR. CALLAN:

new department that could not be and would not be happening if the department had never existed. That is my contention. Mr. Chairman, the sawmills in this Province that are being subsidized by government grants and I suppose government loans that are never paid back, so it still sort of a subsidy by the Department of Rural Development - why could these not be handled by the Department of Forestry? Why is a separate department of government necessary to help finance and to reactivate and to liven up the sawmill and the lumber industry in this Province? Why? What about the small farms that are being subsidized through grants and rural development loans and so on which are probably never paid back? We do not know. We do not have the answer. We do not know if the loans are paid back or not. Why are these things not being done by the Department of Forestry and Agriculture? And the fishery projects that are being handled or mishandled as the case may be by the Department of Rural Development, why is this not being done through the Department of Fisheries?

Mr. Chairman, last week in a five minute debate with the Minister of Rural Development I asked some questions and I made some suggestions. I got no answers. Is the minister tabling these answers?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: What are you going to table them for if they are on the record? -

MR. CALLAN: Why does the hon. member not table them?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: (Inaudible)

MR. CALLAN: That is the question, Mr. Chairman. Will the minister give this House some information regarding his Department of Rural Development? What percentage of the loans made by the Rural Development Authority are paid back? What criteria is used in granting these loans? Mr. Chairman, I can quote examples. The minister just now was talking about loans that were made in various districts. And he mentioned myself and the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) as a couple of members that he did favours for in trying to get loans approved.

MR. FLIGHT: Did he do me any favours?

MR. CALLAN: . . . But, Mr. Chairman, I can give examples as well of things that I saw happening in this department long before I ever got involved in politics. And these are the types of things that people hear about and this is what makes the people so disillusioned. I know one gentleman who borrowed approximately \$4,000. He bought a van and welding equipment and he did not use it for one hour, did not use it for one hour. The man was an alcoholic and that was on the public record. The first thing he did was run into a bridge and smash up the van. Eventually after years and so on, you know, the -

AN HON. MEMBER: Name some of the good cases, boy.

MR. CALLAN: Let the minister give us the facts and let him name the good cases. The minister talks in generalities. How can we assess the value of the department when he just talks in generalities. He does not give us the specifics relating to worthwhile projects, projects that were started by rural development grants and loans and how they have employed dozens of people and have become prosperous. As the former speaker, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) was talking just now, you look in the newspaper practically every day and all you see is repossessions by the Department of Rural Development.

MR. ROBERTS: And how many more have they not even bothered repossessing?

MR. CALLAN: So, Mr. Chairman, you cannot help but wonder why the people are so disillusioned. That is all they hear. They hear the same thing that I hear. They hear about the bad cases because bad news spreads fast, as the member for Trinity North (Mr. Brett) well knows. It is up to the minister to tell the good stuff. That is what we are asking for. If his department is functioning well and if his department is producing jobs and so on, then let us hear about it. But at the same time,

MR. CALLAN: Let us hear all the facts and figures.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN: Let us hear all the facts and figures. Why the high degree of repossessions? Why? We know there are an awful lot of repossessions. Why? Is it because the loans were made for political reasons? We hear these things. Let the minister set the record straight. Are these facts, or fiction?

AN HON. MEMBER: As I understand it -

MR. CALLAN: Now, Mr. Chairman, just now, the Member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) was saying that we wanted a list of Rural Development loans, and who they were given to. Now, from my understanding, and this happened before I came to the House of Assembly - as I understand it, only one list was ever tabled in this House, and it was not done since. And the reason why it has not been done since is because that list of names showing the names of the people who received the Rural Development loans and the Rural Development grants, were predominantly - the list contained predominantly P.C. supporters and former candidates, and what have you. Is this the reason why subsequent lists have not been tabled, because this thing is continuing to happen? I do not know, because we are not given that information. Actually, personally speaking, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to see a list of names. If a man goes to a bank here in St. John's, and borrows money to buy a car, or to start a business, it is none of my business, and I do not want to know about it. And I do not want to know the names of the people who receive Rural Development loans, or grants. I do not want it. Personally, I do not want to see it. But can we not have some facts. You know, after all, it is taxpayers' money that we are handling, that we are talking about. So, the people want to know.

Another thing, and I mentioned this last week - it seems to me, again, only from the information that I have, and my information is limited because the minister refuses to give any information - but from the information and the things that I see happening around me, and what I hear from other districts and other parts of the Province. and so on, people who receive the loans and the grants are the people who have money already. They do not need to go to the government. And the only reason they go to the government is because they say,

Well the government will give me a grant, or, I will not have to pay back this loan anyway, because, you know, the government is not going to be foolish enough to come after me, forcing me to pay back a loan - because if the government puts

MR. CALLAN: pressure on me, then they are going to lose a supporter next time around, and they would not dare to go to Court, because it is going to be bad politically. These are the types of things that we hear. And until we have all the facts and all the figures, and until the air is cleared, there is a high degree of foginess, cloudiness, surrounding the department. I have heard people suggest things, and I have had to tell them, no, this is not true - things that have been said about the Department of Rural Development. People have accused other people of getting loans, and so on, and I said, well, no, I know that man did not get the loan for what he has there. He did not get it from Rural Development - I know that. Or woods access roads are put in, and some people say it was put there for that particular sawmill operator, and it was done through Rural Development. And I know it was not true, so I tell them so. But when the picture is cloudy and when we do not know what is happening, we are not given the facts and figures then, of course, you cannot blame people for wondering and talking and guessing.

Mr. Chairman, last week in a five minute debate with the hon. minister, as I said, I put several questions to him, and I suggested why the Department of Rural Development is not functioning the way that people expect it to be. Mr. Chairman, I wonder is the minister satisfied? Is the minister satisfied with his department of government? You do not very often see him getting excited about it and telling the things that his department is doing. Is he satisfied with that department,

MR. CALLAN: or is he disgruntled perhaps? Is he disgruntled because he had to take over a department that was almost gone to the wall as a result of the former minister? That suggestion has been made. I wonder if the minister would tell us. I wonder would the minister tell us what was the percent? What was the percent of collections under the former minister as compared to the percent that the present minister is collecting on overdue loans, overdue payments on loans? Was the percent under the former minister really bad because perhaps that minister you know was not doing a good job in that department? I have heard that suggestion made. The minister appears to be - You know, he is not the fighting man that everybody thought he would be. The minister in Ottawa was a fighter.

MR. FLIGHT: The minister?

MR. CALLAN: No, the member, the present minister.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. CALLAN: No, I have to tell a little joke here, Mr. Chairman.

MR. RIDEOUT: If you heard about the Grand Falls hospital you would not say it was a joke.

MR. CALLAN: I remember when the present minister was out campaigning in the Federal election, the last Federal election. He was out in Norman's Cove, out in my own community there at the Lion's Club center and the minister was making a fiery speech. You know, Send me to Ottawa and I will fight for you. That is the type of person that the minister was.

MR. FLIGHT: On provincial issues, of course.

MR. CALLAN: But anyway, Mr. Chairman, if I am allowed to finish this little joke. Mr. Chairman, the minister was on the stage there, the candidate at that time, he was on the stage - Send me to Ottawa and I will fight for you. Now in that audience there happened to be a couple of drunks and of course I suppose there is a few drunks in every audience especially at political meetings and rallies and this one gentleman in particular said, You do not have to go to Ottawa to fight,

MR. CALLAN: come down, he said, and come outside if you want to fight. But of course the man was drunk. But at that time what I am saying is that the minister was, you know, there was some fight in him that does not seem to be there now. Why? Why is the fight not there? I was not at the meeting, by the way. I was there but I left.

MR. RIDEOUT: You could not take it.

MR. CALLAN: No, actually it was not because the minister was there, it was because of the gentleman who accompanied him, the gentleman who fought so hard to prevent us from getting a stadium at Whitbourne, but of course we got the stadium eventually in spite of him. But anyway these are the questions that we want to know the answers to. Is the minister satisfied with the performance of his department? And is the Department of Rural Development, is it really developing the rural areas of this Province?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! The hon. gentleman's time has elapsed.

MR. CALLAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, that is what estimates are about, are they not? Back and forth. Mr. Chairman, just a few remarks. I will try not to take up the full twenty minutes. First of all, the hon. gentleman, I have to say that I appreciate his remarks because he is a new member and he is struggling along to make his points and he has made some points and I have to say that I have to appreciate his participation. I am not going to try to get his goat but I would say that being sort of my alter ego - the shadow minister, is that what they call him? - he has given me a tremendous amount of confidence today because every time I hear the hon. gentleman speak it makes me a bit more confident perhaps even though I am quite inadequate in quite a number of ways.

Just in one sentence or two, Mr. Chairman, about the satisfaction with the department. I do not think that any department

MR. LUNDRIGAN: of government or any minister of government should reach the point of satisfaction where we think we have arrived. If we ever get to the point where we think we have the answers or that we are totally on the right track then we should cancel it all out and give it up and go on holidays. And this is why we have governments and this is why we have programmes, this is why we have debates to try to find ways and means to readjust, to adapt and to find ways and means of doing things better. But the hon. member, Mr. Chairman, suffers from an unfortunate situation and that is he resides in the constituency which has had the most disadvantages along with our colleague from Trinity North as a result of the Come by Chance Oil Refinery. And I would

MR. LUNDRIGAN: say with no disrespect at all to his remarks that a lot of the areas in his riding have suffered from the fact that they became part of this great industrial thrust. As a result I will suggest to him if he talks to his constituents, and I know he does because he is a genuine individual, he will find a lot of people gave up their rural orientation their rural way of life as fishing, the kinds of things that made them a living or part of a living. I know that they got involved in this new sort of a industrial thrust and it failed on them. Hopefully it will not be a permanent failure. That is the kind of a thing I believe he does come from an area where the impact of rural development has been minimal.

I will even go as far as to say that the whole of the Avalon has maybe felt the impact of rural development to a limited degree; and maybe the Avalon Peninsula today that has been dependent more so than any other part of the province on heavy construction, heavy industry, is the part of the province that has the most difficulty. I have said this to my colleague on many occasions. I can take him on a guided tour of the province and paint pictures of achievement with rural development as the foundation, that are phenomenal and amazing, where instead of resettlement we have had settlement. We have had communities written off and dying or about ready to cave in that have come right to life again. I can take them around and show them all kinds of examples. I will say without being wasting my time on the philosophy, because I know I am wasting my time talking general principles and talking policy and talking philosophy, because nobody believes in that higgledy-piggledy bits and pieces of old nonsense. You know, the hon. member today for a moment reminded me of the fellow who was on the front page of this week's Television guide. What is his name? There is a

MR. LUNDRIGAN: fellow there-did anyone see the television guide? I forget his name, anyway he is on Another World. A lot of bits and pieces of old rumours and bits and pieces of rumours, that kind of stuff really contributes very little to a debate and to try and identify where his party stands on rural development, on the province as a whole.

Mr. Chairman, the member for LaPoile raises his permanent fixture, that is the names of the rural development authority. I have to say to him that I consider it to be a disadvantage to a tremendous number of people who want to avail of a programme, to make the thing into a publicity stunt.

Now, I believe the former minister that the member said he got up and frequently supported and all that, but I have a feeling I have heard, I was not here, that the Opposition led by the hon. member was almost responsible for driving the hon. former minister out of the House on frequent occasions, on frequent occasions. And I believe did he not even give a list one time, did he not? I do not know, I was not around. Did he not give a list one time of the loans that were made, the individuals?

I have been told now. Did I not hear as well that the members got up and checked them off -this fellow down in Green Bay is a Liberal, this fellow here is a Tory, this fellow here we are not certain of and all that kind of nonsense.

Now, Mr. Chairman, you are talking about a small little loan programme that we are very very proud of. As a matter of fact, it is unique in the whole of Canada. I am not about to make this into a political gimmick. I did indicate, my colleague from Placentia West will attest to this, that if members want to come down in the department to get the names of the loans on a confidential basis, with the hope that they will treat them confidentially, we are quite willing to do that.

AN. HON. MEMBER: Why not table them?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I have no intention of tabling them. If it comes to the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation, the hon. member has solid input there. We have had correspondence back and forth with the federal minister, Marcel Lessard. I have just had a notification from the board, and we treat the board in Newfoundland and Labrador Development as somewhat autonomous, I do not tell them what to do. They have indicated to me that they are going to treat their loans similar to the DREE loans. That I think is something which is, maybe should be a feather in the hat of the hon. member. I think that is only fair.

MR. NEARY: I will get all this out of government.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: As long as I am the minister I am not going to bring in the 900-and-some-odd, almost a thousand small loans that we have made and sort them out for people to play a lot of politics with them.

MR. NEARY: I am going to write the Auditor General and ask him to get them for me.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: You can write the Auditor General. Look at the last year's report we have just got a few weeks ago. How much did you find in the Auditor General's Report about rural development? Somebody is satisfied. As a matter of fact I am dissatisfied myself because if I do not run aground on the breast of the Auditor General periodically in a development department, maybe I am not doing my job. That is the biggest criticism of me. The second one I have to agree with the hon. member from Bellevue, is that I have not stood up in the House often enough and thrown out the development loans, thrown out the community projects that we have been involved in, all of the dozens of success stories, the reason being

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

that I have got a funny feeling that there are members of this legislature that I am looking at right now who are still not convinced that rural development is valuable. It has still got to be tens of millions, large and complex and heavily industrialized to be successful - nothing against that, great. But we have gone a considerable distance. I can give the hon. member - he wants a few success stories. We have got a lot of failures too. We have got a lot of failures because we have helped alcoholics that have come to us and put in applications, and we have looked at them and we have had advice from the professionals. They have said he might be able to be rehabilitated, he has been this and that for so many months, will you take the risk? There is a very high risk factor. We have had this documented. And we have sat down and we said yes, we will go with it. And a lot of them have failed. Some of them have come through. And we are satisfied as a department that if we can save one out of ten individuals by a rural development loan and his own enterprise like that then it is a success story. But it is risky. It is risky. And the hon. gentleman gets up and talks about the alcoholic who got a rural development loan and ran into a bridge. Now I am sure he did not mean to sort of reflect on that because you cannot discriminate against an individual because he is an alcoholic or because he formerly failed or because he might fail in the future. We have got a fairly rigid system. If the project has a chance of economic viability, that is the number one criterion. Number two, it has got to be in the areas of some kind of resource development or manufacturing or processing. And we will stretch the point as far as we can to get involved in the Tertiary sector which we have to avoid becoming a bank because the Province cannot afford to loan interest free to all of the needs of all of the industries and all of the working capital that is required for every business, especially the Tertiary sector.

MR. NOLAN: Will the minister permit a question?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Certainly.

MR. NOLAN: I was just wondering just for a matter of clarification which I think might be helpful. I wonder would the minister be good enough to outline just what type of industries monies can be loaned for? I think it is important to do that because it is largely misunderstood.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Yes. Right. Mr. Chairman, I will do that. I do not want to take up the entire time because I want to give the hon. member over there a few of the things that we have been able to do. I will just give him some list of the kinds of industries in the last - since we started, until 1977 we have had 932 industries that we have loaned money to. We have had in agriculture and farming, we have had sixty-five with a gross input of \$552,000. Now I will go on down through these. But let me just say this, to get back to the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) I will get to his questions as we get through. We have got two areas of ARDA involvement generally in the department. One is a project involvement where fifty per cent of the money is funded by the ARDA Programme. And that is matters such as - and I will give him a full list of them, I will run down through the number that - last year we had thirty-eight that we assisted, ARDA projects.

MR. NEARY: Capital?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Not necessarily capital. Some of them are capital. We will even go as far as to help, say, in Greenspond for a couple of years to help them with their smoke house with working capital, or with direct capital assistance over in Doyles, for example. The bulk of those funds have been ARDA funds. Has the hon. member seen the facility in Doyles? Is he not impressed with what local people could do with a couple of hundred thousand dollars? I will give him a run down on what the prospects are there. Now that kind of project is what we call community project funding or pilot projects, their

MR. LUNDRICAN:

difference only in the sense that one might be getting a brand new idea off the ground. The other thing is the ARDA incentives programme which is what I call a mini DREE programme. We have four officials, DREE, Newfoundland and Labrador Development, Industrial Development, Rural Development officials sit as a management board. And they decide on the small ARDA incentives grants. That is where you can get a direct grant if you have got a capital expenditure in machinery in a manufacturing sector. And of course they are almost like mini DREE, up to \$25,000 capital investment you can get \$12,500 of a grant. Now the rural development loans is directly provincial funds, where we can lend up to \$20,000 for up to eleven years repayment if we have got hard, something we can get our hands on in the way of security to be repaid over an eleven year period with a one year forgiveness of repayment to begin with to get the person off the ground. Now that is the hon. member's question. We had sixty-five in agriculture. We had ten in boat building. We had one in casket manufacturing. That is one of the ones that became very controversial three years ago when the hon. former minister was around. We had six in clothing manufacturing. You know, I can give you an example of this Winter wherein the hon. member from Terra Nova (Mr. Lush),

MR. LUNDRIGAN: in his district quite a number of ladies were involved manufacturing parkas in their basements with their sewing machines. They did add a dimension of economic stability to their homes and their livelihood as a result of a rural development loan. Construction, we had 7; electric mechanical services, we had 69 - I say that sounds high because there has only been a few since I have been around - \$444,000. We have had finished lumber, 6, 40,000 fish processing 41 for \$400,000. Footwear manufacturing, 2. Handicraft 32 and away it goes down, pulpwood harvesting we have had a excessive number, 112. We have had 401 in sawmills, almost \$3 million. We have had woodworking like the hon. gentleman from the south of the bay can attest to, there must be a half dozen. As a matter of fact there is plenty now; we will not very anxiously find many more along the south of the bay.

A lot of small industries that are making a living out of small rural development loans along the south of the bay. Almost all of them and that is a total of 932 for \$7 million in loans. We have \$2 million of that repaid. Last year we had a repayment of \$800,000. The repayment is 44 per cent approximately of what it could be. It has gone up from 38 per cent. But I want to say in defence of the former minister that when the programme got off the ground several years ago it was a whole new ball game for the whole department. A lot of the loans were loans that we were finding our way along, feeling our way along and it was very difficult to be that selective. We are a bit more selective now, maybe a little bit too stringent

Now I can go on and tell success stories, and we have had failures.

MR. GALLAN: I wonder if the department has become too selective, selective to the point where, you know, you give the loans to the

MR. CALLAN: people who have the money and therefore you are pretty sure in getting it back, rather than to the people who need it and who have a good idea. I know of good ideas that have been turned down after six or seven months waiting.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, last year we had 112 loans for \$1.4 million in round figures, about 500 jobs as we determined it; created that was last year and that was in excess of the previous year so we did have more. We are getting quite a number of people who are looking for loans. We have to be a bit selective because the member is right that there are people, and we do not catch every one of them, who would use the loans programme just to finance something they can afford to finance. I run into pressure every day from members of the legislature here who twist my arm and say, "Look, help this person," when we have determined ourselves to our satisfaction that they do not need the help. But it is a difficult thing to determine and I am sure we have loaned money to people who did not need it. I am sure of that.

The percentage of the applications we approve, I would say, Mr. Chairman, approximately 50 per cent of the applications. Just a few little stories, and I do not like talking success stories because we do not brag that our programme is the last straw. I do not want to see members hung up on the rural development authority. That is a small part in many ways of the total rural development programme. A lot of the programme has nothing to do directly with a loan or project, because in an area we can very slowly with professional field people get people to become aware of their own community, aware of their own opportunities, less parochial, more aware of their own sense of responsibility to do things on their own, we think we have made a tremendous achievement. Maybe the best example, not with a great deal of input from rural development necessarily, we do not brag about it as our baby, but certainly with extension services at the University

MR. LUNDRIGAN: and ourselves and other agencies, Fogo Island is an example. In 1968 when I went to Fogo Island the first time

MR. STRACHAN: Are you taking all the credit for Fogo Island?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: No! I just indicated my hon. distinguished colleague was one of the great spokesman in the House and I admire him greatly for his new-found sense of patriotism in our province, that we take a limited amount of credit for Fogo Island. We take some credit. But we ended up going to Fogo Island as a government one way or another through the extension services—not necessarily this government. There has been a whole change of attitude and today the people in the province will tell you, and the people on Fogo Island, that it is one of the areas that has the least sense of resettlement left in them. They have the most sense of achievement maybe of almost any community on the whole of the north east coast. That community some ten years ago, as the member will be able to tell, was talking resettlement.

Now, my friend from Twillingate of course would deny this, but I have been told the story, which has to be a joke,

MR. LUNDRIGAN: like my colleague told the joke about the drunk in Bellevue. Certainly there were no drunks in Norman's Cove, certainly there would be nobody come up and challenge me. If he did I probably would have taken him on anyway.

But there is a story emanating from Fogo Island which is always told, and perhaps the hon. gentleman for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) can correct the record, that when he had his great conference he planned to go to Twillingate or to Fogo one time, and announce a resettlement programme. I believe the general intention was to have the people given the option to move to Musgrave Harbour - now this is what the people tell me, sort of in social, casual ways - only to find out some weeks before he went that the people of Musgrave Harbour had petitioned the government to move to Come by Chance, and it sort of got everybody all off track. But I can categorically state, because I had it thrown at me in public meetings whether I believed that the people of Fogo Island should resettle, I was the most die-hard anti-resettlement person in the Province. I was the one who got the hon. the former Premier in trouble with the - unfortunately he has passed on - Senator Laing, then the Minister of Public Works, when I published some letters regarding Greenspond and Long Island. In those letters there was an indication from Mr. Laing, who was a good friend of mine, the Minister of Public Works, that these communities were on the resettlement list. The then Premier got into a great national fuss with the then Minister of Public Works and called him a jackass, I believe was the term, if that is parliamentary. There was a great fuss but the fact of the matter was that a lot of those communities like Fogo Island, Greenspond, St. Brendan's, Long Island and literally hundreds of

MR. LUNDRIGAN: communities were to die and give up the ghost. If the hon. gentleman goes in these communities today will get thrown over the head of the wharf, if he happens to mention resettlement or anything akin to that nasty word.

Mr. Chairman, in the Western region we had an individual from Flat Bay who got \$10,000 from us in 1973, currently paid up to date, balance now \$5,000, recently approved for an ARDA grant for expansion - that is the grant now, that is an outright grant, no repayment - he has submitted for an additional \$10,000 for our next board meeting and unless I am turned down by my board he will get his \$10,000 further loan. He started out with a one-man operation, he now has thirty-four people employed, he plans to have forty-five people employed. Sixteen of the people were former social assistance recipients.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Now that is a little small story, not expected to get a lot of press on it because half the problem, you know, Mr. Chairman, without being condemnatory of any individual, is that a lot of the things that we -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I will give it another dozen after I get my feet again, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I did not particularly intend to get involved in this debate. I certainly do not know much from a philosophical point of view about Rural Development, as the minister obviously does. I noted that while he was talking I

MR. FLIGHT: apparently was shaking my head and he assumed that I was questioning what he was saying, he assumed that I was not agreeing with the competence or qualifications or performance of his staff.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: You were saying that you were not getting co-operation.

MR. FLIGHT: It is not important whether I get co-operation, Mr. Chairman, it is important whether the people who come to Rural Development get co-operation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: That is the important thing.
Mr. Chairman, first let me say that I have nothing but the highest praise for the people in Confederation Building with Rural Development -

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: - the minister's A.D.M. and some of his top people. But, Sir, I would suggest to the minister that he is not in touch, and a lot of his people in Confederation are not in touch with what is going on out in those branch offices. Mr. Chairman, I came into this House on September 18, 1975, and there was then on file with Rural Development an application for a home industry. It had been on file for awhile. The man was led to believe it would be approved and, Mr. Chairman, roughly eighteen months later, that plant is not in production yet. In most cases, Sir, the reason it is not in production yet is because of bottlenecks in the Department of Rural Development. In most cases, the local office - and I do not even want to name the office, I would imagine everyone knows - when the guy goes in and he thinks he has it made, and he thinks he has met all the specifications that are required by Rural Development, two months pass, he calls up and says, Look, I am no further ahead now than I ever was, what

MR. FLIGHT: is the problem now? He goes back to Rural Development, to the local office, thinks it is straightened out again, but two months after there is something else.

Mr. Chairman, as far as I am concerned, that is not performance, an idea a year and-a-half ago may not be an idea today. Eighteen months is long enough for anybody to lose faith and

MR. FLIGHT: give up and say to heck with it, and there is a chance of an industry going down the drain. And again, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that there is a very great possibility that some of the rural development staff outside of Confederation Building - and I do not intend to name anybody; if the minister were to push me enough I would name them, the staff and the clients and the people looking for rural development loans - are not acting in the better interest of those people. Nine out of ten of the people who come into rural development with an idea comes in in the first instance for information. They do not even know if they are eligible for a loan, but the type of treatment in lots of cases they get there is discouraging and they never come back. Some of those people treat you as though you have to have a degree in commerce or a CA before you come in and make application for a rural development loan and in most cases the hon. member for Bellevue is right. I have seen situations, I have seen rural development applications turned down that if the man had the requirements that were being pushed at him by the department he would not have needed to come for the loan in the first place.

Now repossessions, Mr. Chairman. I am aware, and I can name the repossessions and I can name the people who after three years not one cent paid on the loan, a \$10,000 piece of equipment and not one cent and no repossession. Other cases six months and a repossession order going out. There has to be some criteria. There has to be some rules and regulations under which we control -

MR. ROBERTS: There is. Surely -

MR. FLIGHT: What are the rules? I am aware of a situation, Mr. Chairman, and this is the part of rural development that the general public in Newfoundland sees, this is the part that the guy who is wondering whether he should go for a loan or not sees. I am aware of a situation where a \$10,000 planer had been financed by rural development; three years had passed and not one cent was

MR. FLIGHT: repaid. That planer, \$10,000 of the people of this Province, was taken and thrown in the Grand Falls highways depot, out in the rain. Now anyone who knows anything about planers knows that a month in the rain can ruin a planer, and three months later that planer was still sitting there and then somebody made the decision to take it and haul it back and give it back to the guy from whom it was first repossessed. Now let us see the minister respond. It is an isolated case. Sure it is an isolated case, but if I am aware of that case how many more isolated cases are around the Province. I would like to see the minister stand up and explain that isolated case. Where is the legislation? Where is the criteria? Where is the - What are the rules of the game? And while that planer was sitting in the Department of Highways yard in Grand Falls, rural development was forcing another applicant to go out and buy a \$10,000 planer when that one had been repossessed, after being out for ten years, had depreciated to a minimum of \$6,000 the guy who was doing the business told me that. He was suggesting that, look, let me buy the contract or put it on tender and I will bid on it. No, Sir, they forced him to go into a \$10,000 loan on another planer.

And the situation we have right now, Mr. Chairman, whether the minister cares to admit it or not that we are financing \$10,000 and \$12,000 and \$15,000 pieces of equipment for people in Newfoundland and if they default the thing goes on public auction and some money man from Nova Scotia can come in and walk off with, come in with \$2,000 or \$3,000 cash in his pocket and walk off with a \$10,000 or \$12,000 piece of equipment that this Province financed in the first place and the guy who is looking for a \$2,000 or \$3,000 loan to buy a piece of secondhand equipment is forced - They say, No, we cannot. You have to bid on that. We will set you up for another \$10,000 loan. We will finance another piece of equipment for you.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is the type of thing

MR. FLIGHT: that the rural development - I very much suggest that not only the minister but some of his top people are out of touch with what is happening out in those locations. I have heard some stories that would raise your hair, Mr. Chairman. I have heard stories of where there was skidders, J5's going on tender, and somebody who was in the business of repairing equipment was broached on the subject and said, Why do you not tender. You will get a good deal. Fix it up and we will put it on the market and make some money. Now, Mr. Chairman, I would not have thrown out that thought if I did not know what I was talking about. I do know what I am talking about and there is skulduggery going on in the Department of Rural Development.

AN HON. MEMBER: - aware of it.

MR. FLIGHT: Am I aware? I know that is up to the minister and it is up to his department and it is up to the auditor general to find out. It is not tightly controlled. The Department of Rural Development in the small industry - Again the minister is back in his place now and I am going to suggest to the minister that his philosophical

MR. FLIGHT:

talk on rural development, yes, I agree with him. It was probably one of the greatest things that could ever be to Newfoundland. Maybe that is the way we have got to go. But I have in my eighteen months in this House as a member run into a situation where the rural development is being used. There seems to be no set criteria, seems to be no rules as far as repossession is concerned. One person goes three years, no repossession. Somebody else goes six months, bang, repossession. We are getting hundreds of thousands of dollars wasted, equipment rusting out in highway's depots yards, a \$10,000 planer, or I am repeating myself all over again for the sake of the minister in case he did not hear it.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible.)

MR. FLIGHT: Well, very good. Now, Mr. Chairman, the minister said on four or five occasions in this House, I have heard him myself, he hinted at it today, that rural development have created jobs, 500, 600, 700 jobs. Now I would think it is incumbent on the minister when he stands up to tell us where those jobs are. I suspect that the most jobs that have been created by rural development is administration jobs within his own department - three or four staffers in Grand Falls, three or four in every rural area where he set an office up. And I suspect that those are some of the jobs that have been created. I would like for him to stand up in this House and point out where the jobs have been created, jobs based on utilizing the raw materials of this Province, like the sawmilling operations, that type of thing. I am aware of a carpenter shop that was set up, Mr. Chairman. The man who it was set up for, had he had the wherewithal to have done the business, sure it would have created a job. But in the meantime, I will tell you, in making the loan the guy was taken out of the mines. He already had a full time job where he was earning \$10,000 to \$12,000 a year. And he was taken out of the mines and set up in a carpenter shop. He was into

MR. FLIGHT:

it a year, had not made a payment - it was not repossessed either, by the way - it was just somebody came and made another proposal to rural development. And now a person who was qualified to have walked in and arranged a \$50,000 loan, an interest free rural development loan owns the carpenter shop. I have got nothing against that, but it bothers me to hear the minister stand up and say we have to make mistakes.

The operation of the Department of Rural Development could stand an investigation, Mr. Chairman, not the performance of the minister or his A.D.M. or his directors, but what is going on out in the hinterland out there. Because there is far too much, there is far too much authority vested in the people who are running those offices, far too much authority. They decide - I know situations, Mr. Chairman, where they have decided - in walked Jack Jones and said, "I have a project here I would like to get off the ground." And they make the decision as to whether they are going to recommend the programme to rural development in St. John's or not. I have seen applications rejected and have interceded and arranged that they at least be sent to St. John's to be turned down. Turn them down on their merits, not because some guy does not like the colour of somebody's hair after he lives in a certain area too long.

So, Mr. Chairman, I suspect I am going to get into this again on the heads. But that is all I have to say. And the minister picked me out and suggested that maybe the reason I was getting the kind of co-operation I wanted because of what I interpreted to be some sort of self-importance, because I am a politician or what have you. And I wish to tell the minister this, that I have got as much co-operation as I want or expect to get from the Department of Rural Development. And I do not feel that I am filled with any more self-importance than he the minister himself is. That is it, the answer to that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I think there are about 900 places in this Province that are populated. I think that is about the number. There were 1,300, I believe, the day we became a Province, about 900 now. That is Newfoundland and Labrador, both together. And I believe that in about 350 of these 900, a little more than one-third, the fishing industry is carried on. I do not believe that the fishing industry in our Province is carried on today in more than 350 different places. And in some of those 350 places it is carried on on a very small scale. In some cases it is just a bit of lobstering in

MR. SMALLWOOD: the early summer, and, in other places, lobster and perhaps salmon. And, in still other places, there would be three or four boats, or even four or five boats engaged in the fishery. But taking them all, large and small, I would say that about 350 settlements in the Province are in the fishery, and about 40 others are engaged in fish processing. It is easy to remember the places: St. Anthony, LaScie, Bonavista, Catalina, and so on, St. John's, the Southern Shore, Placentia Bay and the South West Coast, about 40 places.

And there are about 15 places in the Province that get their living primarily from mining. I do not mean that there are 15 mining towns, but there are about 15 places whose population get their living primarily from mining.

And then, in the cutting and handling of pulpwood and saw logs and lumber and woodworking plants, you have, I believe, about 150 settlements in the Province where the people get most of their living from the forests of the Province.

And then, you have about 12 other places that you might call industrial centres - Corner Brook, Grand Falls, Labrador City, City of Wabush, Churchill Falls, and so on, about 12 places that are industrial, and about 25 places that get their living primarily from farming.

Now, if you add that up, Mr. Chairman, you will find that the total comes to something of the order of 600 settlements in our Province - 600 of the 900 - which leaves you, at the moment, about 300 places in Newfoundland that have within their own borders, within their own boundaries, no visible means of living, 300 places whose population have to leave. They have to go somewhere else to earn their living. They keep their homes there. Their families are there. Their churches are there. Their schools are there. Their children are there. And, in effect, those 300 places - approximately 300 - are what are sometimes called 'dormitory towns'. In other words, it is where the people sleep, and their children go to school, and they and their children go to church. It is their place of habitation, but it is not their place of earning a living. And they go out on the roads, at road construction and at paving, and at other types of construction. And they go in the bush. They go anywhere they can get a job - anywhere other than within their own 300 settlements.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now, Sir, I am inclined to believe that, with the coming of the 200 mile fishing limit, the number of places in our Province that are engaged in the fisheries will go up from the present 350 - approximate number - to, maybe, 450 - perhaps as many as another 100 places will emerge, will come back into the fishery, some of them, perhaps, being places that never were engaged in the fishery. But, in the main, they will be places returning to the fishing activity. Now that, if it happened, if that happy event occurred, we would then have not the present 300 settlements, large and small, that have no economic activity of their own, or virtually none. That number would be reduced to approximately 200 places. And, what puzzles me, very frankly, is what we are going to do, what anyone is going to do, about those

MR. SMALLWOOD:

200 places. When you look at Newfoundland in the last five, ten, fifteen and twenty and twenty-five years, you will notice something that is very noticeable, very remarkable. You will see Freshwater near Placentia, and you will see Bay Roberts and you will see Clarenville and you will see Glovertown and the Windsor and Lewisporte and Springdale and St. John's. You will see a number of places in the Province whose population has increased enormously, relatively speaking. St. John's today has become one of Canada's larger cities. Our population in metropolitan St. John's today must be 125,000 to 140,000. Remember that throughout the lives of even the youngest of us here this afternoon, in the earlier part of our lives, the population of St. John's was 60,000 or 50,000. I remember when it was 40,000. And today it is three times as many as that. And there are at least twenty-five towns dotted about, towns that would be as big as Carbonear, as big as Harbour Grace as big as Placentia, as big as Twillingate. You have got twenty-five or thirty towns in St. John's today dotted around that have been built the last five, eight, ten, twelve, fifteen, twenty years. The way St. John's has grown is fantastic. Where did the people come from that have flocked into St. John's? Thousands, and literally thousands of new homes built, houses built, where have they come from? Have they come in from outside Newfoundland? In the main they have come from the settlements dotted along our Coast. Where have the people come from to Bay Roberts, to Clarenville, to Grand Bank and Fortune and Marystown? Where have they come from to Lewisporte and Glovertown and Springdale? They have come from other places in Newfoundland. So that you have on the one hand - the population dropping rather rapidly in hundreds of places, and in a couple of dozen places the population increasing just as rapidly as it decreases in the others. Now when you remember, Mr. Chairman, that in Canada in the last 100 years and in the United States and in England and France and Germany and every country of Europe

MR. SMALLWOOD:

and every country of Asia and every country of South America and every country of Africa and all over the Carribean and all over the West Indies and all over Central America, all around the world for 100 years and longer, much longer, with accelerating tempo, with increasing speed, the population of the world has been moving from the rural sparsely populated areas into the urban centres. Dare we believe that in Newfoundland that trend is not going to prevail here as it is everywhere else? Dare we believe that we are going to be able to keep those 200 places intact? Now the minister, he is minister not only of Industrial Development. He is minister also of Rural Development. And he has two staffs. He has a staff for each of those two departments. He is a minister of two departments, one Industrial, the other Rural. At the moment we are discussing Rural Development. Surely the minister must know in his heart, he is an outharbourman himself, he comes from one of the largest places in Conception Bay, a remarkable people, a dynamic people.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Always have been.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes. And there was a time, not a great many years ago, when Upper Island Cove was one of the great fishing towns of this Province. Is it today?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: It is becoming again.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Becoming, Yes, we are all becoming. Everything is becoming. But how fast, how rapidly, with what degree of determination? The fact of the matter is that Rural Development, if you lend somebody \$10,000 or \$30,000 to start a little something in his little harbour and he employs three people, God help us, that is good. That is good for the two or three people who were engaged and it gives the minister a sort of a glow of satisfaction, Anyway I have helped those three people to make a good honest, decent living. They are producing something.

MR. SMALLWOOD:

They are doing something, instead of being on relief, instead of being on unemployment insurance they are working. And that can give him a sort of a good feeling. And he can look at 900 such jobs and these 900 jobs, if they average three persons or four persons per job, per enterprise, what are we talking about? We are talking about 200 or 300 little activities, or is it 900 separate activities? All right, 900 employing roughly how many?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: That is only one area, that is the loans, development of 3,000.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Three thousand persons.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: About 3,000 persons.

MR. WHITE: Three to a project.

MR. SMALLWOOD: An average of three persons to the project and about 900 projects in about, say, 300 settlements. Well,

MR. SMALLWOOD: that is good. Who dares condemn it? Who dare sneer at it? But when you look at the problem of this Province, its present problem and the problem of its future, the problem of holding our 550,000 people here, keep them from flocking off to Ontario or anywhere in the world, keeping them here, when you look at that problem it is going to take much, much more - admirable as these jobs are, admirable as these projects may be - it is going to take a lot more than that to keep our people here in this Province. Even, Mr. Chairman, when you talk of fisheries, when you talk of farming, when you talk of woodworking, even these benefit enormously from the larger type of industry. The best help that farming could get in Newfoundland today would be for Come by Chance to come back with a bang, another one or two sizeable industries or mining developments to occur. That would be the greatest way you could help agriculture. You provide markets for them. You find people who are earning money - \$12,000; \$14,000; \$18,000 a year - they would become good customers for farmers and for all kinds of small secondary industries - the biscuit factories, the margarine plant, all kinds of factories and enterprises that we already have, good for the sawmill good for the little woodworking plants, good for almost everything and where you will tear your heart out, tear your heart out trying to get a few hundred men working in small projects, which if they are good, if they are sound, if they are permanent that is wonderful. If they are just fly-by-night, if they are come-day-go-day-God-send-Sunday, if there is a very high proportion of failure I would still do it, if I were the minister, and I would applaud him if he persists in doing it, and taking chances and taking chances and risking public money to create jobs. I am all for that.

But let us not kid ourselves. Let us not kid ourselves that that is the ultimate answer to the problems of the future in this Province. I am not happy about it. I do not believe that it is possible, if it is not possible across Canada, in Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island - little Prince Edward Island, if you cannot

Mr. Smallwood: do it there, if you cannot do it in New Brunswick, if you cannot do it all across Canada, all across the United States, all across the world, if you cannot stem this inexorable movement of people from the rural areas, from the countryside to what we would call outports, if you cannot stop that trend into the city what is the chance of doing it in Newfoundland, if you continue to have schools, if you continue to get thousands and tens of thousands of Grade XI graduates, if you continue to operate eighteen vocational trade schools, if you continue to operate the College of Fisheries, Navigation, Technology, and the College of Technology and the University, how do you hope to keep them down on the farm when they have seen gai Paris? How do you propose to do it?

This is why I plead with the minister, forget his ideology, forget the fact that for twenty-three years the party that opposed my administration made almost a religion of opposing resettlement assisting, aiding, helping people who wanted to move, helping them to do so when it was completely voluntary and they wanted to do it. I plead with him, if he knows any place in Newfoundland today "

MR. SMALLWOOD: whose people genuinely want to move out of it, help them to do so. I heard this very day from an hon. member of this House about a place where every last living soul in it wants to get out. They see no future there for themselves or for their children and they want to get out but there is no help. Help them to get to a place where the youngsters can get a half decent education. Help them - even if the grownups have no better chance of getting a job where they move to than they have now where they move from. At least help them to move if not anything else for the sake of the children and for the sake of the women and maybe the men will have as good a chance of getting a job as they have now where they are. I have never for a moment held out the idea of resettlement as something that was going to give men a better chance to earn a living. I have never used that argument.

The argument I have always had in my mind and in my heart was that if you are going to have teachers that are highly educated and trained and qualified and well paid, you are not going to get them to go to the little places with the one room schools. They will not go.

MR. CANNING: You will get them to go. That is one of the reasons those people left these places, they did not have teachers.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Many of the teachers are people who came from those little places and they will not go back. Just as many of the nurses -

MR. MORGAN: They are going back now though.

AN HON. MEMBER: They are going back now though.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, they are going back to one room schools, qualified teachers -

AN HON. MEMBER: They got no choice.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, maybe they go now because they are unemployed.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, God save us and God help us! That is not

MR. SMALLWOOD: what we want, is it?

MR. MORGAN: I could have told you that long ago. St. Brendan's is about the prime example.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am going down to St. Brendan's I think on Friday night. I am speaking at the St. Gabriel's School graduation banquet and it is the first time I have been there in a long time. But do not - Kid me not, kid me not about teachers wanting to go into little places with one room schools. If they are unemployed and rather than go on unemployment insurance they are going to go back, do not hold that up as willingness on their part.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is no such thing. How you can get, how you can preserve these 200 places? Now mind you, I have already said that I see where at least another 100 places that today are not in the fishing industry can be brought back into it. I can see that and the Minister of Fisheries, all credit to him, is making an heroic effort to do it and I believe that all his colleagues are backing him on that. I believe that every man on that side of the House, as every man on this side of the House sees that this is one of the hopes of the future, one of the all too few hopes we have for the future of Newfoundland. I hope that nothing that I have said will have discouraged the minister in any shape or form, in any degree. Kid at it, but let us not kid ourselves that we have the answer yet to the future of this Province. We have not. We do not have it.

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

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, just for two or three minutes to rebut the hon. gentleman. First of all, I have to indicate that I would not want the House to misconstrue the fact that the Department of Rural Development is one, and but one, force of the government. The Department of Fisheries is another force. The Department of Mines and Energy is another force. The Department of Industrial Development is another force. The Department of Forestry is another force. The Department of

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Agriculture is another force and we can go on with every other department. The Department of Rural Development, and I would not want-and I always get a bit nervous when we have problems and troubled times that hon. members latch on to something and try to identify with it as the answer. It is not the answer. Rural Development is one of the forces in the Province that we feel as a government has been one of the great forces. It has helped, if nothing else, to re-orient the people of our Province to a realization that there is a tremendous future in a lot of our smaller towns.

Now the hon. gentleman I have to congratulate him on one point and that is his intellectual honesty. I have listened on many occasions and always have been fascinated to see the hon. gentleman, who is able to stand in his place and verbalize his thinking so effectively, telling me that he has some idea of what he stood for. He is not going behind closed doors today to cover up the fact that he does believe in resettlement. He is imploring me to reconsider the position we have taken on resettlement. He is suggesting that there is going to be a hundred communities, given the optimism of the 200 mile limit, and given the fact that a lot of the communities with the 200 mile limit will have some dimension of economic stability found through fisheries, even given all these factors there will be a hundred communities that will have, in his own terms, no future. Now

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I have to reject that in total, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I did not say that now, I did not say

no

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, let me say -

MR. SMALLWOOD: And no economic -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: - economic base and he suggests that we need to have a continuation of the resettlement programme. It goes on to say that, "Do not fool yourselves with your idealism that the little odds and ends, if you want to call it that, of rural development achievement will satisfy the needs of this Province." I agree with the hon. member. I also agree, and I would like this debated at some given point, that for any government to try to force economic development, force economic development, pick up public dollars and say, "We have got an unemployment problem, 19.1 per cent," and say that we have got the need of heavy industry, realizing we have got a need for heavy industry to take government dollars and try to force development - maybe development that cannot stand on its own feet, major, massive development. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that would be a major catastrophe. We have already seen evidence of it in the last number of years and if we cannot through an emerging economy based on the bit of resources we have, if we cannot provide the opportunities for our people I guess we are going to be in trouble. Because I do not think a lot of the thinking of the hon. gentleman is able to float, because we cannot provide the financial mechanism to day, the dollars and cents to provide the economic base that the people need, unless we gradually and on our own, with our own people, with our own small communities, our own ingenuity, our own engineering capability, our own planning capability, construction capability, processing capability, unless we can build it up slowly it is going to take a long number of years.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: If somebody said to me today, "Put \$50 million behind an industry to create 3,000 or 4,000 jobs," when we have got no chance of its survival, or a danger that it will not survive, I would be reluctant to recommend that to my colleagues. And I believe we have to concentrate on what we have in our Province and we have to be less than anxious to try to just solve the unemployment problem because we cannot solve it by using government dollars to create an artificial economy. And I believe the hon. gentleman has been, sort of in his eagerness like all of us to satisfy the unemployment problem, has been responsible for trying to artificially create an economy that has not succeeded.

No, I do not believe in resettlement. I am totally against it. And I believe that the world, although I have no relationship to Bertrand Russell and Malcolm Muggeridge, but I believe the world has gone through a phase where there is this great aim at getting to the urban setting, this great urban drift. I believe people have changed in the last decade and they are recognizing that there is a value system, there is a quality of life in the rural setting even if it does not have the heavy kind of secure materialistic base that is worthwhile. I believe the whole world has recognized it.

I picked up the paper today, I do not know if that is The Telegram, and I read somewhere where a \$2 or \$3 piece of equipment, where was it - I saw it somewhere today, lying somewhere, a bit of equipment in one of the - a generating system in some city put many millions of people in the dark. Where was that?

MR. MURPHY: That was in New York.

AN HON. MEMBER: \$50 switch.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: A \$50 switch in the corridor, it knocked the hell - you know, a population of a whole region in the dark and sent them into a panic.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The hon. members who have travelled a bit more than I have can tell you about what has happened in New York in the Summertime, the air conditioning system brown outs, there is a whole feeling that we cannot manage the urban setting. Mankind has not developed the intellectual capacity or developed the aids, even with computers, to handle the kinds of settings that we are talking about in a lot of the urban parts of our Province, in our world. Three million in the dark, the member for St. John's Centre (Mr. Murphy) passes me along, Mr. Chairman, because it is very warm right now.

MR. SMALLWOOD: How many of the population will leave?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: 3 million left in the dark? A lot of them will not,

MR. SMALLWOOD: It decreases every year by year.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Does it? What about the New York population?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That decreases.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Does it? The hon. member is -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Every city in the United States and every city in Canada.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Frequent visitor, out last year -

Twelve months ago I was in New York, I was on my way somewhere out of the country and I got there and I never had time to learn about the whole of New York, and I said to the taxi driver,

"I want you to take me down around some of the areas in the city where the people have the most disadvantages," Harlem and various other parts of the city. And I saw whole city blocks, whole ranges, whole communities, populations the size of St. John's, nobody living there. The whole empire, windows broken out and delapidated and people had left the city on the broad of its back, bankrupt.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Come on. Come on. Come on.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The American Government had to bail it out.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Boston is -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: This is what you are getting in a lot of our urban settings. The people are concerned especially with the energy crisis. And I say, Mr. Chairman, we have a lot to be thankful for, Even with the unemployment problem we have today a lot of the people in the rural communities who have some kind of an ownership of some property, have some kind of a secure dollar flowing in - they can grow a few vegetables, can earn a livelihood in some kind of a way relating to resources, are better off than they are in the urban setting. I would say today that the most disadvantages are in the urban parts of our Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Exactly.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: And I get great compassion for my colleagues, the St. John's members, when they talk to us and say to me, "Look, you had better recognize that we have problems in the urban setting today in our Province!" I am against resettlement. I believe very firmly, Mr. Speaker, that a lot of people could have been better off if they had been left and encouraged to develop their rural economies. No great effort was put into encouraging development of rural economies.

The member is on his way to St. Brendan's this weekend. I

MR. LUNDRIGAN: do not know when he was down to St. Brendan's last, but I believe he can tell you little stories that I will not tell you in the House today.

When I walked into the department a year and-a-half ago, the first thing that happened somebody came along to me and said, "I am on the way to Glovertown." "What are you going to do in Glovertown?" "I am going to negotiate with the town council for seventy building lots. We can provide in Rural Development under the resettlement programme \$3,000 per building lot, a serviced lot, we are allowed to give this, and we are going to arrange with the town council in Glovertown for \$210,000 to develop seventy building lots." "Congratulations! What for?" "To move the people from St. Brendan's." I said, "Cancel it. You are not going to St. Brendan's." I will tell you the rest of the story, that I have had to pay off the Glovertown Town Council in the last twelve months for some of the expenses they incurred in the development plan to resettle St. Brendan's. St. Brendan's was on this list that is so controversial.

I said, "Let us seek and weep. First of all cancel it, put it out of the people's minds so there is no anxiety, and let us see if we can do something about it." This present, past Winter, with the co-operation of the member for Gander - Twillingate, we were able to get some work done on the wharf. And I personally with Father Parsons and other people, made the representation then, as my old federal seat, and we were able to get the money approved for a fishing wharf, a premises on which we can build a facility. The Minister of Fisheries turned to and provided the funds, I believe it was the highest amount of money next to a couple of places like Island Cove and a couple of

MR. LUNDRIGAN: others, to provide the monies for a facility to handle fish. Not to freeze and thaw and cut and all the rest of it, not a big processing facility.

There has been a complete change of attitude. Two new houses gone up, seven other families have asked me, and I have the authority - and I should not say this too loud - to allow them to reoccupy their homes. There are nine new householders this year in that community.

Greenspond: I will not tell the story; I will wait for my colleague the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Cross) to tell the story. A whole change around of attitude. Musgrave Harbour: A few years ago I went down as an elected member. Musgrave Harbour, the - what is his name? -

MR. FLIGHT: Talk about your estimates, boy.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: That is the estimates. That is the guts and the essence of the estimates, not the nonsense about the bit of rusty stuff out in Grand Falls, little old nonsense because the hon. member has not graduated from high school yet. Do not talk to me about that kind of nonsense! That is the extent of his capability.

Mr. Chairman, this is the kind of debate that we have to get involved in, whether we believe in further centralization -

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: - pooling everybody together in dungeons where they have no opportunity.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear. hear!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Ask the member for Placentia about what is going on in Placentia Bay today. And by the way, I think it would not be inappropriate if

MR. LUNDRIGAN: members were to recognize -
and maybe, Mr. Chairman, it is a little bit sort of out
of order perhaps, that we pay tribute to Ray Guy for an
achievement today which has to be a first in the
Province. Hon. members might not be aware that he wond
the Leacock award for literary achievement on his book
That Far Greater Day, which is one of the things I am
most proud of, the way that Breakwater Books and Ray
Guy and these people have tried to capture in literature
the essence of what Newfoundland is all about. I hope
that tomorrow someone will move a resolution along these
lines.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Getting back, Mr. Chairman,
to the point about Placentia Bay, there is evidence
of the people going back to the communities. The member
for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) will know that this
Summer there are going to be seventy or eighty fishing
crews. We have to spend money now doing up the community
stage. And you fly over Merasheen Island - a real tragedy!
here are the church walls all fallen in, the homes all
blown down, and we are going back now trying to help
them revitalize their economy.

MR. NEARY: What about Tack's Beach?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Tack's Beach is - my old buddy
Max Haynes who is teaching up North used to education me
about Tack's Beach.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is the minister going to help
to get the bank dory fishery restored also?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, I have some roots -

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is on a par. It is on a par.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The hon. member - I have roots!

You know, Roots, the U.S., the famous effort now in
the book and the film and that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is silly fellow, is it not?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Silly fellow! The hon. member has forgotten his roots.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about Upper Island Cove?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: That is his problem. He has forgotten his roots. He is out of touch with the Province.

MR. FLIGHT: Are you going to resettle Exploits Island?

AN HON. MEMBER: What about Upper Island Cove.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Musgrave Harbour:1968 - people were talking about going to Come By Chance, nobody discouraged them. People have got to be given encouragement and assistance to move to where the jobs are. To end it up, Mr. Speaker, this year with the Minister of Fisheries and ourselves working together we got a facility there which has been a federal facility. There is a cutting line there. There were twenty new homes last year built in Musgrave Harbour. That is the reason they are in clamoring to get a new school out in Musgrave Harbour right now. Their enthusiasm was gone to zero, Now twenty new homes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the minister allow me? Does he not realize that he is citing the examples of the places to which, not from which, to which people are moving, that if they move in there they must have come from somewhere, and that you have maybe twenty or twenty-five places, thirty places in Newfoundland that are growing rapidly as the other places go down.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, I have got a list, There are 281 communities that were crossed off the face of the earth that the hon. member cannot take any great deal of credit for. I have got another list of communities, Mr. Speaker, I have not counted these up but there are roughly 100. A lot of the communities today are growing and starting to prosper. They were to be resettled. I mentioned St. Brendan's, Greenspond is another one. The population of Greenspond has increased in the last twelve months, six new homes gone up. It has not got the most steady economy but the people are starting to recognize that they are sitting on something that we almost threw away, the fisheries. If there is

MR. LUNDRIGAN: anything in our fisheries programme today it is the fact that we are a bit late in getting there.

The member talks about 300 communities that are affected by fishing. I will challenge his figures. He stood up here today and he made up a list in his mind, 900 communities, 300 I will say are fishing communities.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I said 350.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: 350 fishing communities. I would guess, and my own feeling is there are not 900 communities left in the Province. There were 1100 in 1954 and the aim of the administration of that day was to reduce that to 450. That was the official aim of the government of that day.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not so! Not so!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: 450 communities.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is absolutely not true.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I am advised by people who were around at the time.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not so.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: It has been reduced to 300 communities in round figures in this Province today. I would say, I would guess there are no more than 100 communities at the most that are not affected by the fishery, not 100.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is not one that is not affected. I am not talking about those that are not affected.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Participating. He mentions Upper Island Cove. I would like to invite him back to the walled city, as he so colourfully classified that community, my home town and Mr. Chairman's home town.

The fishing just about disappeared in Upper Island Cove, almost down to zero. You know the biggest problem there today? The biggest problem is that the licencing system, which has to be imposed because the resource has not yet replenished itself, is making it almost impossible for a lot of people who do

MR. LUNDRIGAN: not see any other opportunities, it is making it impossible for them to get fishing. We have about fifty fishermen right now, this past Winter the unemployment rate was high. The Minister of Fisheries and the member worked out an agreement and they got \$75,000 I believe for a small holding unit.

I am told by officials in the Department of Fisheries it is the best use that has ever been made of a public dollar. They have got of course all the crafts, all the skills, they can build anything. They can build the Empire State Building without going outside the town. And today you have got a tremendous revival in the fishery. We have got people out on every facet of it, every aspect of it. And I will go as far as to say, Mr. Speaker, if we cannot make it on the few resources we got I would be very, very reluctant to start to risk any more big bulks of public dollars in trying to artificially stimulate the economy. And we have got a few dollars here. It is not big stuff. It is not going to solve the problem. When I get around to Thursday, if I get a chance on the Industrial Development estimates I will give hon. gentlemen some awareness, I hope,

MR. LUNDRIGAN: of some of the marine related industries that might be a bit larger, a bit bigger than the rural development kinds of thing, all again compatible with resource development.

DR. FARRELL: Good man, 'John'.

MR. FLIGHT: You would not address yourself to that concerns people.

MR. CALLAN: All talk and no action.

MR. FLIGHT: All talk, yes.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Chairman, if can get away from the problems of New York and Florida and get back on to the problems of the department -

MR. FLIGHT: That is right.

MR. STRACHAN: I had no intention of getting into this type of debate, but the minister gives out some flicks and I want to respond with some flicks. He accused his alter ego, as he calls him, of talking on bits and pieces of rumours, so I think I have a considerable amount of facts that I should like to throw at him, not rumours, facts.

I would also like to state in response to a little comment there, when he talks about my new found patriotism, that after fifteen years I am patriotic. It is not new found.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STRACHAN: It is exactly the same as his colleague's sitting next to him is not new found. And that kind of statement of patriotism is the last defence of the bigot. I am not going to apologize to the minister for where my mother dropped me and neither is his friend.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Point of order. Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman is obviously too sensitive. That never even crossed my thoughts.

MR. SIMMONS: Racism.

MR. FLIGHT: Racism. Sensitive.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, the patriotism that I am talking about is the patriotism that I have been talking about since I have been here. And the hon. gentleman is one of the members who has articulated a lot of the feelings that I have about this Province and I certainly did not want to reflect on his parenthood or his ancestry or anything of this nature. As far as I am concerned he could have easily come from Island Cove. And for the hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) to be talking about racism!

MR. FLIGHT: Talk about your department boy.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, he is asking for a few problems.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Chairman, anyway getting on with my argument, one of the points I would like to raise, may be not exactly on patriotism -

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

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, the minister just confirmed in response to a question from me that he threatened me a moment ago.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: What!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, a moment ago I asked the minister to clarify and he said yes he was threatening. He said I was looking for problems if I persisted in stating my opinion in this House.

MR. SIMMONS: It is my opinion that his comments directed at the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) were racist in nature, racist in tone and racist in intent, and by saying that the minister implied that I was looking for problems. First of all, Mr. Chairman, I am not looking for problems; secondly, Mr. Chairman, as a member of this House -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: May I be allowed to state my point of order, Mr. Chairman? Mr. Chairman, the minister has said quite clearly that I am looking for problems. I am not going to take that kind of a threat from him, whether he is from Upper Island Cove or where he is from. I am not going to take it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I would ask the hon. gentleman to state his point of order please.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, if you will listen I am very quickly getting to my point of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: I can only hope the Chairman understands what I am saying.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I ask the hon. member to get to the point of order. I am sorry but I feel he is debating it.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Chairman.

MR. SIMMONS: I am on a point of order,

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman.

MR. SIMMONS: I am on a point of order, Mr. Chairman, as the Minister of Justice ought to know.

Mr. Chairman, I think I have stated the point of order actually, that the Minister of Rural Development is threatening me as a member of

MR. SIMMONS: this House. He said so. He has confirmed that it was a threat. The tapes will show that. I normally would not rise to this because it is the kind of thing the minister gets on with in this House quite regularly, but I believe it is time that Mr. Chairman pulled in his tether a bit; the tether of the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) and showed him that not even he can get away with all kinds of things in this House. He has threatened me and I would suggest that he be instructed to withdraw that threat without any equivocation or qualification at all.

MR. FLIGHT: The bully.

MR. HICKMAN: If I may rise for a minute in response to that silly point of order. And it is silly, but that is not relevant. What is far more relevant to this Committee were the interjections of the hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons)-

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, there is only one point of order. Only one point of order.

MR. HICKMAN: - in espousing that specious point of order. What was far more serious, which I direct Your Honour's attention to, was the threatening manner in which the hon. gentleman directed his remarks towards the Chair.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: Is this a new point of order?
Is this a new point of order?

MR. HICKMAN: That, Mr. Chairman, is something that I suggest the Chair cannot overlook -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKMAN: - if this House is going to maintain its decorum and operate the way it is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKMAN: Because let us make no
mistake about it, if there is the slightest hint

Mr. Hickman:

toward the Chair, either toward the impartiality of the Chair, which was the tenor of the hon. gentleman's comments, then it has to be dealt with and dealt with quickly and severely by the Chair.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: To the point of order, Mr. Chairman, for a moment.

MR. CHAIRMAN (MR. YOUNG): The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Chairman, if there was a threat - and I assume there was, and I was not following at all - but if there was a threat of any member in this House there is only one recourse and that is to have it withdrawn immediately. It does not make any difference what side any hon. member is on. If any member is threatened and it is allowed to go without being challenged then we are all in danger. Now we have to solve this right here and now. And if that means that we have to take a recess let us do it, but let us clear it up, Mr. Chairman.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, maybe I can solve this. I withdraw my threat against the hon. gentleman. I certainly would not want to leave him in any state of anxiety for any prolonged period of time. I got the impression he was going to hit me with his handbag and I categorically and unequivocally withdraw any threats of harassment or any intention thereto.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: And, Mr. Chairman, on my own point of order, Mr. Chairman, the member accused me of making some kind of racist comment -

MR. CHAIRMAN (MR. YOUNG): Order, please! There is a point of order -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: My own point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is a point of order to be dealt with.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Oh, I am sorry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Young): I did not hear what the hon. minister said; it must be two conversations back and forth. And as the hon. minister has withdrawn the remarks, that is the end of the subject.

Now another point of order by the hon. minister.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, I made a comment when the hon. gentleman was - I was pointing back and forth across the House about the member's sense of patriotism. And I fail to see how -

AN HON. MEMBER: New found patriotism.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: New found, whatever it was in the fluency of debate and the like, I fail to see, Mr. Chairman, how that could have reflected on the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman has been one of the most colourful - and the member to my left here from across the pond originally, I think -

DR. FARRELL: Get pretty snotty too.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: - would certainly not allow me to be so inclined in any remark, and I feel very badly if the hon. member feels that I have slighted him in terms of his background or his origin.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: If he feels I have, I did not intend to. If I have made him feel that way I would like him to be reassured that it is not my intention. And I think the hon. member knows as a fellow I have had many discussions with - the colleague, I have had many discussion with - that I value very, very much the input that he has in the House and his attitude that he has towards the department that I represent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NOLAN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I feel that it may be the remarks that the hon. minister were interpreted the way it has been discussed here, but I feel now that he is man enough to get up and point it out, and so on. And I think that if we are going to get on with this debate - he has already stated I believe, in my opinion, Mr. Chairman, how he feels about the hon. member. There was no reflection one way or the other; in my opinion, if we are any

Mr. Nolan: good at all, the matter is now settled, surely we can do that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I feel that the hon. minister has made a full explanation of his remarks, and I will ask the hon. member for Eagle River to continue.

MR. STRACHAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank the minister for his comments. Just to get back, I just wonder if that comes off my twenty minutes?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes, it does.

MR. STRACHAN: However.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STRACHAN: It is pretty difficult to get into what I am getting into in twenty minutes.

However let me try one part of it. I understand last year was the first time that Labrador Services Division was moved over into Rural Development, and it has been a year, or close to a year, where it now has been in that department. So I would like to point out some things that I think are wrong there, and some things that are happening which we do not quite agree with. For instance, we do not agree with a division of the department purchasing food in Sept Isles, Quebec, transporting that food up in a QNS&L railway to Schefferville in Quebec, to chartering a Quebec company, Laurentian Airways, to then fly that food onto the Labrador Coast for the Labrador people, because we feel that the department doing that is committing one of the greatest sins against this Province. It gives the people of the area, and it gives the people right on that strip of Quebec the feeling that they own Labrador. That even the Province, even St. John's has got to come to them to purchase food and transport food for the people of the Labrador Coast. Surely it would have been much easier to utilize

Mr. Strachan.

Goose Bay and the businessmen of Happy Valley - Goose Bay and to give them some kind of subsidy regardless of what it is, because we have to pay high costs anyway to Quebec merchants and to Quebec airlines. Surely it would be far better to do it by providing Labrador businessmen with the opportunities to try to fly into the Labrador coastal communities during the Winter the foodstuffs that they require. To me it just does not make sense that for the past number of years that we still have food purchased in Quebec by the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, transported in Quebec and paying Quebec airlines to fly food onto the Labrador Coast again, right across the Labrador Coast into this Province. And I would like to bring that up to the minister and possibly he would respond to that later on.

During 1964 the Smallwood - Pearson Agreement was made, an agreement which handled native people in this Province. That agreement was for something around \$1.5 million. The relationship of spending is ninety per cent federal contribution for Indian people, ten per cent provincial, and something around sixty per cent - the factor varies - for Inuit people because of the high number of Settler people who are apparently the financial responsibility of the Province under the agreement which was drawn up at that time. It never changed for a number of years, and I go to the previous administration as well, it never changed. In 1969-1970, for instance, this Province turned back to Ottawa some \$200,000, to \$300,000 a year which it could not spend on the Labrador Coast through the Labrador Services Division. But recently after the Royal Commission on Labrador came out there was a renegotiating at funding and the renegotiation was up to \$4.5 million. But some interesting things happened at renegotiation. The federal government counted the number of Inuit people in Labrador, and they give to the Province \$3,005 for each Inuit person, Innuk, for each person, and so much for Indian people. The figures that the federal government came up with was

Mr. Strachan.

1,800 Inuit people. They counted the Inuit people in Happy Valley - Goose Bay. They counted the Inuit people in the North side - and the hon. member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) knows as well - the North side of North West River. There were Inuit people who were resettled, came down from Hebron and Nutak. But it seems that an Inuit person who lives in the North side of North West River is no Inuit any longer. An Inuit person who lives in Happy Valley - Goose Bay is no longer an Inuit person, because the federal government offered for these 1,800 people, including these Inuit people, \$3,005 per head per year.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the hon. member permit a question?

MR. STRACHAN: One second until I finished my point.

They offered \$3,005 per head, per year, and the provincial government did a count of their own, and instead of coming up with the federal government's 1,800 people, they came up with 1,280 Inuit people. They would not count the Inuit people in Happy Valley, and they count the Inuit people in North West River. So it seems as though you are not Inuit to this Province when the federal government offers you \$3,005 per head per Inuit person.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The hon. member, he said, talking about the federal estimate of 1,800 Inuit, without counting them in the urban centres? Or was it that the government, the Province, did not count them in the - ?

MR. STRACHAN: The Province did not.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But the federal government did?

MR. STRACHAN: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And that accounts for the difference between 1,200 and 1,800.

MR. STRACHAN: Correct.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But men, women and children Inuit in Labrador, federal count, 1,800?

MR. STRACHAN: That is right.

The federal say 1,800. The Province said 1,280. The Province played down the number of Inuit people and did not count them. And not only in urban communities, North West River of a population of 900 or 1,000 is hardly a large urban community compared to, for instance, Nain or somewhere else.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What about the Indian people?

MR. STRACHAN: The Indian people - the federal government - and the figures are very close on the federal government's figures and the provincial government's figures.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is because the Indians keep to themselves.

MR. STRACHAN: Because the Indians do not mix with the Settler people and they have not intermarried over the years, with the result that what has happened in this agreement is that this Province has lost per year, and in the last two years and will continue to lose for the next years of the agreement, \$1,562,600, just because its figures for Inuit people were lower than the federal government's. In other words, the federal government was offering us \$1,500,000 more if we would count people Inuit with the result we have situations in which we have Inuit people in Hopedale who are funded to come to university through Inuit programmes. But an Inuit person from North West River is not counted as being Inuit and, therefore, is not funded to come to university.

MR. SMALLWOOD: On what grounds?

MR. STRACHAN: Because he is not Inuit; because the Province says he is not Inuit.

MR. SMALLWOOD: On what grounds does the Province say that?

MR. STRACHAN: Because the Province does not count them.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And why not?

MR. NEARY: Because they do not live in the communities.

MR. STRACHAN: They do not live in the communities. They stay at the North West River, there is not any other Inuit community. They live on the wrong side of the river. They have been told if they lived on the Southside of the river, of North West River, we will count you as Inuits, but because you live on the Northside of the river we do not count you as Inuits.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Do they give that as the reason?

MR. HOUSE: That is a designated community.

MR. STRACHAN: It is designated but the only designated community in North West River is the Southside of the river. If you live on the Northside you can be Indian and Inuit, but you are not designated as an Inuit and you get none of the benefits, federal government benefits.

MR. HICKMAN: Is that not the federal government policy?

MR. STRACHAN: No, the provincial government is responsible.

The federal government counted them, 1,800 it said, and then the provincial government count them and said only 1,280.

MR. MURPHY: Is that an annual thing or -

MR. STRACHAN: Oh it has been happening for years. I know the predicament it gets the Minister of Education in because he cannot do very much about it because it rests with the Department of Rural Development who sets up the federal-provincial committee.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the hon gentleman - I am sorry to interrupt him so much, but if the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland sit down and make an agreement under which Ottawa will pay Newfoundland so much a head for all the Inuit people, now there has to be a count, is there an annual count or is there one count for the life of the agreement?

MR. STRACHAN: Well there has been one count for the life of the agreement for five years, and then after five years it is renegotiated and they count again. But what we are stating is that the count was made after the Royal Commission on Labrador, and the count was higher for the federal government and lower by the provincial government with a consequent loss of \$1.5 million and the consequent positions of native people living in other communities no longer being regarded as native and not having any of the benefits.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Can the Provincial treasury benefit by that?

MR. STRACHAN: Yes, because the agreement is that Ottawa will pay ninety per cent of funding for education, homes, housing, supplies - Ottawa will pay ninety per cent if the Province only pays ten per cent to these people.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What do they save is it ten per cent on - between twelve and eighty-six hundred souls.

MR. STRACHAN: I am not sure, I -

MR. SMALLWOOD: How much a head?

MR. STRACHAN: \$3,000.

MR. SMALLWOOD: \$3,000, ten per cent of \$3,000 is \$300 on 600 heads.

MR. STRACHAN: Now then let me get onto another point, and it is very difficult, for instance, a man in North West River, McNeil, who has a brother in Makkovik, but because he lives in Makkovik he is therefore designated as living in a native community; therefore his children in Makkovik, Rubert McNeil's children, can be paid to university, Leonard McNeil, his brother who lives on the wrong side of the river in North West River, and his daughters who are relatives and friends, cannot be paid to come to university here because they are on the wrong side of the river and they are no longer native or settlers. That happened last year.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is extraordinary that is.

MR. STRACHAN: Well can you wonder why people get bitter on the Labrador coast?

MR. HICKMAN: Is the federal government's policy based on designated communities? In other words -

MR. STRACHAN: No, it is not the federal government's policy. It is argued between the federal and provincial committee. The Province can include communities; Now the Province included the community of Black Tickle, which the member for LaPoile did, rightly or wrongly, and I think for very good reasons he included it. Because Black Tickle was desperate and it could be included and he did try to bend the rules.

MR. MURPHY: And why did he include it?

MR. STRACHAN: At least it was included.

MR. MURPHY: But I mean why did we not include them all?

You know -

MR. STRACHAN: This is the argument that these people are having. Anyway this comes under the Department of Rural Development and I hope they will look in to some of these. For instance, the community - others communities cannot be included, and some communities are and some communities are not with the consequent result in my district that we have tremendous bitterness, especially for a member like myself who tries to represent people, because some people feel that some have this and others have this, and it is a crazy situation. Anyway I throw out some of these figures there. My main point was not on that at all, my main point was on the fishery but I do not know if I am going to have enough time. How long before I get into it? Five minutes.

The minister talked about the Labrador Services Division. I got a great deal of respect for what Labrador Services Division with a lack of staff, and I will state this right when I start that whatever I say from now on I agree that they have been understaffed and in many cases shifted around in departments, and in many cases put into the Department of Welfare in the past, a while back when I first knew about it, and therefore was always regarded as a welfare oriented division, it was not regarded

MR. STRACHAN: as development oriented. In fact in 1967, when I first did work in char, and in 1969 when I first talked about forming a fish plant and taking some of the money which was welfare oriented to the community of Nain, and putting \$80,000 into a fish plant so you could employ people and give them pride, rather than just shove it out on a welfare reel somewhere, was I think a start of some of the direction we went to.

What we have here, and I suggest the minister look very carefully. It has been in his department now for one year, and the situation less than a year, and the situation in the fisheries is desperate. These figures which he gave me I think will account for it and I think you can look at it.

First of all I think that in many cases the department is open to obtaining very high prices for the fish which comes out of the communities of Nain and Makkovik and in return paying very low prices to the fishermen. Now the minister can defend this on the grounds of the costs of collecting. Well the cost of collecting to us is a ridiculous cost because you have no collecting vessels whatsoever.

In the past most of the collecting vessels were tied up to wharves. We had to put pumps in them all Summer, pump them, keep them dry, keep them from sinking. I have seen three collecting vessels in tow - three collecting vessels at one time, owned by the division in tow, not one working - so with a result that we have here collecting of fish costs, the cost of collecting fish, for instance, of one pound of fish - one pound of salmon - it would be different if it were codfish - one pound of salmon in 1974 cost seventy-four cents a pound to collect, only to bring it into Nain just from around outside. In 1975 it cost ninety-six cents a pound just to bring it

MR. STRACHAN: in by boat from the fishermen into Nain.

MR. NEARY: If you shipped it to Pasadena -

MR. STRACHAN: In 1976 it was eighty-nine cents a pound.

MR. NEARY: If you shipped it to Pasadena -

MR. STRACHAN: So with a result we find here that the cost of collecting shows a very high loss on the plant, and that the fishermen there, who get very low prices in correspondence - for instance, I will just go through this; a fisherman is based on under six pounds and over six pounds. That is how his fish is bought. A fisherman gets sixty-five cents a pound for salmon for under six pounds, ninety-five cents a pound over six pounds.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: What is the state of it?

MR. STRACHAN: That is dressed salmon. That is what he gets. Regardless of it all you do is take it and freeze it in the plant and pack it in a package and put it on the Bonavista. That is all you do. In return the department gets for under six pounds \$1.20 a pound for frozen salmon in Main going on the Bonavista, \$1.20 to the department, sixty-five cents to the fishermen. That is not so bad. That is okay.

But then it starts, The department then gets a price. Remember, the fisherman gets ninety-five cents a pound whether the salmon is eight pounds, twelve pounds, fourteen pounds, twenty pounds or twenty-five pounds - and sometimes we catch very large salmon - he gets ninety-five cents a pound. The department gets for six to eight pounds \$1.60 a pound, eight to ten pounds it get \$1.90 a pound, ten to twelve pound salmon, for taking it into the fish plant, freezing it, putting it back on the boat, the department gets \$2.40 a pound. The fisherman only gets ninety-five cents. Twelve to fourteen pounds the department gets \$2.60 cents a pound. And over fourteen pounds it gets \$2.60 a pound.

In other words, the fishermen are, in my estimation, and I can go through char prices and the whole works and so on because I have done it for years until I got sick and fed up.

MR. MURPHY: And what does it do when it reaches the retailers? Who can afford to buy salmon at that price?

MR. STRACHAN: Well the point is that Fishery Products Company in this Province is buying from the department salmon at \$2.60 a pound frozen, and the fishermen get ninety-five cents of it. And all the plant does is it just freezes it. It does not process it.

So there is something wrong somewhere. There is a balance wrong somewhere. And what we are afraid of is this is now being attributed to the fish plant, the fish plant has a loss because of the collecting boats, and therefore that is why we should keep the price of fish down to the fishermen on the Coast. And I think there is a need to have change there, you should accept the fact and give up your boats; charter private boats and get the men because they will run efficiently. Every time we have had breakdowns - five boats I had once, five government vessels broken down, one sunk and four other ones tied up and broke down.

MR. CROSS: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. SIMMONS: Its the Greenspond story.

MR. CROSS: Mr. Chairman, a little more than the Greenspond story -

MR. WHITE: The blueberry project?

MR. CROSS: No I have listened with intense

MR. CROSS: interest to the debate that has gone on on both sides of the House on the estimates for Rural Development. Certainly I listened with delight to some of the people from the other side. I listened to the hon. member for Twillingate when he spoke of all of the fish plants that were in operation. He came and passed by one of the most modern plants that we have in Newfoundland today and a plant that since its opening has been certainly a success story all the way. I have mentioned this in this hon. House before. I did not intend to mention it this evening but since the hon. gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) forgot it I thought I would have to remind him.

AN HON. MEMBER: Forgot what?

MR. CROSS: Forgot the plant in Valleyfield which is a success story, and possibly with the 200 mile limit, if that plant cannot operate all year round certainly its life can be extended, and it is and will be the life blood of Bonavista North.

There is a story behind that plant and I will take a few minutes to try and relate it. In 1967 certainly the Beothuck Fish Processing Company took over the plant at Valleyfield and that year really there was an ultimatum really that 45,000 quintals of fish would have to be brought in if that plant was to operate a second year. And the manager of that plant went everywhere looking for fish that year. He reached his quota and the plant operated a second year and is still in operation today and is expanding, expanding and employing people. I have already said that from 1971 to 1976 the production has tripled. I have said that the work force has tripled. I have mentioned why the work force has tripled.

In its beginning it was a salt fish plant, then it became salt and fresh, and since then we have seen a fish meal plant built, we have seen a crab plant built, a herring plant being and machines installed. And for the first time this

MR. CROSS: year, from 280 to 300 people will work in that plant, and for the first time we are hearing with the herring fishery there that in a moment it will be a double shift, and a double shift means a double number of people employed in the fish plant.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. CROSS: I take off my hat to the manager of Beothuck Fish Processors anytime. He is a man of dedication and concern for the fishery and for the people of that part of the district and in fact the people all over Newfoundland. And certainly I take off my hat to the man, I said, and he is Mr. Boyd Wade from Newtown.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. CROSS: But I want to go back to Greenspond, sure I do. My roots are there. My grandfather was born there, eventually relocated to another little cove, maybe smaller than Greenspond at that time. But down through the years in Newfoundland we have been talking big - big industries, big cities, big schools, big hospitals, and we have forgotten the success that the small school can have, the small industry can have, and the small town or city can have.

I would like to relate a little success story of a small school where I had the privilege to teach for four years and that community was Greenspond. The first year that I lived in Greenspond and taught, the fish plant was working, the bait depot was going, blueberries were being processed, cod tongues were being cut and so on and that little community was a beehive of activity.

CAPTAIN WINSOR: Do not forget the Minister of Fisheries was born there.

MR. CROSS: I know very well that the Minister of Fisheries was born there. Certainly.

AN HON. MEMBER: And a credit to the community.

May 17, 1977

Tape No. 2880

NM - 3

MR. CROSS: But the first year in the set up -

AN HON. MEMBER: The best Minister of Fisheries we have ever had.

MR. CROSS: - when I went there as a teacher

Mr. Cross:

and as a principal we had 196 pupils, and five of these were Grade XI students, Certainly in two years the population of the community was cut in half, but we did not have five Grade IX students - we had seventeen. No dropout rate. The dropout rate had almost become nil in four years. And I had the privilege to go back to that community and hand out fifteen out of seventeen Grade XI diplomas. And I can rhyme off a list of names here of great boys, great girls, great men and women that I had certainly the privilege of teaching, many of them. There was for a time that Greenspond per capita had more students coming into university than any other community in Newfoundland.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. CROSS: There are M.As, B.As, B.Eds, Nursing Assistants, Electrical Engineers, teachers, architects, commerce students, nurses and doctors, but I am talking about the four year little period in which I was there, and I could bring them in -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. CROSS: Good. - that got their education in the little small school -

AN HON. MEMBER: The Minister of Fisheries.

MR. CROSS: - is not sorry - and I can say something else; we talk of teachers wanting to teach in the large, big, highfalutin schools, all of the teachers from Greenspond with the exception of one are degree men that are back teaching that I had the privilege of teaching. And when I go back - the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Scallwood) said he was going to St. Brendan's on Friday night, I hope to go to Greenspond for the same occasion. I will see a number of graduates, but I will see graduates of yesteryears that were products of the teachers off Greenspond at the time that I taught there, not only me alone, but there was a team effort by all of the teachers while I taught there.

The hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) certainly spoke of the hon. Minister of Rural Development, said that he had stood on the stage and said, Send me to Ottawa and I will fight for you. What

MR. CROSS:

I have seen of the hon. minister and know of the hon. minister in this, that he is still a fighter, that he is still a dedicated man, that he is still full of concern for Newfoundland, and when I say, in particular, rural Newfoundland, because he was born in rural Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CROSS: Certainly in 1970 the approximate dollars that were spent on rural development and resettlement was in the vicinity of \$4.5 million. And certainly it was resettlement that was biting into a great amount of that money. In 1977 the total budget is \$13 million, and with resettlement gone it means that the monies to be expended in Rural Development certainly has shown an increase.

The islands and the little coves in Bonavista North were resettled, Sidney Cove, Fair Islands, Silver Fox Island, Newport, Flat Islands and all down the line, and I feel that maybe I had something to do with Greenspond being still there today, hanging on for a number of years, but hanging on no longer. There is a new lease on life. There are new homes being built there. There are young fishermen going back there. Back in 1967, 1968 the old man might have left, sure, and took his boys of seventeen or eighteen years with him, but now the boys, that were boys then, are men of twenty-six and twenty-seven and have come back to Greenspond and have made a living in the fishery -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CROSS: - and certainly that is something that we should all appreciate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CROSS: I believe we should.

Newport was a salmon fishing port, and I have had X number of people that have come to me and said, We want to go back to Newport fishing. We would like to have some form of facility there. We cannot afford it ourselves, do you think we can get a

MR. CROSS: little help, not a lot but a little? And if we can cater to these people then our people will be all the better off for it. I think of Fair Island that was resettled. Go back now, if you fly over Fair Island or you pass up through Fair Island tickle, you would think that the community is beginning to live again, you would think that there were people who lived there permanently but they have their summer houses there, fishermen, and they fish from there.

Only last week when I visited my district, this was the story I heard from one man "I have four quintals of fish salted in my little store and I sold \$284 worth of fresh" that is dollars, that is new dollars. That is not welfare.

AN HON. MEMBER: Where did he catch the fish?

MR. CROSS: Fair Island.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CROSS: But, Mr. Chairman, certainly I said that I would like to think that I was responsible for retarding the slipaway progress and the resettlement progress in Greenspond. People were saying you had to have your big schools in order to have success, and when our success story of the small school was told abroad - remember it was the smallest school in Bonavista North but it took the record percentages, the record is there to show for it, it took scholarships in that forty years, eaten away from the big schools. But there was dedication and determination on the part of the pupils that were there, and their sense of independence had to be stolen from them. Your small school is good, your big school is good. But when the school becomes so big that the pupil is a number and he is not an individual then it is too large. So we talk of big but how big? How big for our schools, how big for our hospitals, how big for our industries, how big for our cities?

Before I sit down I said that I was responsible for retarding the resettlement of Greenspond, and if there was anything,

MR. CROSS: if there was anything that stuck in my craw as far as the previous administration was concerned it was the resettlement programme. And I certainly opposed it and I opposed it vocally everywhere I went . Because not only Greenspond would have been resettled now, because this is what was happening; a man in Greenspond could buy a house in some small community in Bonavista North, get the grant for moving, and a man in that community could get a grant for moving away. There was no resettlement to the thing, just haul the people out at any expense, this is the way that I see it.

I composed a little song, I am not going to recite all the verses but I am going to give you one or two .

MR. FLIGHT: A point of order, please!

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Chairman, although I am very appreciative of the hon. member's last debating point, and I am as interested in resettlement as he is, and he is making good sense in as far as he is debating resettlement but I would like for the Chairman to tell me, if he would, Sir, what the last five minutes of debate has got to do with this years estimates on rural development, and we are debating the rural development estimates.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: Have we got relevancy, Mr. Chairman, or are we not going to have relevancy?

MR. HICKMAN: Under the heading minister's salary there has been a great deal of latitude allowed so long as it is related to one of the headings within the department then it has been held to be relevant, and community consolidation is simply another word, I gather, for resettlement and I -

MR. MURPHY: That is the antidote.

MR. HICKMAN: Yes. I feel reasonably certain that what the hon. gentleman from Bonavista North has been debating has been just that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I believe in the debate on the estimates the question has been raised as to bigness and smallness and settlement and resettlement and so on and I understand that the hon. member for Bonavista North is pursuing that subject, so I would rule that his remarks are within order in the context of the debate to date.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CROSS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, To add to that I do not feel that I have been any more irrelevant than some hon. members in the House have been. I have listened, I have not talked too much, I would like to think that I have been a good listener in this House so far-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CROSS: - because sometimes when you keep your tongue still and your eyes and ears open you learn something in the

Mr. Cross.

learning process. And I feel that, as I said before, that I had not been too irrelevant. Rural development and resettlement go hand in hand as far as I am concerned. And certainly with those few words said my time has all but run out. I cannot follow another train of thought, but unless I am called to order again I am going to recite one or two or three or four of these little stanzas, because it tells a story. I sat and reminisced as I lived on Greenspond, and the poem went something like this: They tell us today our community is gone / The people are moving away from Greenspond/ They have grown discontented and say they cannot stay/ They are leaving the old rock in Bonavista Bay. Then I went a little further and I said: I wonder what ails them to make them act so/ Is it really the money given by Premier Joe/ Or is it because no more jobs can be found/ Since the year before last when our fish plant closed down. A little further, But where can you go a good job to get/ It is not Come By Chance, the mill is not open yet/ You can go up to Burin but there is no future there/ Our fishery is failing and the government do not care.

Then - I am not going to recite it all, but I said: The mistake we are making is this I believe - I believe a tiny bit of it deep down, perhaps, in resettlement if it were done in the right way - The mistake we are making is this I believe / Let us tell the government we all want to leave/ Providing that they will put us where work can be found/ And we can all live together in our own little town / Take us to the mainland but give us something to do / Do not carry us somewhere where we are in a worse stew / Let us all live together until our days they are gone / Build another community and call that Greenspond.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring up a point here. We feel that in this debate in the Committee here on the estimates of the Department of Rural Development, and we all feel here generally that the minister has refused consistently to table the list of projects that the members are asking for, that we do not know whether the jobs he talks of are good for one year, two years or three years or whatever, that the minister has consistently - and it is the feeling generally of us here - brought up the philosophy, points and philosophy of his department for the last three twenty minute speeches, and neither the members of the House nor the press have been given any information, no information whatsoever, that we require and should be presented here in the House. And, therefore, we have heard nothing whatsoever from his department to go on. All of us here, however, feel that we therefore refuse to discuss this department any further and wish to continue on to another department where information is more forthcoming.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to table the letter and the questionnaire that I was going to table earlier, Sir, because I read from it, and I have to table it. But I must say that I agree with the hon. gentleman, Sir. I join with the official Opposition in protesting the contempt, the refusal of the minister to table the list of names of those who got loans from the Rural Development Authority. The minister has nothing but contempt for this House, and I am going to boycott the minister's estimates until the minister lays on the table of this House the information that we have been asking for.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Naskaupi.

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to delay the progress of the Committee, but I would like to ask two or three questions that perhaps the minister might feel inclined to answer, because some of the work being carried out - or at least being proposed to be carried out - by this particular department directly affects my district, and one of them was referred to in the Throne Speech and that is the appointment of an assistant deputy minister which I understand will take place shortly to administer programmes under the Department of Rural Development. He will be located in Happy Valley-Goose Bay as a headquarters. I would like to know from the minister, if he feels inclined to answer, what changes will this mean to the present system when the headquarters, if you will, for that particular aspect of his department will be set up in the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area? What changes will it mean in administering a programme? I would also like to know how many personnel are going to be involved in terms of work? How many people will be hired from the area or how many people are going to be required to carry out

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

Mr. Chairman, all I have to say before responding to the hon. member - I hope nobody else comes back in the House because I have about at least an hour where I can relay information to the House on Rural Development which I will do after supper. But first of all, I have never seen such a childish display of immaturity, almost verging on purlity, by the Opposition members. Take their marbles and go home, you know, take their marbles and go home. They have two gentlemen across the way who had enough decency and enough kinds of gumption and backbone to stay in the House and want to debate the estimates.

They got a little bit ruffled up, eh? They got their noses a little bit reddened and they were coached, I believe, by the member for Lewisporte (Mr. White) who has not got the guts to stand in the House here and carry on a good debate. They took their marbles and went home. A bunch of old women. A bunch of old women.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

A point of order has been raised.

MR. NOLAN:

Mr. Chairman, have we now reached the point in this House where the hon. member is allegedly qualified to determine who has guts in this House and who has not and so on? He has cast aspersions now upon the member for Lewisporte who is not here to defend himself. I now ask that he withdraw those remarks, Mr. Chairman.

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

Mr. Chairman, on that point of order, I will withdraw nothing. I will withdraw nothing. A bunch of supposed parliamentarians get a little bit roughed up in debate, because we get involved in the cut and thrust of debate, and take their handbags and gently steal away. What kind of behaviour

MR. LUNDRIGAN: for people who are responsible for debating the millions of dollars of estimates and these kinds of things! If they do not like it - what is it? - 'if they cannot stand the heat get out of the kitchen.' A lot of nonsense. I will withdraw nothing.

MR. NOLAN: Get out of the kitchen, yes. Well now that we have heard from the poor man's Harry Truman, Mr. Chairman, I do demand that he retract what he said.

MR. HICKMAN: On that point of order, Mr. Chairman, may I draw to the attention of the Chair that at the time the hon. gentleman was making his remarks there were only two other hon. members in this House opposite, namely, the hon. the member for Terra Nova and the veteran, the other rural member, the hon. the member for Burin- Placentia West. I seriously doubt if any hon. gentleman who is not in the House can come in and raise a point of order on some matter that he was not a party thereto. Because being out in the corridor does not make any hon. gentleman a party to anything that transpires in the House. I say, Mr. Chairman, that the point of order is frivolous, vexatious, and totally irrelevant.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: To say the least.

MR. FLIGHT: To the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We will hear one further hon. gentleman.

MR. FLIGHT: The hon. the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) got up and I was standing in the corridor and I heard him suggest that - his words were 'Did not have the guts to stay in the House' and he cast aspersions, as my hon. friend said, on the member for Lewisporte who is not here to defend himself. And the

MR. FLIGHT: fact is, Mr. Chairman, that I do not see what purpose it would serve - and I speak for myself in this particular debate - whether the points raised were significant to the minister or not, whether he thought it was, as he referred to it, a high school debate or not that is beside the point. As a member representing a district who has come across the type of things that I have come across in Rural Development, I believe that I was entitled to an answer.

He got up and spent twenty minutes -

DR. FARRELL: That is not a point of order.

MR. FLIGHT: - in highfalutin debate about the merits or demerits of centralization.

DR. FARRELL: Sit down! Sit down!

MR. FLIGHT: If I am going to raise issues that I want the minister to address himself to and he is not going to do it, then what service am I serving here listening to the type of debate that I have listened to from that particular minister?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

I believe the point at issue here is whether the hon. minister engaged in unparliamentary remarks and said matters that would be outside parliamentary usage. I do not believe that the remarks he did make could be termed unparliamentary. I do feel that they were not particularly relevant so I would say that the minister should be now asked if time allows to continue his remarks but to observe relevancy.

However, as it is six o'clock now, I will leave the Chair until eight o'clock this evening.

VOL. 2

NO. 83

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
17 MAY 1977
TUESDAY 8 - 11 p.m.

The Committee resumed at 8:00 P.M.

Mr. Chairman in the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

The hon. member for Kilbride.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of privilege.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, before the House rose for supper, Sir, and although members were not in their seats, the Minister of Rural Development was heard accusing the Opposition of having no guts, leaving the House. And, Mr. Chairman, if my memory serves me correctly, Your Honour has ruled on a number of occasions that that kind of language adds nothing to the decorum of this House, is unparliamentary, offensive and obnoxious. Your Honour did not see fit to ask the minister to withdraw the statements and apologize to the House for making such offensive remarks, and I ask Your Honour now to rule that the Minister of Rural Development withdraw these obnoxious statements that the minister made before the House rose at six o'clock and apologize to the House and to the Chair for making such offensive statements.

Your Honour, I would like to send for the tape.

One of my colleagues to our left here has gone to -

MR. NOLAN: It is shocking!

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. NOLAN: It is shocking!

MR. NEARY: - to get a copy of Hansard. But it was a shocking performance, Sir, and Your Honour might wish to get the tapes and probably -

AN HON. MEMBER: We will get the Hansard.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: We will get the Hansard.

MR. NEARY: Hansard? Can you get it?

Oh, somebody is gone for it.

MR. NEARY: It was the worse display, Sir, that has been seen in this House for a long time. And obviously I know the minister is under pressure from his district. All the editorials in the newspapers out there and so forth are attacking, tearing the hide off the minister, but there is no need to take it out on this hon. House, Sir. I ask Your Honour to ask the gentleman to withdraw the statements and apologize to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

The point brought up by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) relates to a matter that occurred before 6:00 P.M., just immediately before the Committee rose. I left the Chair at 6:00 P.M. as is required by the Standing Rules. Now just before leaving the Chair I made a ruling on that point of order so I do not think it is required of me to make a ruling again. However, possibly as the time was short and I did not give much reason for the ruling I made, I might now just say a few words on that. As far as my memory serves me, the words referred to had to do with - I believe the word was 'gutless' - that was the particular word, and words similar to that. There is in Beauchesne - I do not have the actual item before me now, but I think, again if my memory serves me, there is in Beauchesne a note there indicating that it would be unparliamentary to say that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: an hon. member is a coward or is cowardly and it may be one way of taking the words of the hon. minister as it refers in that way to hon. members.

However, I would point out there is another way of understanding that remark and I believe it was in this manner that the hon. minister made the remark. He was referring, as far as I understood him, to the stomach, if one wishes to use that word, the stomach for debate on the particular matter that was under discussion at the time. He was not referring to fortitude or courage in any other sense or lack thereof on the part of members opposite and he certainly did not refer to any individual member in that way. I understood him to mean that the hon. members opposite were gutless in the terms of not having a wish or a stomach to go on with the debate, on the point under debate. And in that way I made a ruling on the matter and I am afraid that the ruling does stand.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Carry on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Chairman, are we going to discuss this matter?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well I have made a ruling, unless one wishes to question the ruling.

MR. NOLAN: No, I am not questioning the ruling, Mr. Chairman. The position is that there was a very specific reference to the member from Lewisporte (Mr. White) and not to all members generally. And the member for Lewisporte (Mr. White) was singled out and mentioned, and I am sure the tapes will verify what I have said.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Again, as far as my memory serves me, when the point of order was brought up I do not recall that the hon. member for Lewisporte was mentioned specifically in the

MR. CHAIRMAN: point of order as brought up. I understood, and this is the way I remember it, that the remarks of the hon. the minister in regard to how the members opposite were approaching the debate, I did not think that there was anything, at least I do not remember that there was anything specifically about a member, including the member for Lewisporte.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the member for Lewisporte is gone to research Hansard and Your Honour might wish to know that the member may wish to rise on his own point of personal privilege. He has to do it at the earliest opportunity and as soon as the hon. gentleman gets back in the House I give Your Honour notice now that the hon. member for Lewisporte (Mr. White) may raise this matter as a matter of personal privilege.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I understand that the hon. member is informing the Chair of something that may transpire.

The hon. member for Kilbride.

MR. WELLS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is same stuff, Mr. Chairman, to talk now about Rural Development after all these exciting developments before six o'clock. What I would like to do, and I think this Rural Development heading which we are discussing now, Mr. Chairman, is probably one of the more important topics that is going to come before this House in this or any session. I say that because it is pretty obvious by now, after - what is it? - twenty-eight, twenty-nine years of Confederation that we are never going to be a major industrial site. I think we would all agree with that. It is very interesting that after twenty-eight years of Confederation we look and see what we have got in major industrial terms that we did not have before.

We had Bowaters before, we had Price before, we had Bell Island, and that is now phased out, we have Buchans, and that has a very tenuous tenuous hold on viability, that particular mine; so since Confederation we have attracted by way of major industrial enterprises virtually nothing. We have had

Mr. Wells.

the Iron Ore Company in Wabush, in Labrador, Rambler Mines, and one or two other mining the mine up on the North West Coast. We have had three or four mines. We have had a certain number, a relatively small number of fish plants, but we have had no major industrial enterprises started up in Newfoundland since Confederation.

MR. NEARY: Since 1972 when the government changed.

Joey - (Inaudible).

MR. WELLS: Oh, no! Oh, no!

Show me the counterpart to Bowaters, show me the counterpart to Price.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS: It is not here. It is a sadly significant thing that

Mr. Wells.

one of the most interesting things and sad things that happened after Confederation was that the various secondary manufacturing industries that we had here in Newfoundland all closed down; not all, most, a good many of them, significant ones, the White Clothing, the tobacco plant, all these sorts of things, the shoe factories, they all closed down.

MR. NEAPY: But why did they close?

MR. WELLS: They closed because we cannot compete with the mainland. They could not compete.

MR. NEAPY: In other words, shut her down.

MR. WELLS: But that does not mean that they were rotten operators, that they were inefficient. It does not mean that at all. What it means is that the natural advantages that accrue to Southern Ontario and Quebec and whatever other major industrial sites there are where you have centres of population will always out-perform the peripheral areas like Newfoundland. So we can write off, Mr. Chairman, we can write off, I think, major industrial enterprises in Newfoundland. And the fact that the refinery closed, and the fact that unfortunately the Linerboard mill had to close, these are only just outward, visible signs, as it were, of the very point that I am making. So to come back to rural development, either we make it on fisheries development and rural development or we are not going to make it at all.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS: Now let us take, if I may, Mr. Chairman, a certain perspective by looking back at Newfoundland and the various attributes that we are endowed with. We have found you know - especially those of us in politics - in going around and saying, We have great natural resources; we have this and we have that. Yes, we have some great natural resources, but we also, Mr. Chairman, have and have had right from day one various significant strikes against us, and it is just as well to lay them out

MR. WELLS:

on the table, too. Strike number one, lack of agricultural or arable land. I remember the present member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) saying to me some twenty years ago when he was Premier - I have never forgotten it - he said, "If only the work that had been done on the sea had been done on the land in Newfoundland, what a country we would have." And he was right. But the reason that it was not done on the land is because we did not have the agricultural land to start with to do it on. Where does wealth come from? Where does wealth really come from? If you look at the developed societies in the world today - in Europe, you look at England, France, Germany - where did their wealth begin? It began in the soil. My hon. friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary), do not enter into the little byplay with the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan). It might be worth-while listening. I listen to the hon. member for LaPoile many times.

MR. NEARY: What is wrong? Is the hon. gentleman getting paranoid?

MR. WELLS: Not paranoid at all.

AN HON. MEMBER: They were looking at one another earlier this morning.

MR. WELLS: That is right, a love affair.

When you come to this question of development of industrial nations, you have the European nations, you have the United States, you have Southern Ontario, you have every place that has acquired wealth, and where has it got it from? It has got it initially from the soil, and we have not had that in Newfoundland, and we never will have it. That is strike one. We had the sea and we got such wealth as was available out of that, but it was a poor, second-rate thing, and that is why we have not developed as have places like Southern Ontario, most of the U.S. or a great many European countries.

Mr. Wells.

And it is just as well to face it, and we are not going to develop along these lines, and it is no accident that when the waves of immigration came from the Old World to the New World in the last two or three centuries, it is no accident that most of it went on past Newfoundland and left Newfoundland so that she entered this century with a population of about less than one-quarter of a million people. That is no accident, and no joke, and we have got to live with it, and we can go around boasting all we like of the great resources we have and the great this and the great that - we have not, Mr. Chairman. We have not got a decent climate; we have not got arable land. We have got resources like water power, like the Lower Churchill, and we have got minerals, and they are all very expensive to develop. You talk about mineral development and what is possible in this country. Compare the cost of taking minerals out of Labrador with the cost of taking iron out of Brazil or Venezuela or out of West Africa, and what have you got? You have got a very, very sorry picture.

MR. WELLS: If anybody thinks, and if anybody is foolish enough to think that this Province is ever going to be a wealthy place by world standards, forget it. They are very sad. So what have we got? We have got the chance by making a greater effort, if we are capable of it, than most people in the Western World, or the Eastern World either for that matter. If we make a greater effort, if we are prepared to make greater sacrifices, we can eke a living out of this place. But we are going to have to work harder than the people in Southern Ontario and the people in Tennessee where they have paper mills competing with us, and the people in Brazil where they have iron mines, and Venezuela and West Africa. We are going to have to work harder and we are going to have to accept less, and then we might make a go of it. But let us not kid ourselves that the millenium has arrived here in Newfoundland. It has not. And I think we will all be dead and gone before it ever comes.

So this really is what I am saying tonight, that we are going to have to make up our minds, we are going to have to work harder.

Now the member for St. Georges (Mrs. MacIsaac), the only lady in the House, the other day made a speech and she said something that everyone of us ought to remember and every person in Newfoundland. She talked about public money and the regard or otherwise that is had for public money and I forget her words, I read them in Hansard, she said something like this, Nobody has any respect for the government dollar. How true, Mr. Chairman, and they do not. And we talk about Rural Development and how we are going

MR. WELLS: to prime the pump, because that is all Rural Development is, it is priming the pump; it is trying to get little industries going and it is a great thing because we are either going to make it there - we are sure not going to make it in Come By Chance and I wonder if that refinery out there is every going to open again. I wonder. Who is going to buy it? Nobody is going to pay \$600 million for it. Do you think anybody is going to pay \$100 million for it, or \$50 million for it?

AN HON. MEMBER: Shaheen.

MR. WELLS: Yes, Shaheen. But I wonder where he is going to get it? So let us face it, Mr. Chairman, we are facing a pretty tough time here in Newfoundland. Who is going to buy that Linerboard mill? Who is going to pay \$1 for it and try to operate it as a Linerboard mill? There is nobody standing up and forming a queue. We have got to be realistic and we have got to tell people whom we represent that we are in for tough times and we are in tough times now. And no government, either Liberal or PC or NDP is going to wave any kind of magic wand and bring us out of it. Sometimes I think we are in an Alice in Wonderland world, a looking glass world where everything is upside down, where you go around saying, What great resources, what a great future we have! We have only got a future that we have got to work for and we have got to make some changes and the Federal Government in Canada has got to make some changes. There have got to be a few changes in the unemployment insurance regulations, a few changes in the social welfare regulations generally. I spoke earlier in this session about family allowances given to people who do not need them.

You take the unemployment insurance system;

MR. WELLS: it is the work holiday ratio of the year in reverse, where a man, you know, works what you would normally think would be the holiday or a bit more, and he is off the rest of the time and getting paid by the rest of the taxpayers. This cannot go on. No country ever became strong in that way. And what the member for St. Georges (Mrs. MacIsaac) says, the disrespect toward the government dollar, yes, that is true. And the things that the minister said this afternoon about some of the failures I think are tied to that disrespect. In other words, "Come on boys, the government has got lots of it. The government can dish it out. We will get a loan here. "But it is a different thing from taking your own savings and putting into something.

I will never forget, nearly twenty years ago now, I was in the Justice Department, and the files that first came my way was to sue somebody who did not pay for an engine that he got. And I went through the file and found out all the details. And what happened was the man borrowed \$2,000 or \$3,000 and he got an engine but he did not care. He was not serious about it. He took the engine out of the boat and the engine was rusting and rotting outside a shed somewhere and he was not paying, he was not using the engine, it was money gone to waste and it was taxpayers' money that was rooted out of me and you and everybody else.

The government dollar is despised and that is why we ought to be ever so careful in dishing it out, Mr. Chairman.

So all I would say to the minister, I would like his comments on these things. If we are going to prime the pump, and I believe in priming the pump, I believe in trying to help the small outport industry get going, but do not just dish it out, Mr. Chairman, do not dish it out to people who just want it for the sake of getting it and who could not care

MR. WELLS: less and who do not realize that this is somebody else's hard-earned dollar that it taken off him in taxes and gets into the public treasury and let him waste it and throw it away.

We have all heard of longliners tied up, beating up against the wharves with not even a spare tire or a rubber tire in between to protect them. Why? Because they were paid for out of taxpayers' dollars and the fellow who had them could not care less. We have all heard of this sort of thing and this is the kind of thing that I feel is ruining this country and ruining this Province.

MR. CANNING: Could I ask a question?

MR. WELLS: Yes.

MR. CANNING: Would the hon. member specify some other direction the taxpayers' money is going besides into longliners? Does he know any examples of the contractors?

MR. WELLS: Yes. Look, I agree whole-heartedly! The taxpayers' money since Confederation, and I make no distinction between governments, but since Confederation the taxpayers' money in my view has been dished out too freely, not just by this government, I think the federal government is the worst offender of all and again I do not draw a distinction between Liberal and PC. You take you know some of these water and sewerage systems in remote areas of Newfoundland -

MR. CANNING: You are coming to a point now. That is better than longliners.

MR. WELLS: - you know, some of these water and sewerage systems. Do you know that there are programmes where the federal government pays ninety per cent and the Province picks up ten per cent and water and sewerage systems have been put into small places, and I do not begrudge them it, but let us face it, it is gone in, as far as I can determine, at a cost of approximately \$25,000 to \$30,000 per household.

MR. CANNING: That is right.

MR. WELLS: Now that to me is an insult to every taxpayer in Canada. What is it all about? What is it all about if we have got to pay out our money and see it go that way, where somebody else who chooses to live Heaven knows where, can get the taxpayer to pay \$25,000 or \$30,000 to put a water and sewerage system in his house?

MR. STRACHAN: Do you know why?

MR. WELLS: Well I would love to know why. Why I do

MR. WELLS: not know, but it should not be. It should not be. I really do not think it should be. If I choose tonight to go and live out on Baccalieu Island, should you and you and you pay for all the services that you might have in Washington and give them to me?

MR. FLIGHT: What about resettlement in that case?

MR. WELLS: What about resettlement? Look, I was involved as a civil servant, twenty years ago nearly, with the resettlement programme. It had its faults and I think it became at a later stage much worse than it was then. But at that time, and I can speak with some authority on it, there was no compulsion on anybody - I am speaking back 1957, 1958 - no compulsion on a single soul. And I went and I visited a lot of communities like that and the people wanted to move and they were going to move come hell or high water.

MR. CANNING: That is right. Right.

MR. FLIGHT: Tell the minister.

MR. WELLS: Well I will tell the minister. I am saying it as it is. I was involved, After 1959 I was not involved. I do not know what happened after that. I do not know anything about lists and all that. But I know in 1957-58 there were people on the islands of Bonavista Bay and the islands in Placentia Bay, a lot of places, crying out to move and they were going to move anyway. And I will go back even further; before Confederation, places like Pinchards Island down in Bonavista Bay, they moved long before the government got involved, in Commission of Government days before there was a cent of government money. They moved because they wanted to move and, God help us, if you said to me tonight, I am going to transplant you and put you down on Pinchards Island I would move out of it supposing

MR. WELLS: I had to get a few logs and float out of it.

Now there are parts of Newfoundland where people live that were not sensible places to live. But there are also parts of Newfoundland, rural parts like Greenspond, where I think there could be a future. And if the minister can do something in Rural Development to help these places come along, to help them develop, that is fine, but the majority of places that moved, in my opinion, certainly in the early days, moved because they wanted to move and for no other reason.

And, you know, it was not the great reasons, you know, that you read about in books. I have talked to ever so many of these people. I talked to hundreds. And they have come off an island and they would come and they would see a new car and they would say, Skipper, well boy, she is a beautiful car. I would love to have her. I would myself. You know. And they would want a fridge and a stove and they would want electric lights, and why should they not have these things? Why should they not want these things? And they moved to get these things and more power to them, fair enough.

Resettlement has always been going on in Newfoundland. Resettlement has always been going on in the world.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is going on now out of Newfoundland.

MR. WELLS: Sure it is. Sure. And why not? Why not? My eldest kid is graduating from Memorial after five years and a BSW which she will be awarded, and I say to her, Do not confine your horizons to here. The whole world is there for you to choose.

MR. NOLAN: She should be able to stay if she wants to, though.

MR. WELLS: If she wants to.

MR. NOLAN: Right. That is the job of government.

MR. WELLS: No, it is not necessarily the job of government. It is the job of private enterprise too and

Mr. Wells,

that is the trouble with us in Newfoundland: we think too many things of the job of government. Believe me, whenever government invests in anything, it has got a less than even chance of success. Where private enterprise invests in something, and if it is its own money, and it is shareholders' money, it is money that comes from the conventional institutions, somebody will get off his rear end and do a day's work. But I am sorry to say that when it is government money nobody seems to care. And we all know that, but we do not say it very often, and that is one of the sad things, too. So I would say to the minister - he has got a good programme, a good department, he is not going overboard. I am glad to see that we are only talking about \$6 million. If we were talking about \$20 million, \$30 million, \$40 million dished out in government funds to people in, you know, these schemes, I would be worried, because I would be afraid there be even less chance of its being spent properly and used for the proper pump priming. But \$6 million, I would think the minister and his department are well-equipped to oversee that, and I hope they do not lash it out. I hope they are careful with it, and I hope that they insist that it is repaid, and that is the only way. If you go to a bank and you borrow money for a business enterprise, the bank will take a first mortgage and the bank will want to be repaid, and they will make sure that you repay it if there is any human way. And I think the government should do the same thing.

I think that we talk about all the services we should provide, give people this, give people that. That is fine, great, great, no problem. But we forget that the money that we get to give people all these things with comes out of somebody's pay cheque. It comes out of your pocket when you go in and you pay your ten per cent. It comes out of your pocket in

Mr. Wells.

Federal and provincial income tax. And, you know, we are taxed almost to the limit in Newfoundland. The heavens, you talk about, just to get - I will speak about another level of taxation for a moment, municipal. Take here in St. John's. I learned quite by accident this morning that if, for example, a business pays \$12,000 a year rent here in St. John's, that between the landlord who collects that \$12,000 and the tenant who is in and pays business tax, that slightly over \$7,000 would be paid to the city council, under certain circumstances, in taxes. And you wonder why firms are wanting to go out at Donovans Industrial Park, to get outside St. John's and the level of taxation.

If we keep taxing people in Canada, federal, provincial, municipal, if we keep taxing them at the levels they are being taxed at now, finally everybody is going to lie down and throw up their hands and say, You feed me, government! That is just what it is going to come to. And you talk about people going outside Newfoundland, leaving Newfoundland. Our bright people are going to be long gone, because they are going to go to places where they get a better shake, and where they are not ripped off, not by business, but by government who is taking it all and giving it to those, very often sometimes, who have not got the will and the gumption to get up and do a day's work.

So I say to the minister, I am glad that it is \$6 million that he has and not \$26 million. If he can develop schemes and programmes that can prime the pump and can get people working, can get them off unemployment insurance, can get them off welfare, as he is doing, great, more power to him, and more power to these people. But be careful not to lash it out, because if it is lashed out willy-nilly and carelessly it is going to be wasted, and it is just going to be one of these great other examples that we have in Newfoundland, and have had since Confederation, of money going into a bottomless pit, money

Mr. Wells.

that is wasted and will do no good. And I will say something else. You talk about what has happened in Newfoundland since Confederation. I remember during the great building boom about ten years ago. An economist came down here. He was employed by a trade union, and he came down, and he took a walk around St. John's, and I was talking to him afterwards and he said, "Boy," he said, "I have taken a walk - it was a Sunday - around St. John's and have seen all the construction projects that are underway. But you know, Mr. Wells, not one of the construction projects that I saw are ever going to return a dollar to the Newfoundland economy after the construction stage." He said, "They are all public buildings. There is nothing that is going to produce anything and earn a dollar or even a foreign dollar or a recycled local dollar," he said, "not one." Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, I am just going to take a minute. We have got about twenty-five minutes left in the estimates, and my regret is that I do not have the time really to give the House a lot of information. And what I am likely to do, in view of the fact that I have not put it on the record - we have gotten involved in pretty much of a debate, which is something that I am very please with as well. But there is a lot of information that should be placed on the record to give members an opportunity to ingest what is going on in the department. But I would just like to comment on a few things. The member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) this

Mr. Lundrigan:

afternoon mentioned about the Assistant Deputy Minister of Rural Development. I want to inform him that on tomorrow the officials of at least three departments, plus the Public Service Commission will be involved in doing a preliminary - what would you call it? what is the word? - analysis by interview of the prospective candidates for that position, and I hope that within a week or so to be able to make a final selection along with my colleague, the Minister for Labrador, regarding that particular position. As to the number of people that will be working for the division in Labrador, it is difficult to say. We have isolated \$350,000 in the estimates, as hon. members can find, and that money will be used for the staff to fill the positions in Labrador to help administer our programme, and to help perhaps blossom out and reinforce the work of the Labrador Services and extend some of its work along the entire coast as well.

Mr. Chairman, just a few things on the member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells). I appreciate his comments. I have some very strong differences of opinion with him on the resettlement and I hesitate to emphasize this again, because I do not think it serves much purpose in view of the fact that the programme will discontinue or is discontinued but for a small cleaning up vote that is in there.

MR. NEAPY: Sit down, boy!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that as of 1970 the programme that he might have been a part of, where you might have had a voluntary resettlement, was somewhat slanted when we had the system of designated sending communities that were established. And I believe it was at that time that the programme got off stream when communities were designated sending communities, and I believe, even if it was subconscious, the departments of government were not eager to assist communities that

Mr. Lundrigan.

were on that sending list, and I do not think I am saying anything too controversial in that regard.

Now regarding the programmes, I indicated this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, that in the past twelve months, we have had 112 Rural Development loans approved in almost every district in our Province, some one and two, some three and four, as many as a half a dozen small loans. And we rate about approximately 500 jobs were created as a result of the 112 small industries that were started, averaging about four persons per small industry on the average, and costing about \$1.4 million in the form of a loan programme. And in that same calendar year, Mr. Chairman, to indicate to my friend from Kilbride, we had \$800,000 repaid by former clients of that programme. So the general treasury of the Province it was an outlay of a net of \$600,000, which is a small and modest programme, and it is having, we feel, an impact for the dollars that we are spending. We had roughly eighty projects or companies that received incentive grants for approximately \$750,000, and these incentive grants are mini DREE grants, if you want. They are smaller industries. They have not reached the \$25,000 minimum DREE requirement, and they can qualify for fifty/fifty cost-shared grant with the provincial and federal governments. And we feel these projects with about 250 jobs were very beneficial as well.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in the ARDA III projects, community projects, I will just indicate some of them. But it is not much good of me trying to convince hon. members who do not want to listen to little things, because none of these things are big and magnificent. They are all small. And I will just give an indication of some of the little things that happened in 1976, not a lot. These are some examples. The West Coast Dairymen's Association got an operating grant of \$33,000. Last week when I was out there in one of the communities we were able to meet and visit and see

Mr. Lundrigan.

a slaughter house going in a small community, and we were able through our programme to provide the \$51,000 or \$6,000 for facilities to have cattle - and you know what I mean by raising them up on the - what is that word? - the shuttling systems they have in the slaughter house - little things! But rated by the association as a very vital aspect of the economy of that area that has 800 head of cattle. Bay St. George got \$1,800 through their Development Association to complete the holding shed at Fishells and Crabs River. I understand that that has been a very beneficial thing, working with our fishermen and our Fisheries Department who reinforced the work that they are doing. The South Coast Development Association got a grant of almost \$10,000 for handicraft, and these people have been able to travel the various parts of the country to try and sell and market their handicraft. And we have had in handicraft, we have had

MR. LUNDRIGAN: people from the Straits, we have had people from the South Coast, and we will have more from the Northeast Coast travel to Toronto, travel to Vancouver, show their wares at the great fairs, have the buyers come look at what is possible to be marketed and really get into the market place in a very, very effective manner. Small things, little things, but very effective.

The White Bay North Development Association got a little grant which was comparable with the Fisheries Department. The Newfoundland and Labrador Crab Development get a grant to help underwrite some of their administrative costs. The Bay St. George Association, they got a grant which was in the fisheries area. The Rural Development Council got a grant of \$45,000 to put out The Rounder which we feel is one of the most valuable instruments of development in the sense that it emphasizes rural communities and achievements at the local level. No real boost to government but certainly a great boost to the local community and we feel this is one of the best uses of our dollars. This year God willing we will expand that amount of money to enable the positive press which it is, with no control by government whatsoever, to have a much broader distribution.

The Upper Trinity Development Association got a grant to complete a craft centre in Upper Trinity South which is an asset. And I was talking to the President some days ago and they were very pleased with this bit of money to help their particular development.

We provided in pilot project funding for the monies to complete the first fish farm that has ever

MR. LUNDRIGAN: been completed in this Province, with sixty odd thousand dollars in Upper Trinity South, Hopeall. For the first time in 1977 we will have fish grown and raised and developed in our own Province. If the pilot project succeeds we will end up expanding it into a programme, a little thing, a tremendous number of headaches and heartaches and challenges have gone into this little project. No great effort on the part of anybody except the combined group at the local level and the department and federal fisheries, we have worked towards something that looks like it could be a success story.

In Bonavista North we put \$65,000 into a -

MR. ROWE: I am not going to try to prorogue tonight, but would the minister accept a question? This trout farm here in Hopeall, as it is called, the Hopeall Fish Farm, how many people did that employ over the last couple of years and what is the intention of the department now after this gets moving with respect to transfer of fish to other areas of the Province, or is the minister planning to set up similar farms in other parts of the Province as a result of this experimental project?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, I cannot give the precise dollar value attached to the construction and the establishment of the facility. To operate it and actually carry on the day to day operations there are a couple of people involved. The capital cost at the present moment has been in the vicinity of \$65,000 with all of the labour input as well and some of the technology that has gone into the plant. But the big thing is if it is successful, if we can raise fish by the force feeding methods and the sort of control environment, then it could mean that we will have in almost any number of regions of the Province, two or three, three or four people being

MR. LUNDRIGAN: able to make a livelihood out of the fish farm concept which has become a big industry in Denmark but really it is not a big industry, it is thousands of little ones, and if it succeeds and it looks like we are looking at success, then we will expand it into a programme. Right now it is a project.

Mr. Chairman, we have assisted on the South Coast -

MR. ROWE: Can the minister indicate when the result of the experiment will be known?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: We should know it by the end of this calendar year and we should have the first crop of fish ready for market, if you want it, the market might be in my deep freeze for all I know because I am very susceptible to -

MR. ROWE: Well let us get together on it.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: - taking advantage of those particular fish,

MR. NEARY: How are you going to be able to get it to market?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I have already bought an extra deep freeze, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman-see, tells the story, the aspiring leader. Look, he is trying to figure out which direction he is going to move in. He is sitting there today hopefully. The Leader of the Opposition is over to this particular function, is he not? There he is there right now showing his true colour.

MR. NEARY: You need a walk in freezer.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, we help with the fog horn on the South Coast that was quite controversial last year, which is an instrument of communications along the South Coast which we rate as very valuable. Again it does not create a tremendous number of jobs but it helps focus on people

May 17, 1977

Tape No. 2892

NM - 4

MR. LUNDRIGAN: at a local level which we read is important.

We put \$125,000 behind the Codroy Valley Development Association to establish a wool carding spinning mill facility. Now this is something which will be open by the end of this month, I believe the 3rd. of June is the date specified, in Doyles. The total capital cost is just over \$200,000. The value of it, I would say, if it had been done by a contractor or if it had been done by government, to build

Mr. Lundrigan

the mill, to equip it, to place a facility in place, would cost, I would estimate, about \$ 1 million. The association on their own - the only thing we have done after working with them very closely through our planning and through our various other divisions, we have assisted them with the few dollars once we were certain, as much as we could be, that the concept was viable. They have gone literally throughout the world. They have acquired equipment and manufacturing capability. They have had professional people come in from various parts of the country to train at the local level. They will have at the end of the month of May twelve people, once the thing gets off the ground, spinning and carding wool for the first time to our knowledge as a major industry in our Province, major in the sense that we will have twelve jobs. By the end of the year, if the thing picks up and we can capture the local market, we could have thirty-six people employed, a very important thing. It is a big industry for the local community. It reinforces the agricultural potential. They have already purchased about 12,000 pounds of wool from around the Province, places all around the Southern Shore, Lewisporte, from my hon. member's district. Again it was amazing when I was there to kick around the bags of wool and find they were from all around the Province. It does not do much for an individual per sheep. It adds about \$10 on the average to an individual as a return per sheep if he is a small farmer.

But again, you know, I am wasting my breath. I believe, talking to hon. members, because it is a little thing, and it is not a great major industry. Mr. Chairman, we can go on and talk about the construction, by the Central Development Association, at St. Pauls of a landing facility which, I understand, has been very successful. We have done little things on the Eastport Peninsula

Mr. Lundrigan.

with lobsters and the fish plant at Salvage. We have helped in Makkovik with the harvesting of seals, a small grant of \$8,000. The Exploits Development Association have gotten \$18,000 to reinforce the work being done in the processing of salt fish in Leading Tickle. And I will just take that as an example for a few moments, and just mention it. Leading Tickle was a community that was going downhill very, very rapidly. The Development Association got involved and started to do a survey of what the potential was in Leading Tickle. It was not a big discovery to find out that the big issue, and the big opportunity was in the fishery. Nothing had been done to upgrade, first of all, the capability of processing, adding value at the local level and helping with the marketing. Over a period of months and months and months of deliberation at the local level, surveys, meetings, discussions with the people, with the fishermen, arguing back and forth, saying, There is no future here, they finally came to the conclusion that they were going to try to do something with the fishery. Last year Leading Tickle had a fairly healthy economy. Instead of it being dependent on government, it began to be independent, a very few dollars involved. The total outlay of funds was \$18,000, but the process of having the people sit down, debate among themselves, discuss and argue and determine what their future was, drag in the salt fish marketing, look for opportunities themselves. The process was more important than the dollars, and the jobs.

Now I find it difficult to educate -

MR. NEAPY: How much did the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation put in?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I do not think they put in anything, to my knowledge.

MR. NEAPY: Well, I think they did. They put a fair amount in.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I do not think they put in anything, to my knowledge.

Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY: Give the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation the credit.

MR. LINDRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, I could not give a damn who gets the credit. What I am trying to say is that there is a development taking place in a community -

MR. RIPEOUT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I do believe that earlier today there was a ruling made here with regards to 'damn' and 'bloody' and language of that nature being unparliamentary and so I would ask the Chariman to ask the minister to withdraw it.

MR. LINDRIGAN: I withdraw that remark and get on with the business. I am just a little sick and tired of hon. members worrying about who is responsible.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, there is a point of order before the House and Your Honour has to rule on the point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is time for us to dispose of it once and for all. Damn is a German coin, practically worthless, and the expression 'not to give a damn' has nothing to do with swearing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

The hon. minister has indicated that he is withdrawing the remark so there is no further need to rule on that point.

The hon. minister.

MR. LINDRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, we helped out several small producers with research into craft development, raw materials for craft development, the smoking facilities at Greenpond, with working capital, all of them, small projects. Who gets the credit? I could not care less who gets the credit. I am trying

Mr. Lundrigan.

to tell hon. members that there are hundreds of small, little things going on in a lot of communities they do not know about.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEAPY: Give us a list of names.

MR. LUNDPIGAN: All he wants is a list of names.

I do not trust the hon. member far enough to give him a list of names under the Rural Development Authority.

MR. NEARY: Well, the people do not trust the hon. gentleman any more.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The Southern Shore Development Association, a bit of activity in Ferryland; the Placentia Area Project, St. Anthony Concerned Citizens, one of the ones that I am most proud of, 2,000 little dollars going out

MR. LUNDRIGAN: to help these concerned citizens focus attention on the seal fishery. I have got a bit of criticism for that. I am delighted about that because I think they perhaps produced through their effort this year one of the most positive results we have ever had in trying to defend success of the seal fishery.

We go on, Mr. Chairman, to -

AN HON. MEMBER: Little Bay Islands importing workers.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, I can go on down with dozens of those -

MR. ROWE: Would the minister indicate to the Committee where he got the criticism?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, I do not know if I got any criticism, I am going to say that -

MR. ROWE: He was congratulated in this House of Assembly.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Thank you very much. I am delighted, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the Bay St. George Native Women's Handicraft Association - \$3,000, constructing handicraft building, and we can go on. We have 112 little loans. Not all of them were the most successful, but, Mr. Chairman, we have got dozens of examples of where we have created with a small little bit of effort very successful enterprises in a large part of our Province.

I was just going to start now, Mr. Chairman, if I can take the next five hours, I will give hon. members a list of all of the projects that we have been able to successfully put together in the Province through the ARDA III programme under incentives and under loans. And I want to tell the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan), has the member for Bellevue ever heard of the Cron-coar Farms?

AN HON. MEMBER: The what?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: That is in Bellevue, Trinity Bay. Where is Bellevue? That is that beautiful little community out there in the bottom of the bay. A \$12,000 loan to try to develop organic fertilizer from two ingredients, peat and poultry manure. Has he heard of that project?

MR. CALLAN: No, I understand -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Has he heard of that project?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Four jobs, full-time, looks like it is going to be a success story, \$12,500, likely to have four more, right now four full-time jobs.

MR. NEARY: I will tell you what -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: We have got dozens. Last week we had a project approved where we think a very capable successful individual is going to raise pheasants, not a great deal, funny little stories, but we have got hundreds of those funny little stories.

AN HON. MEMBER: He admits they are funny.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, I am suggesting to Your Honour, listening this afternoon, the hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan), the official spokesman for the Opposition told me, I listened and heard, "You do not need Rural Development. Transfer," he said, "there is a little bit of it is Fisheries, there is a little bit of it Forestry, a little bit of it Agriculture. What do you need Rural Development for? Get rid of it." That is what the hon. member said and that was the tenor of the conversations I heard from across the House this afternoon.

This is a very successful programme. A very limited amount of dollars have gone into it. It is not dollar oriented, it is process oriented. It takes a long time.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: It is going to take I say ten years. We have been four years on the go now, to bring about some of the evolutionary changes in a lot of our smaller towns and there has to be a realization, as the member for Kilbride said, that for government to do it all, for government to initiate it all, for government to spend the money on it all, for government to run out and start the industry. That is the one way to rob people of their pride, their independence and their initiative and that is where this government differs from that government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: This afternoon I made some notes of some of the comments that were made by hon. members and it was a little bit nauseating. "Where have the monies been given?" says the member for Bellevue, the official spokesman, "Where have all the monies been given?" The kind of attitude, "monies given," No monies have been given. Our programmes are supplementary programmes. They are under-scoring programmes, under-pinning programmes. They are programmes that try to re-enforce local initiative. They are not always successful. They are not programmes that are the active ones that go out and start industry. It is not the responsibility of the government to go out and start industry. It is not the responsibility of the government to go out and start industries. If that were the case we might as well turn it all around, all become rampant socialists and we will destroy our system in about two more years. We are on the way. It has taken us a long time. We have turned the corner a bit, especially

MR. LUNDRIGAN: in our rural parts of our Province and I will say right now, members can get up like the hon. gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) who speaks out of four sides of his mouth, Mr. Chairman. This afternoon with his comments and his negativism and his feudal attitude, talking about Rural Development, a great success story.

MR. NEARY:

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

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, whether I am successful or not Rural Development is on its way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please! I have to indicate that the hon. member's time has elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

On motion 1601-01 through 1604-0306, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do the remaining heads under heading XV carry?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Carry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carried.

On motion heading XVI, without amendment, carried.

MR. HICKMAN: Head VII - Justice.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Head VII, page thirty-seven, Justice.
The hon. House Leader.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I am sort of in the hands of the Committee. There has been some suggestion during debate in Committee on estimates that more information can be acquired by dealing with the individual headings rather than the minister's salary whilst other hon. gentlemen would prefer to move to the minister's salary and debate the minister's salary. I can do either.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there being no consensus I will follow the same practice as my colleagues and very briefly refer to certain highlights in the Department of Justice's estimates. I have to confess that the estimates -

MR. NEAPY: I am sorry. Was the hon. Leader asking a question?

MR. HICKMAN: I was sort of inquiring and indicating that if hon. gentlemen opposite - because my anxiety is to see to it that whatever information there is in the Justice estimates be made available to the Committee. There has been a suggestion from time to time when estimates are being debated that we are spending all of our time, or too much of our time, on great philosophical debates under the minister's salary, and then when we get to the real meat and the real information sections of the estimates that there is a lack of time or inadequate time or people have lost interest in it, and I just do not, as I say, have any objection in moving that way.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Chairman, if I may. I do not think we would have any. Is it four hours on this or is it three?

MR. HICKMAN: Three.

MR. NOLAN: Three hours on Justice. Therefore, perhaps the minister might want to give a short rundown on his department of what he has done and what he has not done, and in addition -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: That will only take ten seconds.

MR. NOLAN: - in addition to that maybe we can have a short go at it from over here and maybe we can then go to the headings because I agree with the minister. And I am assuming that the members agree that there is no intention obviously to squelch anything that one might want to say. But sometimes we can get into more meat, if you like, by getting into the exact headings -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NOLAN: - and getting more specific into the various items that I think we should discuss, and I believe we have missed some of this in the past frankly.

MR. HICKMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Well may I first in referring to the matters that are coming before the Committee now under the heading of Justice draw the Committee's attention to the, I think, change of attitude, change of philosophy, that the 'Voores Administration has shown toward this important field of government. We should remind ourselves, Mr. Chairman, that, you know, parliaments and governments were created primarily for the purpose of making laws and administering them.

MR. NOLAN: Yes.

MR. HICKMAN: The building of roads, the providing of water and sewerage, the providing of schools, the providing of the amenities of life came many centuries after, but politicians over the last fifty years or more in their anxiety to satisfy the electorate that they are sensitive to their needs have made it increasingly difficult for Attorneys General to find the kind of money that is necessary to properly discharge

Mr. Highman.

the electorate that they are sensitive to their needs have made it increasingly difficult for Attorneys General to find the kind of money that is necessary to properly discharge that responsibility. But I think it is significant, Mr. Chairman, that in 1972, five years ago, the total vote on current and capital account for the Department of Justice was \$9,002,200. ~~The vote that is being asked-~~

MR. HICKMAN: The vote that is being asked for in the estimates this year, from the committee, is \$29,677,000. Now some of that, obviously, Mr. Chairman, is inflated money. But none of it, Mr. Chairman, unfortunately - When I say none of it, there may be a couple of hundred thousand dollars coming under the Legal Aid Programme. Other than that, regretfully - unfortunately, there is no federal money in my vote, in the \$29,677,000. Mr. Chairman, all I ask this committee for is the amount of money that the Province and/or Government of Newfoundland pays toward the R.C.M.P. This is provincial money. I have subscribed to the view, from the very beginning, that there should be a responsibility on the part of the Government of Canada to provide what I call a foundation in the administration of justice.

The Fathers of Confederation, in 1867, I think, put one over on the Provinces at the time with respect to the administration of justice. They said, "Give us the exclusive responsibility to make the criminal laws." Nothing wrong with that. It is good. We must have uniform criminal laws across Canada. But they then said, "We will confer upon the provincial Attorneys-General the total and exclusive responsibility for enforcing the criminal law of Canada." That does not make much sense. There is little, if any, consultation in the making of the laws that we have to administer, but we have to bear the cost.

The same thing applies with the Superior and District Courts of this nation, Mr. Chairman. Again, the Governor General-in-Council appoints and pays the salary of all judges. But the total and exclusive responsibility for providing facilities, in order that the federal appointees perform their work, falls upon the Provinces. And, obviously, this makes for a very marked disparity in the administration of justice, facility-wise, across this nation. All one has to do is look at the facilities that are available in Ontario and Quebec, Alberta, British Columbia, and now, Saskatchewan. They seem to have come into their own financially, and one will see why, in my opinion, there is a great deal of merit in advocating that there be a foundation below which no province would have to go with respect to the facilities that ensure speedy trials. This theory,

MR. HICKMAN: this belief, this philosophy, was espoused by me in 1972, and, slowly but surely, we have now reached the position where all ten provincial Attorneys-General, last year, came to the conclusion that this should be the kind of policy, the kind of change in policy that we would commend and recommend to our federal counterparts. So far there has been no indication at all, Mr. Chairman, that there will be any change in that philosophy or constitutional right.

Mr. Chairman, the budget for the Department of Justice shows, again, a very substantial increase in the cost of administering the Courts in this Province during the last five years. The day-to-day operation of even the limited Court facilities that we have, that vote has gone from \$944,000 to the amount that is being asked for this year, \$3,766,000.

Mr. Chairman, every year since I have occupied the portfolio of Attorney-General, when I come before committee with my estimates I have been in a position where I have had to indicate, with regret, the inability to attract young lawyers, or lawyers generally, to the Public Service. I am very happy to report to the committee that there is a change coming about in that regard. When I reassumed this portfolio in 1972, we were down to, I believe, four lawyers in the Department of Justice - maybe five - certainly, not more than five. Today we have on staff twenty-three lawyers. Now, that is not enough. I would like to see double as many,

AN HON. MEMBER: You want a hundred Mr. Hickman.

MR. HICKMAN: No, not a hundred. The province of New Brunswick, where they have a divided jurisdiction in law enforcement where the municipalities pay for a lot of the law enforcement costs - some of the Crown prosecutors and policing, I believe - in New Brunswick, they had sixty-one on their staff - sixty-one lawyers, all told. I doubt if we will ever reach that desirable number. But, be that as it may, we now have, as I said this morning during question period, ten Crown prosecutors in the Province, plus another in Corner Brook, who, whilst

May 17, 1977

Tape No. 2896

EC - 3

MR. HICKMAN:

He is not a public servant and is not on salary, is devoting most of his time, so that makes eleven, all told.

Mr. Chairman, since the committee last met we have spent a considerable sum of money in renovating and modernizing, and improving facilities, and, hopefully, giving the kind of facilities that will result in speedier trials in the main provincial court house for the Province, in St. John's.

In the Superior Court, that is the Trial Division of the Superior Court, there has been a very satisfactory renovation of the courtrooms and the facilities in that building. And there has been provided a third

MR. HICKMAN: courtroom in the main Provincial building, with the result that any three trial judges of the Superior Court can be sitting at the same time. There has been a fair amount of improvement, one that is long, long, long overdue in providing adequate facilities for witnesses who come to the Court House. As far back as I can remember - and I started practising law in this Province in 1947 in St. John's - the wooden chairs and the hard benches that were provided for jurors and for witnesses who were summoned to give evidence from time to time in the Supreme Court, left a great deal to be desired.

MR. NEARY: Do they pay witnesses, and how much?

MR. HICKMAN: The witnesses are paid, I think it is eight dollars a day, but I say that off the top of my head. It is a very small amount that is being paid, but on the other hand there is the philosophy and belief in the hallmark of the British system of justice that any citizen should be very willing to, once in a while, probably once in a lifetime - I doubt if there are very many people ever get called to serve either as a juror, or to give evidence more than once or twice in a lifetime - and that should not be -

MR. NEARY: Why should it be the citizen who has to sacrifice? Why cannot the system be changed?

MR. HICKMAN: Because, Mr. Chairman, the reason why -

MR. NEARY: Why not change the system of the Supreme Court?

MR. HICKMAN: The reason why - the citizen is not exactly being asked to sacrifice - but why it is not as remunerative as maybe one would like is that most citizens regard it, and should regard it, and should be asked to regard it, and should be taught to regard it, as one of the public duties that only very few countries left now where you have the right to participate in. If one would look, Mr. Chairman - and now I am getting into philosophy - if one would look at the very few countries in the world today where that right still exists - not just the Iron Curtain countries. Just take a look at all the continents.

MR. NOLAN: Newfoundland.

MR. HICKMAN: No, not Newfoundland. Not just Newfoundland, But in most parts of the Commonwealth, but not all, does one find that kind of freedom where a man or a woman can still look to his or her peers to decide on their innocence or their guilt, or the right vis-a-vis their neighbour, or their right vis-a-vis some other citizen.

Mr. Chairman, these renovations, as I say, have immensely improved the facilities in the Supreme Court building. We have also, and this is a very vexing problem that has been with us for a long time, but I think we are beginning to see daylight on it, and that is with respect to the acquisition of and the providing of speedy, efficient, accurate, quick, court reporting. Too many cases have been delayed on appeal because of the length of time that has been required in order to get a transcript - an accurate transcript - of the evidence. We have been using - pardon ?

MR. STRACHAN: What about the magistrates who write it in longhand?

MR. HICKMAN: I will come to that now, too. We have been using in the Trial Division and in the other courts some recording equipment that has to be supported by court reporters.

MR. HICKMAN: This is still being done, but recently new recording equipment was provided to the trial division - and I believe to the district court, but I am not sure of this - after the officials had taken a look at the recording equipment presently used in other provinces and specified what they felt to be the most accurate. I am hoping that as the accuracy of the recording equipment is proven to the satisfaction of our judges that they will then see fit to move away from having court reporters there as well.

In the vote one will see also money for recording equipment to continue furnishing our magistrate's and district courts with the same kind of equipment, somewhat different than in the trial division because it has to be portable. The magistrates have indicated to me they prefer the kind that they can take with them without the necessity of having to bring their court reporter whenever they travel long distances.

But this, Mr. Chairman, is designed to speed up appeals and to provide adequate staff in the reporters office because it is not the kind of a job that one can expect to find a young man or woman coming straight out of trade school capable of handling. It takes a very experienced shorthand reporter and, as I say, we may move away from that in time. We are also moving toward building up a pool of court reporters so that when one becomes ill or leaves we do not have to wait for several months in order to replace that person.

Mr. Chairman, when we get further along into the estimates I want to spend a bit of time referring to and advising the committee of what is transpiring in the district court area, We now have seven district court judges. I am determined that the people of this province will not have to spend lots of money will not have to spend excessive amounts of money, will not have to travel excessively long distances in order to have their rights adjudicated,

MR. HICKMAN: but rather the courts must come to the people. With the establishment of a district court in Gander and another in Grand Bank we now have Corner Brook, Grand Falls, Gander, Brigus, Grand Bank and two in St. John's. That is beginning to cover, Mr. Chairman, the province. I still am not satisfied with the coverage that is being provided to the Labrador section of our province, although when the new district court is proclaimed, and it will be proclaimed as soon as the Judges Act is amended in Ottawa, so that they can appoint in Ottawa an eighth district court judge, namely the chief judge, that gentleman or lady will have the responsibility and the right to assign district court judges to any part of the province so that we can have what I would hope to be continuing circuits in these areas. But, as I say, this comes under a specific heading. I think too that the committee will be particularly interested in certain figures, certain information that has been evolving since we have had some marked changes in law enforcement by the police as it relates to traffic control, both as a result of changes in policing methods and communications by the Newfoundland Constabulary and by the RCMP. I do have some figures here showing a very very substantial decline in traffic accidents and serious inquiries which in my opinion is proof positive of the wisdom of pretty rigid law enforcement in the motor vehicle and or traffic area.

Mr. Chairman, again one of the, I think, very necessary and exciting approaches to law enforcement will transpire in this province this year with the establishment as a pilot project in cooperation with the Government

MR. HICKMAN: of Canada of the Unified Family Court. Three provinces are in the process of negotiating with the hon. Ronald Basford, P.C., Attorney General of Canada, on the idea of a Unified Family Court - Manitoba, Ontario and Newfoundland. Mr. Basford visited St. John's recently and indicated that his government was prepared to accept the invitation which I had extended to him some months ago to work with us in establishing a Unified Family Court. And there, Mr. Chairman, the emphasis is going to be away from the adversary system. The adversary system in most matrimonial cases is not effective and should, in my opinion, be used only on the rarest of occasions.

The Unified Family Court, hopefully when as a result of legislation which is planned to be introduced within the next few weeks in the House, this Unified Family Court, which will be a pilot project in the metropolitan St. John's area and Bell Island, will be a three year project because when one embarks upon what is a very major change in the common law one has to move with a great deal of caution.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. HICKMAN: And with that cautious word I shall cautiously take my seat, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, how long more are we going to have to listen to these sanctimonious introductory remarks by the Minister of Justice? I wish, Sir, the Government of Canada would send the hon. gentleman to the bench -

MR. HICKMAN: Never.

MR. NEARY: - so the hon. gentleman will not come in to this House year after year preaching to the House.

MR. HICKMAN: You will miss me.

MR. NEARY: No! I might miss Mr. Crosbie but I would not miss the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman, Sir, in introducing his estimates was just as dull, unimaginative as we have heard him in recent years. Nothing new, Did not tell us how the administration of justice was operating in this Province, Did not enlighten us, for instance, Mr. Chairman,

MR. NEARY: on how the investigations are going into the fishery gear replacement scandal and we have been trying to pry information out of the hon. Minister of Justice now for almost two years in connection with these investigations. They have dragged on for between a year and a half and two years, and the other day, when I asked the minister in the House during the Oral Question period for some information in connection with these investigations, the minister was vague, evasive, uncommittal, noncommittal in his answers as if the minister was trying to hide something. The minister left me with the impression that the whole matter was being swept under the rug, that the investigations were grinding to a halt; and that only welfare recipients and only those who are receiving unemployment insurance that they are not entitled to would be hauled into court and put in jail, but not those who committed serious offences in connection with the fishery gear replacement programme.

It is a shame, Mr. Chairman. Does the hon. gentleman realize - the hon. gentleman is a lawyer and any lawyer in this House, and I am not a lawyer, but any lawyer knows that it is very poor law when you cause a delay in an investigation in bringing culprits, charging people and bringing them before the court. It is considered to be very poor law indeed.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of privilege, according to our Standing Orders at the first opportunity, because it is the first opportunity I have had to rise on this point of privilege, because I was not in the House after quarter to six this afternoon and I needed the transcript of what was said in the House this afternoon in order to respond, since I only found out about it after the House closed this afternoon. Mr. Chairman, it came about during the debate on the Rural Development estimates this afternoon, and I am referring

MR. F. WHITE: to remarks made by the Minister of Rural Development, the member for Grand Falls, who, it is my opinion, attributed motives to me this afternoon when he spoke in the House after I had left. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not know why the hon. member would see fit to do this, I did not get up and attack him today or any other time since the House has been open, or since I have been in the House. I did not get involved in the Rural Development estimates this afternoon although I once attempted to and another member was recognized.

Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that the privileges of the House were breached when the hon. member referred to me in this way this afternoon, and I will quote: "They got their noses a little bit reddened and they were coached, I believe, by the member for Lewisporte," and he went on to say, quote, "Who has not got the guts to stand in the House here and carry on a good debate."

Now, number one, Mr. Chairman, I did not coach any hon. member on this side of the House with respect to the action that was taken by the opposition just before six o'clock today. It was a collective decision made by members here to forego further discussion with respect to the Rural Development estimates because we felt that we were not getting any information from the minister, so that was the decision we made.

Now if I heard your ruling correctly earlier, Mr. Chairman, you said something to the effect that you did not feel that the member for Grand Falls, the Minister of Rural Development, was referring to cowardice or anything of that nature with respect to me, and I feel, Mr. Chairman, that he was referring to cowardice when he said "The hon. member has not got the guts." That has nothing to do with my anatomy, Mr. Chairman. In my opinion, it has to do with whether or not I am cowardly or not. So, Mr. Chairman, I would ask that the member for Grand Falls, the Minister of Rural Development, be asked to withdraw both remarks without qualification and we will let it rest

MR. WHITE: at that.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I realize that in responding on the question of personal privilege the Chair will permit only a very few remarks and no debate. But I simply draw to Your Honour's attention that earlier this afternoon - or earlier this evening, the Chair did rule on the use of the word 'guts' and interpreted the use of the word 'guts; or lack thereof, as it related to the hon member for Lewisporte is that he did not for some reason or other have the stomach to participate in this debate and that it did not in any way refer to lack of courage or anything thereof.

If Your Honour in deciding whether or not the hon gentleman from Lewisporte has made out a prima facie case; which he is obligated to do on a question of personal privilege, I would draw Your Honour's attention to page 130 of Beauchesne and in particular paragraph 155 thereof, and in particular sub-paragraph (4) which defines abusive and insulting language and gives examples: "Villains", "impertinence", "rude remarks", "gross calumny", "impudence", "ruffianism", "hypocrites", "pharisees", "murderer", "holligan", "blackguard", "traitor", "charges of treason", "That a member ought to be in prison for high treason", "alleging that a member's statements were not 'consonant with personal honour'", "malignant slander", "scurrilous", "dishonest", "vicious and vulgar", "criminal", "corrupt", "That a member has been detected in the grossest practice of corruption" -

MR. NOLAN: Is that your own biography, or what?

MR. HICKMAN: alleging "that a member was returned by the refuse of a large constituency", "cad or caddishness", "insulting doe", "description of a member's speech as 'blather'", "lie down doe", "behaving like a jack-ass" -

SOME NON MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKMAN:

"swine," "cheat", "stool-pigeons". All of these, Mr. Chairman, have been ruled as abusive and insulting language and I believe that in this House - but I cannot swear to this because it was long before my day - but I did have a great-uncle one time who represented Burin and he used -

MR. NOLAN: Is this in order?

MR. HICKMAN: I am just giving some very brief remarks because the Chair, I know, will want to give this very careful consideration to see whether a prima facie case has been made out. But I did have a great-uncle who one time represented the great district of Burin, and on one occasion used the phrase "barber's cat" and there was some great debate took place in this House that lasted well into the midnight as to whether "barber's cat" was indeed one of these abusive and insulting

Mr. Hickman:

language of some description. I am not sure of the ruling that was made with respect to "barber's cat." But I do hope that my very brief comments will aid Your Honour in arriving at a decision, an agonizing decision, with respect to a prima facie case.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, speaking to the -

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will hear one more hon. member on the point of privilege, and then I would propose to discuss it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! When the Chairman of Committee, as indeed similar to the Speaker addressing the House, is addressing the Committee, members should not interrupt until he has concluded his remarks. The remarks that I was making were that I will hear one hon. member, one further hon. member, on the point of privilege and then I would propose to speak to the Committee on the matter. There may be further discussions following this, but I would like to address the Committee having heard one further hon. member.

MR. F. ROWE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Minister of Justice, Mr. Chairman, referred to Beauchesne, page 130, Section 155, Subsection (4), and the hon. member listed off from beginning to end all of the words that are not allowed to be used by hon. members of this House, in a rather jocular manner. However what the hon. Minister of Justice failed to do, Sir, with respect to his citation from Beauchesne was to carry on with the other sections under Section 155, the other subsections. And I refer specifically to page 131, Mr. Chairman, Subsection (2) of Section 155, in which it says, the following phrases are unparliamentary, "No member shall be permitted to say of another that he could expect no candour from him." And I would submit, Mr. Chairman, that from what I can see, from the transcript of the remarks made by the Minister of Industrial and Rural Development that this is in fact what he has done. Also, Sir, that

Mr. F. Rowe:

his remarks were indeed insulting to the House and to the country. I would submit that the minister was insulting to this hon. House at Committee stage, and in fact to the country. And that he was also, Sir, guilty of gross misrepresentation when he referred to my colleague for Lewisporte (Mr. White) who had not even spoken in the debate up to that point. Also, Sir, if you would look at, refer to Subsection (3) "No member can be allowed to attribute any intention to insult others or to question the honour of one."

MR. HICKMAN: Is the hon. gentleman reading ...

MR. ROWE: I am - if the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. ROWE: - listened quite patiently to the hon. Minister of Justice and I would expect that he would do the same for an hon. member who is replying on this side of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please! The hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde should continue his remarks without interruption.

MR. ROWE: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

And, Sir, further down in Subsection (3) the last phrase on page 131, "No member can be allowed to attribute any intention to insult others; or nor may he refer derisively to another member."

Now, Sir, I looked at the transcript of the remarks made by the Minister of Rural and Industrial Development, and I would submit, Sir, that every one of the phrases that I have cited from Beauchesne, the hon. minister is really guilty of committing each one of these crimes, if you want to call it that, or using unparliamentary language in this House of Assembly, breaches -

AN HON. MEMBER: Offensively.

MR. ROWE: Offensive language in this House of Assembly.

AN HON. MEMBER: Insulting.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROWE: "That he could expect no candour from him."

AN HON. MEMBER: When was that said?

MR. ROWE: Well that is what the intent

MR. ROWE: of the statements made by the hon. the minister meant, that his remarks are insulting to the House and to the country which in debate had to be, Sir, particularly when you take into consideration the fact that my colleague representing the district of Lewisporte had not even opened his mouth in this particular debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please! I believe I do have the sense that the hon. member is contributing on this matter -

MR. ROWE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: - so if he -

MR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, may I just - I was citing Beauchesne, may I just clue up with one -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No. No.

MR. ROWE: Look, the Chairman rules the House -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. ROWE: I am asking the Chairman if I may be permitted to have a closing statement, a closing phrase -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. ROWE: - a closing sentence.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I have indicated that I have understood the hon. member's remark. I feel that he did repeat some of the points he was making so that I would assume therefore that his remarks have come to a close if he is at the point of repeating some of the remarks already made.

MR. ROWE: No, I have not. I had not finished.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In the matter of clarification -

AN HON. MEMBER: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to remind hon. members of the House that when the Chairman is addressing the House it is quite unparliamentary to interrupt. It does disrupt the order of the House. It makes the job of the Chair very difficult if not impossible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On a point of clarification, I would remind the members of the House that this matter arose out of a point of order which was raised by the hon. member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan). I do have a copy of the transcript so if you would allow me I will read the point of order he raised:

"Mr. Nolan - Mr. Chairman, have we now reached the point in this House where the hon. member is allegedly qualified to determine who has guts in this House and who has not and so on." The point of order then continues: "He has cast aspersions now upon the member for Lewisporte, who is not here to defend himself. I now ask that he withdraw these remarks. Mr. Chairman."

The House will recall that I had already made a ruling in regard to that point of order. The ruling I made covered the first part of the point of order, that is, the part relating to the question of who has guts in this House, and if you will remember I ruled that this was a matter that related - or at least an opinion that related to the hon. members opposite wishing to debate the matter. It was not on their personal courage or similar attributes. And secondly that it related in a general way, it did not relate to a specific member.

Now the hon. the member for Lewisporte (Mr. White) has brought up a point of privilege that relates to the second half of that point of order, the part that I did not rule on. The reason why, the House is aware, I did not rule on is that it had escaped my attention and had escaped my memory when I made the ruling so that bringing up the point of privilege is in order because a ruling has not already been made upon it.

Referring to May, page 429, and page 430, on page 429 in the first instance there is a section under Allegations against members, which reads in part as follows: "Good temper and moderation are the characteristics of parliamentary language."

MR. CHAIRMAN: On page 430, under subsection 4, entitled "Abusive and insulting language of a nature likely to cause disorder," it indicates here certain expressions which have caused the Chair to intervene from time to time are listed in an appendix in this chapter, which I need not go into now. "Expressions which are unparliamentary when applied to individuals are not always so considered when applied to a whole party."

Also in Beauchesne, section 154, subsection 3, in part it says, "The imputation of bad motives," and so on, "or contemptuous or insulting language of any kind. All these are unparliamentary and call for prompt interference."

The remarks which the hon. member for Lewisporte (Mr. White) objects to and brings up in his point of privilege are:

Mr. Chairman.

"who has not got the guts to stand in the House and carry on a good debate." I would take it that these remarks are, as indicated, are not in good temper and moderation. They do have a connotation of being contemptuous and insulting. So I would, therefore, feel that the Chair should call upon the hon. minister if he would withdraw these remarks in the context that they have been taken as being insulting and contemptuous.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, I do so with great sincerity, because I do feel, even if Your Honour had not ruled accordingly, and he did, and, of course, it is a double reason why I need and must respond as I am doing, that in the heat of the debate around five to six when the hon. members fled from the Chamber and left me alone at the mercy of the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Canning), and I believe he was the only member in the House, I was very perturbed, and I did make some pretty controversial comments, and I apologize to the hon. member for Lewisporte (Mr. White), who is a person that I have known in the Parliamentary circle, even before he got elected, in his former profession. I think it was unfair of me to be sort of derogatory as I was in the way I lashed out, and I think it was a bit unfair of me. It is the sort of thing, Mr. Chairman, that happens in the heat of debate, and I will predict, Mr. Chairman, that before the next decade is over it might even happen again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: 701-01.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: By the way, Mr. Chairman, I did not know that I had referred to the hon. member as specifically as that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: Now, I assume we are back on the estimates of the Department of Justice.

MR. MURPHY: We are now before the bar.

MR. NOLAN: We are now before the bar.

MR. MORGAN: How much time did you lose over this incident?

MR. NOLAN: Yes, 15 that taken out of the estimate time? I guess it is.

MR. MORGAN: That is the name of the game over there. It is obvious.

MR. NOLAN: It is the name of the game over here? Do we have to ask the hon. member to withdraw that now also, Mr. Chairman? He is implying motives again.

MR. MORGAN: Twenty minutes gone off the estimates.

MR. FLIGHT: Thanks to "Alex".

MR. MORGAN: Thanks to privilege and points of order.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Chairman, I am about to try to address myself to the matters referring to the Department of Justice. I have not yet opened my yap, and the Minister of Transportation and Communications is there jibbering away. Now I want silence or I am not prepared to continue.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

The hon. member has requested silence while he makes his remarks which is within his rights as an hon. member of the House.

The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: All right, now that we have that cleared away, Mr. Chairman, we will get on to the Department of Justice. First of all I think it is only fair as we start off to remember, while we certainly have some criticisms of the hon. minister and his department, that it is not all bad. And there are any number of items in here that one could address oneself to and in fact be very complimentary. I refer, of course, to the police, the fire departments, the volunteer fire brigades, which, I understand, are not directly under the minister, but he has certainly some part to play in the volunteer fire departments. Also if one looks

Mr. Nolan.

through the budget you will find also that you have here also,
I believe, Human Rights which comes under the minister.

MR. HICKMAN: For the first time.

MR. NOLAN: For the first time? Well it was in bad enough
trouble before, but it is in real trouble now if it is with the minister.

MR. HICKMAN: I intend to find out what it is
all about.

MR. NOLAN: You will find out.

MR. MORGAN: Human Rights?

MR. NOLAN: Human Rights, yes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NOLAN: Our old bailiwick.

And also the electoral office, which
I hope to address myself to also, is under the jurisdiction
of the Minister of Justice, and I think that that is about all
I had meant. Anyway first of all, since we last discussed the
estimates of the budget for the Department of Justice, we have
a new Chief of Police for the City of St. John's, and a very
fine gentleman indeed, and I believe, generally speaking, that
if you forget all the partisan business and so on, that there are
few indeed who would be so foolish as to raise any objections or
criticisms, because I believe he has moved into a very difficult
position; and from what I can hear, and what I have heard of his
own public statements, and from what I have heard from the police,
in fact, that I have talked to from time to time, we indeed are,
I believe, fortunate in having a Chief of Police, who has a very
unenviable task, but from what we can see, Mr. Chairman, so far
he has been doing an excellent job, and I feel he deserves our
encouragement and commendation, because it is a pretty difficult
task that he has. And even right now, I understand, the police
are presently negotiating a new salary or a new contract or something,
I believe I heard

MR. NOLAN: on the air today. And so we can certainly appreciate the part that the police have played, not only the local police but the RCMP, in attempting to control matters in a very changed society. And of course there is some criticism of the minister, and I hold him directly responsible because he has played down vandalism to such an extent over the last few years. It was a very, very sad thing indeed, Mr. Speaker, after all the questions I have asked in the House and asked on the air over the year and posed them, and other newsmen posed them to the Minister of Justice and he continually evaded and tried to gild the lily and tried to pretend things were not that bad and so on. And what do you have? The new Chief of Police for the city of St. John's in one of his first public statements I recall coming out publicly and verifying just about word for word everything I had said, everything molested citizens had said, everything the press had said for years and years and years and we could not get it out of the mouth of the Minister of Justice. It had to come from the new Chief of Police, and thanks be to God for that - and I do not think that is unparliamentary.

Now the next item that I would like to move along to is the fire department in the city of St. John's and of course the volunteer fire brigades that I referred to earlier. The fire department is an old and honoured force, as are the police here, and they have been doing some terrific work at considerable risk to themselves. One of the great tragedies that comes to mind in the last few months of course is the Chafe fire in the Goulds. I notice and perhaps it is not proper to comment, I do not know if it is or not on something that is presently - Is it before the courts or public commission or what is it?

MR. HICKMAN: It is a public enquiry.

MR. NOLAN: Do not be too conservative now.

MR. HICKMAN: I have heard half a dozen rulings in this House as to whether you can comment on a public -

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, I am always interested in the hon. gentleman's speeches which he makes in the House and I want to listen to the justice debates, but would you mind if we call a quorum in the House

MR. CHAIRMAN: A quorum has been called.

MR. NOLAN: All we need is one more body.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would ask the clerk of the House if he would cause the bells to be rung.

I am informed a quorum is present.

The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: Am I in order, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, the hon. member.

MR. NOLAN: I must admit publicly, Mr. Chairman, that I have had to do some funny things in my day to gather audiences and so on, but never have I had to depend upon a Minister of the Crown to bring all the sheep back in. So I am afraid it came from an unexpected source and I thank him very much, although I am not saying his colleagues will. Anyway, getting back, the hon. members can now, I am sure, retire to more important matters. There is no hockey game on or anything tonight, is there?

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. NOLAN: But anyway, I was making reference to the Chafe fire in the Goulds. I do not want to go into any kind of a dissertation on that so that I could be in any way in conflict or to influence anything within

MR. NOLAN: the enquiry, because that would be wrong. However, emanating out of that fire and subsequent events, I have a question for the Minister of Justice, and the question is this: Within the Police/Fire Department - I suppose, with the B.C.V.P., another item, other things - you have a communication system or systems. I would like very much to know how well the system or systems operate. I would also like to know how it was operating on the night of the fire in The Goulds. I would also like to know, if, since that time, a gentleman by the name of Scanlon, who came from, I believe, a university in Ottawa, came to this Province and conducted an enquiry on communications. I would like to know if that report is finished, which I believe it to be. And I would further like to know if the minister is prepared to table that report on communications - the recommendations, the faults in the present system, and what they are recommending, on the table of this House.

MR. HICKMAN: I do not have it.

MR. NOLAN: The minister never heard of it?

MR. HICKMAN: Oh, yes. I know of it, but I do not have it.

MR. NOLAN: Oh, well, if the minister does not have it, there are a number of people who do have it.

MR. HICKMAN: I am told they have been doing very commendable job, as you know, and I hope it would be part of the evidence in the Gushue Commission report.

MR. NOLAN: But the question is, Are we going to get it? Everyone else seems to be able to. Members of the House should not be deprived of information, that is my whole point, this is the whole thing in here.

MR. HICKMAN: I will see if I can find it. I have not got it here with me, but I believe there is a copy in the department.

MR. NOLAN: You believe there is a copy. One copy?

MR. HICKMAN: That is all that came to my department, I think.

MR. NOLAN: I see.

MR. HICKMAN: And I am not sure if it did not - because he is a federal employee. I should not interrupt the hon. gentlemen, I will tell you afterwards.

MR. NOLAN: You will tell me after. I do not care if he is a federal employee or an employee of the Russians, There are people in Newfoundland who have copies of the report and I want one for the House, That is all I am saying. Nothing revolutionary about it.

MR. HICKMAN: It is kind of revolutionary ,

MR. NOLAN: All right, Now in reference to the fire department, I want to leave the Chafe Home because I think it is a very sad thing, I believe there is an inquiry going on and I think it would be unfair for me to get involved and particularly in areas perhaps where I am not sure of all my facts. Not that facts always make a heck of a lot of difference sometimes in this House, I notice.

But nevertheless, the police I mentioned earlier here in our debate this evening, The fire department, of course, is one that we have seen grow over the years, We have seen, for example, in St. John's the various new fire departments being built, centered in what I would believe to be in various strategic areas of the city. As I recall from my own experience with the minister, in those long lost dark days when he was under the guise of a Liberal, we used to discuss where the fire departments would go and so on. And it was then, as I understand it, there were certain studies done to see where they would go and so on.

So with the fire departments we have now, I would certainly like to ask the minister as to what extent and in what direction the fire departments are going to grow from here. Are there more needed? If so, where? And if they are, what are their locations, the new locations going to be based on? What evidence do we have, what recommendations do we have, and from whom, as to where they might go? To what extent is the city now protected - well protected, overly protected, under protected - here in the city of St. John's since we are now growing very, very rapidly? And I hope that the

MR. NOLAN:

minister can provide such information to us on this matter. I must say it is a long haul, I suppose, for the fire department from the days when I can first remember - my old friend over here has gone out, the Minister of Consumer Affairs. By golly, I think they had the horses in the fire department up there in the West End -

MR. PECKFORD: Your friend is up in the gallery.

MR. NOLAN: My friend is - ah, there he is, yes. I was saying, and I am sure my hon. friend who is a year or two younger perhaps than me may remember when they had the horses for the fire department up there at the head of Job Street, New Gower and Buchannan or whatever - remember? - or Bambrick Street, and also down in the eastern end where they also had them. But you had some very, very fine men who were involved in that department over the years. They did not have the equipment, but by golly I can remember as a young fellow their going through the streets of St. John's through the snow. They had no snow plowing around here then, I guarantee you, and I thought they did a heck of a good job.

And now of course I am told by some who know far better than I that the efficiency of the department, in spite of some of the criticism we get back and

MR. NOLAN: . . . forth here every now and then, has improved considerably. The question I would have to ask the minister though, is - What kind of equipment do these men have to use? - One, how old is the equipment? Two, if there is equipment - and I assume there is; they are not going by dog team - what kind of repair is it kept in? Is it in good repair? To what extent - I mean, the firemen have enough of a risk to go to in fighting fires, God knows, and this should be all that is ever demanded of them, Mr. Chairman. So then the question I raise is, Is the equipment that they have in good repair? Are they provided with the necessary, the best of equipment? Because I feel while you do not necessarily have to go Cadillacizing everything as we do oftentimes in government agencies, I feel that right here within the fire department, and for that matter within the police department, these men should be well-armed, well-equipped. They have to face weather, elements and circumstances that none of us are called upon to face. Therefore, it is absolutely essential. If we are going to bend a little one way or the other, for God's sake let us do it in the cause of these men who are working twenty-four hours a day and so on.

Now then, Mr. Chairman, let us go on to the Department of Justice and some of the other items that are involved and for which the minister is responsible.

Vandalism continues to be a plague in this Province - just shocking beyond belief. I am fed up with the calls that I get. And I do not know, but sometimes I feel that the minister has reached the point where he has thrown up his hands and given up; or he feels that in his position as Minister of Justice, if he goes on the air in response to questions from the people in the press and so on and denies it often enough, that maybe the people whose property is being ransacked will begin to think to themselves, My God, maybe it is me! How can the Minister of Justice be wrong? He is there in that position, and he must know what is going on better than those in the press and so on. But the fact is, in many areas of the urban area of this Province today - I am not attempting to speak for every little community in Newfoundland because I do not know - but what I am saying is that in many areas of this

MR. NOLAN: Province within a twenty or thirty mile range of St. John's - St. John's and around - that you have a pretty serious situation. For gosh sakes, right here in this city I can remember just last year, a lady down here I believe on Pine Bud Avenue or somewhere in that area had even gone to the trouble - they had taken the advice; they knew the price of food was going up - went out in their garden and planted vegetables and so on. And they get up one morning and they find it all thrown out on the street. Now they pay taxes too. In the case of the couple or couples that I am thinking of they have been paying it for years and years and years.

There is a feeling amongst many people - and I do not want to try to promote this thing at all - but there is a feeling amongst people - sometimes it is not justified, I agree - a feeling that if a certain member - for example, let me take myself or anyone here - if it were our property that was affected, a member of the House of Assembly, they feel that justice would be swift, very swift and it would be remedied almost immediately. However, they feel that because they are relatively unknowns and so on that justice does not hurry to help and assist them. Now oftentimes, of course, I would dispute and argue this myself with many of them, as I have, because the more people you get believing this type thing then the whole system of justice would eventually break down.

But there is a matter, Mr. Speaker, a matter that I raised some time ago publicly, where a lady and her daughter had heard a knock on the door one night and they opened the door and this character came in from a club or something, and not only that, but he threw a knife into the hall. And mind you, the man in question - he was not home - he was a policeman. Fine. I do not think the family has ever been the same since that happened which is only a year ago. So I had a call from the gentleman, six months ago, I guess. Apparently they caught the individual concerned and he went to Court. And the magistrate - I do not know exactly what the magistrate found, but I do know he was out on bail or something, and anyway, he has flown the coop. He is gone. He has just left the Province.

May 17, 1977

Tape No. 2906

EC - 3

MR. NOLAN:

So this is why -

MR. HICKMAN:

I do not tell the court what to do.

MR. NOLAN:

No, no. I am not trying to nail the minister on this one. All I am saying is, when people 'phone me and tell me this

MR. NOLAN:

I am left without a word in my chops, practically, because they sometimes cynically say, "Ha ha! They can walk away. But if I am driving over the road and I am one mile over the speed limit I get nailed." Then it is pretty difficult to rationalize and to reason with people and try to make them understand that we here in the House of Assembly are not attempting to crucify some and let the others get away scot-free. We have vandalism in this Province that must be costing a fortune. We have shoplifting. I will never forget an experience I had. I really went after a crew one time, publicly, on the air and I really nailed it to them because of how they had been treating some people in a certain commercial establishment. However, the gentleman in question called me or asked me to go in later in the day and I did. He showed me \$4,000 worth of bad cheques. He laid it right out in front of me on the desk. And that gives you a little bit of a different perspective. And I do not know if I have related it here in the House before, but in the shoplifting situation, I do not know if the minister has any figures on it, but it is of an enormous proportion in this Province. And therefore it is nice to talk about free enterprise and so on, but the big heart of free enterprise is not taking the cost of that. It has got to be passed on to the consumer. So generally speaking there are many people, Christian people, God-fearing people who have never hurt anyone in their lives who are being victimized. Their fences are being broken up. Their cars are being run into on parking lots and the guy goes on and leaves it. They have their windows broken in. They go out of town for a weekend, perhaps, and their homes are broken into. And this is going on. It is not just an isolated case. If I were just talking about one or two or three or five or ten cases, well you can say Nolan is always raving about that. But I am not. It is going on continuously right in the streets of St. John's and in many other places around the whole urban area. And it is shocking. People feel, What in the name of God am I paying taxes for? Do I not have the same rights as the residents of

MR. NOLAN:

those who are in the Confederation Building, meaning the members, of course, or some people who live on certain streets in St. John's and so on. They say this out of frustration, absolute and utter frustration. So I am afraid the Minister of Justice has not to give an account of himself. It is no good getting up and being evasive and folding his hands, rolling his hands, rolling his eyes heavenward and so on looking for inspiration. The time has come for him to put up or shut up and give an account of how bad vandalism is in this Province right now. And I feel further that the minister is concealing information from this House. He has not been telling the whole story in the past.

MR. HICKMAN: That is utterly false, demonstrably false.

MR. NOLAN: Okay. Well, if you think so I will withdraw it. But I doubt very much at this stage we are going to fight about it. We have been through too much.

Anyway, the fact is that the vandalism is going on and all those who are involved in justice in the Province are now under suspicion. I say the members of the House of Assembly on all sides, I say the judges, I say the magistrates, I say the lawyers, I say everyone who has anything to do with law and order directly or indirectly is looked upon with great suspicion in this Province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

The hon. minister.

MR. HICKMAN: Now, I have made notes here, and I have the answers to the questions raised by the hon. member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan). And he has referred to particular headings. If it would be more helpful to the committee -

MR. NOLAN: We will get to the headings.

MR. HICKMAN: - could we move along and deal with them as we reach the headings?

MR. NOLAN: Well it is entirely up to the members.

MR. HICKMAN: Will that be all right?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Agreed.

On motion 701-01 through 702-02-01, carried.

MR. NOLAN:

Wait a minute, Mr. Chairman, if I may.

Excuse me! Is it permissible to revert back to 701-000?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

By leave?

MR. HICKMAN:

Yes, yes sure.

MR. NOLAN:

Yes. Well we are merely talking about - when I say we see travel and car allowance here, we are merely talking about the minister's? Is this just the minister's travel allowance, that is all, is it not?

MR. HICKMAN:

And the office.

MR. NOLAN:

And the office. All right, okay, let it go then, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Shall 702-02-01 carry?

MR. NOLAN:

Wait just a moment, Mr. Chairman.

Let us get to the executive, administrative and clerical personnel.

Now the executive: is this the executive assistant who is unofficially the member for the non. member's district that we have been hearing

MR. NOLAN: - so much about? Is this his salary and travel allowance and so on?

MR. HICKMAN: No, he is under my office.

MR. NOLAN: Under your office?

MR. HICKMAN: Yes. What do you want to know about him? Ask me.

MR. NOLAN: Well, that is what I was after.

MR. HICKMAN: Well, I will answer it anyway.

MR. NOLAN: Yes. Please do.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I have been without an executive assistant, regretfully, the last two or three months.

MR. NOLAN: Oh.

MR. HICKMAN: He entered industry.

MR. NOLAN: He gave up being the member, did he?

MR. HICKMAN: No,

MR. RIDEOUT: There is a vote here now for him to carry out the duties of the M.H.A.'s.

MR. HICKMAN: He entered industry and I am proud and delighted and pleased -

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Without prejudice.

MR. HICKMAN: without prejudice, that yesterday to my great relief, to my undying relief, he heeded the call to serve me again and has returned to his post.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKMAN: And may I say -

MR. RIDEOUT: Will he be travelling as the M.H.A.?

MR. HICKMAN: I would hope so. I would hope so.

MR. RIDEOUT: Paid out of Government funds?

MR. HICKMAN: Of course!

MR. RIDEOUT: The Auditor-General does not say, 'of course'!

AN HON. MEMBER: Certainly not!

MR. HICKMAN: I would hope there is no one in this House who does not know that part of the duties of an Executive Assistant to a Minister is to take care of some of his constituency problems.

MR. RIDEOUT: But to travel around?

MR. NOLAN: The idea was to take care of some of the duties for which he is responsible, not just his constituency, and the Minister knows it too.

MR. HICKMAN: And may I say, in having the Executive Assistant who I am so fortunate to have, I have a man -

MR. NOLAN: And so do the people of Burin.

MR. HICKMAN: - who spent considerable time in the Corrections, field as the hon. member for Naskaupí (Mr. Goudie) will know because he has been very much involved there, and in the Stephenville area in the Corrections field, and at Correctional conferences. But also, and the thing that pleased me more than anything, was when there was a couple of comments in this House, a couple of questions that I thought were rather unusual -

MR. NOLAN: We are going to buy you two new lapels for Christmas so that you can swing on them.

MR. HICKMAN: - asked me, the tremendous response that I got from the municipalities in my District who were very angry over the criticism and the suggestion that that gentleman -

MR. RIDEOUT: Can we all have one now?

MR. HICKMAN: - was doing anything more than so adequately and so faithfully -

MR. RIDEOUT: Can we all have one?

MR. HICKMAN: - serving me.

MR. NOLAN: Do we take that as read?

MR. HICKMAN: Okay, Sir. Sorry. But I would like not to pass courts before I get an opportunity to reply to the hon. gentleman.

MR. RIDEOUT: Have we passed 701 yet?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes, we did.

MR. HICKMAN: We are down to law books 02 - 03.

MR. NOLAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member would permit, we had planned to go heading by heading because rather than everyone getting up and making a twenty or twenty-five minute speech. But if the hon. Minister is going to follow that course every time we

MR. NOLAN: ask him something, when a mere 'yes' or 'no' or 'maybe' or whatever will suffice, then if he wants to play that game we are quite capable of doing it.

MR. HICKMAN: Sorry, I did not mean to make a speech.

MR. NOLAN: All right. Very good. Let us go on, Mr. Chairman, please.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKMAN: All of this. 02-03.

MR. NOLAN: Pardon.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Chairman, I am sort of lost. It is 702-03, I believe, is it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. RIDEOUT: I just want to ask the Minister a very quick question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. RIDEOUT: I want to ask the Minister a very quick question, Mr. Chairman. I see two votes here for law books, 702-03 and 703-04 \$23,000 in one and \$55,000 in another.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is the revised.

MR. RIDEOUT: No, it is not the revised, I am sorry.

MR. HICKMAN: One is Beauchesne and one is May.

MR. RIDEOUT: \$55,000 in another. Yes, Beauchesne and May. Could the Minister explain how come there are two separate votes for law books?

MR. HICKMAN: \$77,000. That is about half of what we asked for.

AN HON. MEMBER: \$24,000 last year.

MR. HICKMAN: Yes, and not half enough, I may say. 702-03 is for law books for the Department of Justice Law Library and the most of that is going into subscriptions to the periodicals, you know, the Annual Law Reports which are very important. Every case which is decided in Canada and the United Kingdom is reported certainly at the County Court level and above and they are reported in the Law Reports and we subscribe to them and we are not getting the kind of law books that we would like.

MR. NOLAN: Is that why the Minister never gives us a legal opinion in the House? We have to spend \$150,000 a year now.

AN HON. MEMBER: The rule does not allow it.

MR. HICKMAN: 703-04 is a very modest amount -

MR. NOLAN: I wonder who designed that rule.

MR. HICKMAN: - Mr. Chairman, I want to answer. 703-04 covers the law books, some of them, that were requested by the courts. The requests from the courts this year for law books under that one was \$70,000 and I could not persuade my colleagues to give me more than \$55,000.

MR. RIDEOUT: \$21,000 more than last year.

MR. HICKMAN: Yes. But

MR. HICKMAN: the Court of Appeal has come into existence since then, the separate Court of Appeal, and here is how we will probably distribute it. The Court of Appeal were looking for \$20,000. They will have to get a proportioned amount less. The trial division, \$10,000. District Court, St John's East and West, \$7,000. District Court, Trinity Conception, \$7,000. Provincial Court \$6,000. Not a nickel in there for the District Court in Grand Bank. That has to be rectified.

MR. SIMMONS: The minister is going to donate his books to them, is he?

MR. HICKMAN: One is for the Department of Justice, that vote; the other one is for the courts and I am the first to admit we are not even close to meeting the requests for the law libraries.

AN. HON. MEMBER: The minister has only to revise them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 02 carry?

MR. NOLAN: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, On the convention here, are we on 703?

MR. CHAIRMAN: 702.

MR. NOLAN: I am sorry, go ahead. Computers Services. \$10,000. Is that your contribution for your department? As I recall the Computer Services used to work where you have, first of all, computer services, various departments utilize it, including Memorial University, and you all kicked so much into the kitty. Is this what we are talking about, this \$10,000?

MR. HICKMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NOLAN: You had nothing last year?

MR. HICKMAN: No, but this year we are coming on, hopefully, and I am hoping we may be able to computerize some of the traffic court work. Hoping.

AN. HON. MEMBER: And records, too.

MR. HICKMAN: Magistrate Jack A. White is doing a tremendous job in the traffic court. I wanted to refer to him when we came to

MR. HICKMAN: courts and under the Constabulary report I have some statistics here on traffic that the Committee will be interested in. But I understand that we are moving towards some computerization. If we can get it, \$10,000 will be a modest amount.

MR. NOLAN: Could I ask the minister a question, Mr. Chairman, if I may? While it may not be under the right heading at the moment he can either answer now or wait, but there is a question that occurs to me and that is this: To what extent is a person's record now, how long is it allowed to stand before it is eliminated? I am just wondering what the circumstances are on that matter. Some concern has been raised over the years about this. You know, if a person pays their penalty they pay the shot as far as I am concerned. There is no reason why they should have to suffer for evermore. When is it removed?

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I cannot, I regret I cannot give the Committee the date. There is a provision under a federal statute, and it is not the criminal code, which gives a person the right to apply, I believe it is after three years, to have his record erased.

MR. RIDEOUT: Still has to apply, does he?

MR. HICKMAN: Oh, yes.

MR. MURPHY: To erase his criminal record?

MR. HICKMAN: It is a fairly new piece of law that the Parliament of Canada passed within the past two or three years.

MR. NOLAN: There is no provincial jurisdiction in this regard?

MR. HICKMAN: No.

MR. NOLAN: Well alright, let us forget the criminal thing. How about any other actions and so on?

MR. HICKMAN: You could not have a criminal record except for a breach of the criminal law.

MR. NOLAN: I see. I see. Has the minister been charged?

MR. CHAIRMAN: 702 carried.

703-01?

MR. MARSHALL: First of all I want to make it quite clear that I think we have a marvellous Minister of Justice. Certainly in this instance what I am going to say is by no means a criticism of the Minister of Justice. It is probably moreso a criticism of some of his colleagues, probably some of them who are pounding on the bench at what I said a moment ago. This vote involves salaries for the courts. I suppose I should be speaking on the general subhead to say that, you know, I can sympathize with the Minister of Justice from time to time because I know he tries to get things, and the first thing that is slashed in any budgetary consideration has always been the department of justice. Nobody realizes the importance of these particular expenditures until such time as one happens to be before the courts.

Now these salaries involve the salaries down at the Supreme Court and the various court houses around for the administration.

MR. MARSHALL: of justice. I would like to bring something to the attention of the Committee, not for the sake, I emphasize, of criticizing the Minister of Justice, but to give an example and to implore his colleagues in the future, when he makes representations for improvements in staff and what have you down there, to give it more full consideration.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that this year in the Supreme Court there was a chronic, abysmal lack of staff in the court itself which greatly impeded the carrying out of the functions of the Supreme Court and greatly impeded, in effect, the administration of justice.

Now there is one instance that I was very particularly related to and I am referring to, and that was the instance of the recent election in Ferryland, when that hearing occurred. I think it escaped the notice of members, of hon. members, it certainly escaped the notice of the press, that the decision that was filed in the court by the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Mahoney, was dated in January, I believe, of this year. Now the reason is that they only have to, in this case, give a certificate and that certificate was dated January, and lo and behold! The decision did not, as hon. members know, come into the House until, I believe, sometime in April. And the reason was that the Act requires, for reasons best known to those who framed the Act, the evidence to be presented to the Speaker with the decision itself.

The reason for the two or three month delay was not the fault of the court at all, of the judges and the decision, but the fact that it took two or three months for that evidence to be transcribed. That is one specific instance right before this House itself of unnecessary delays in the administration of justice purely and simply because of the lack of adequate stenographic

MR. MARSHALL: assistance and competent assistance down there it took that length of time.

There have been instances before in other areas where people have had to wait inordinate times, these are people whose cases have been before the court who wish to have an appeal. They wait for a year sometimes, a year and a half for the evidence to be transcribed, and in any case of an appeal it is always necessary to have this evidence transcribed.

As I say, I know the position has been remedied. The hon. the Minister of Justice is bringing in sophisticated recording equipment but, of course, this will not dispense with the necessity of trained clerical staff there and court reporters. The matter has been, as I say, remedied now so I am talking, as it were, ex post facto. But I just want to point out that I do not think that situation should ever be allowed to rise again. I do not blame the Minister of Justice for it, but I just draw it to the attention of the House and of his colleagues of how justice can be - justice delayed is justice denied and this is what has occurred again and again. One of the reasons, as I say, is because justice is so low down on the totem pole when it comes to budgetary considerations, because it is like a terminal disease almost; nobody considers it affects them, or nobody considers it is going to happen to them, nobody considers it is of importance until they happen to be there before the courts and when they are before the courts it is not a very pleasant thing where the administration of justice is inadequate to cope with the reasonable needs of society.

So again I emphasize, so that the blood pressure does not ascend too high because I understand it ascendeth a little bit high this morning, that it is not a criticism of the hon. the Minister of

MR. MARSHALL: Justice but, as I say, a criticism of the whole system and in particular, the members of the Cabinet who I know when the Minister of Justice rails and ask for increases in these areas they are denied and the first thing that is cut.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, if I may. I will state momentarily the fact that we did have an appeal by the Landlord - Tenants and the evidence had to be transcribed and I think we had to get three or four people in from Office Overload to bring it up to date because of the fact, you know, the evidence was taped apparently and it had to be transcribed or whatever you may want to call it, and for that purpose I think it was for nearly a full week we had to get outside help to bring that evidence up to date. So I am only supporting the fact that the hon. the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) mentioned in strengthening the the hand of the Minister of Justice when he comes to people looking for money.

MR. HICKMAN: I thank my colleagues most profusely for their generosity in the future and may I assure the hon. gentleman from St. John's East,

MR. HICKMAN: in the Trial Division now we have five plus two coming on, plus two from Business Overload, and there is a pool that we are advertising for now so that there can be no delays in filling any vacancy which may occur. Our court reporters are really dedicated, hardworking people and hopefully this has been remedied, but it was a problem in the past and I would be less than prudent if I suggested that it will never arise again, but we are doing our best.

MR. RIDEOUT: What do supreme court registrars do? Supreme court registrars, deputy supreme court registrar 11, assistant supreme court registrar, deputy supreme court registrar 1, what do they all do? And the assistant deputy supreme court registrar?

MR. HICKMAN: The registrar of the supreme court is a statutory position. He is the chief administrative officer for the superior courts of the Province. He is also the taxing master. He also has jurisdiction under the - not the guardianship act - What was the name of that act? The Public Trustee Act. He is also the public trustee and he has a deputy registrar and the other -

MR. RIDEOUT: There are four of them.

MR. HICKMAN: Yes. Whenever the supreme court is sitting there either has to be the registrar or one of his deputies as the chief administrator officer in the court.

MR. RIDEOUT: In the courtroom?

MR. HICKMAN: In the courtroom participating in the administrative part, swearing the witnesses, watching the transcribing machines, recording, he is responsible for the exhibits. Again we are understaffed there.

On motion, 703-01, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 02-01.

MR. STRACHAN: That is for the travelling, is it? The \$113,000 -

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. STRACHAN: For a start I should maybe suggest to the Minister of Mines and Energy that if he believes in energy conservation - maybe

MR. STRACHAN: It is because I come from Labrador - but I find it tremendously warm in here, awful hot.

MR. HIDDOUT: What about that thing behind you?

MR. NEAPY: We are short of air conditioning.

MR. STRACHAN: Maybe the member for Nauskaupi will join me anyway.

On this travelling, \$113,000. I do not mean to say any criticism of this heading but from our experience in Labrador I would say that this sum is -I take it this is for the courts including the magistrates magisterial courts?

MR. HICKMAN: No.

MR. STRACHAN: Supreme, District?

MR. HICKMAN: Yes.

MR. STRACHAN: Yes, this is for their travels around and doing their duties and so on like that. I feel that that sum in many ways, from our experience in Labrador, is far too low. The reason why I give that is that, for instance, on the coast we have seen magistrates being left at the end of the year or for a considerable part of that year not being able to travel on the coast because there was no funds available. Or even when he does travel, he has to share his travel with other parties with social services, for instance, the welfare officer, or he will look for other Hydro choppers going in or whatever is moving, and he will often delay it for a week or two weeks. In fact, except for the present magistrate down in Happy Valley who has done a tremendous job of trying to keep the courts in order and coming every month, I have seen someone commit an offense, or an alleged offense, in the month of July and not be taken to court for it until the following March. And that is quite recent, I mean in the last four or three years. And many times because the magistrates have not been able to move around or cannot get moved around, and I know the present magistrate moves around once every month and tries at least to try and keep up with it, but in order to move around he has often to jump onto helicopters or share helicopters with other people. He often cannot take staff with him or anyone else

MR. STRACHAN: he wants to, and it is a pretty desperate situation for a magistrate trying to carry out a system of justice - because I think justice is important and it should be given in a responsible manner - and when a magistrate has to hop off a bush plane or a helicopter and hold court and has three hours or four hours to hold court with 'x' number of offences and hop back on again it is a problem.

So my argument here, my opposition is that maybe there should be a look at this, that there should be additional funds for travelling so that there can be a routine business of justice and that justice is not postponed because the lack of funds are present there. The other thing that we have often thought about too and mentioned is that - and I know there are difficulties - it was suggested last year, for instance, that we would have Supreme Court in an isolated community.

MR. STRACMAN:

I realize that there are a great deal of difficulties going to form a jury, because you find that, when you go in there, once you remove the witnesses, and once you remove everyone in isolated communities who are related to the offender, you have nobody left to form a jury, and so with the result - and I think this point should be explained - the Supreme Court cannot travel there, I think it should be explained because there has been some criticism of the Justice Department, that they have not been having these Supreme Courts there for many reasons. And I have heard native people, for instance, saying that they want to be judged by their peers, and their peers are native people. And they have regarded the fact that the Supreme Court did not travel there as being a matter with, let us say, racial overtones, when in fact there are very sound, justifiable reasons, and a sense of carrying out good justice, why it cannot occur. I think they should be told quite explicitly and clearly exactly why these things cannot come about under these circumstances. So I bring this up, this part here, because I have had experience of it. I know people who have waited a long time before they came to court because they have been waiting for a magistrate to come in. And to many people, by the time they come to court, the whole thing is a laugh or a farce. In some cases responsible people, and there are many responsible people, will get worried about the whole thing. They are delayed and hanging on and hanging on, and they get worried about it. And many times you will see that people will behave or carry on for three months after the initial offense, but will then say "To hell with justice!" and will then start committing all kinds of minor offenses or foolish offences, which are really meaningless, and they would never carry them out except they just do not believe there is any system of justice anyway or they have not come before it. And I think there is a whole realm there, that \$113,500, for courts to travel in this Province, as big as this Province is - and I am specifically

MR. STRACHAN:

referring to Labrador where the cost to travel, for instance, from St. John's to Main and back again, or St. John's to some of the isolated communities and back again is more than the cost of travelling across the Atlantic and back again. For a court to travel it is extremely expensive, and \$113,500 is not very much money.

MR. HICKMAN: I thank all hon. gentlemen for sharing my philosophy with respect to getting money. As far as I know, because we have thirty-one or thirty-two magistrates, the largest number we have had in Newfoundland history, we have almost doubled - I do not know if people realize it - we have doubled in this Province in the last five years the number of judges and magistrates. This has been done deliberately with a view to bringing the courts to the people, to cutting down the distances people have to travel, and consequently in many areas, for instance, the travelling expenses of the provincial courts should be down considerably because they do not have to travel anymore. In Labrador such is not the case. Magistrate Joseph Woodrow, who is presently in Labrador, stationed at Goose, is an outstanding magistrate -

MR. STRACHAN: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKMAN: - a nephew, by the way, of the hon. the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow), and his wife was taught by the hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde, comes from a very fine family in St. John's. He has set up a circuit system on the Labrador Coast and from what I have heard he gets there on schedule. So did his predecessor, Magistrate Seabright. Now Magistrate Woodrow, unfortunately for his constituents in the magisterial district of Goose, is going to Dalhousie Law School next year. But with the chief magistrate system we now have it is being impressed upon magistrates who are stationed in that magisterial district that the only way that the people in that area of the Province can be adequately served is by way of regular circuits. And I have not heard a complaint in the last couple of years, so hopefully this will be maintained.

May 17, 1977.

Tape 2912

pg - 3

MR. NICHAN:

The other point raised by the hon. gentleman from Florida
River (Mr. Strickland) is one that I have talked to Mr. ... it causes
me concern, and I do not believe. I am not sure I know the answer
to it, and

MR. HICKMAN: that is the question of the Supreme Court on circuit travelling to places other than Labrador City and the Goose Bay - Happy Valley Area. Last year I directed, which I have the right to do, that there be a circuit in Nain. We went as far as to take a jury list in Nain. Now there were two or three criminal cases pending. It was then discovered that we would not be able to empanel a jury to try these cases, because what you do is you summons sixty or seventy jurors for a criminal trial. The Crown has unlimited challenges, the accused has twelve, and when you take all that out, when you take out people being related, not being able to - you know, blood relations not being able to sit on a jury, witnesses, and in a community of the population of Nain some of the potential jurors are bound to be witnesses for the Crown or the accused.

Or again you get others who have some knowledge of what transpired with respect to that particular offence. The other problem is, whilst I can direct the issuance of the circuit order, the final decision I guess rests with the judiciary and not with me. But we made a very valiant effort but the Director of Public Prosecutions in consultation with the Deputy Minister of Justice, and also in consultation with the Judiciary, came to the conclusion that we could not empanel a jury in Nain. The Supreme Court then went and these cases were tried in Goose. But there is another circuit going soon and I would hope that there will be more frequent circuits of the Supreme Court. Most assuredly, once we get this new district court system in place this year, the district court judge has to get down there frequently.

I say without any hesitancy I do not subscribe to the view that judges should not travel. They certainly should travel. I think it is a most important

MR. HICKMAN: function of any court to come to the people and I do not apologize for the spreading out of our courts throughout the province. From time to time I get complaints saying, "You have a judge or a magistrate in a particular area and he has not much to do." I say I would rather have an underworked judge there than the people having to travel two or three hundred miles to have access to the courts. I would hope that that travelling vote will be sufficient, Mr. Chairman.

MR. STRACHAN: One point, Mr. Chairman. I hope that my comments that I made about this travel allowance here, my remarks about cases taking a long time to come before the courts and so on, that I mean no disrespect for the magistrates. I know them well enough. Magistrate Joseph Woodrow, for instance, is practising law - not practising law. has been a magistrate in a very difficult area, probably the most difficult area of this province; because as soon as one gets involved in native law one gets involved in a whole case of dilemmas, of arguments in which there are many arguments right across the North. Magistrate Joseph Woodrow as far as I am concerned is an excellent young magistrate and has done a tremendous job - I would agree on that - and his predecessors as well. I have no argument at all.

My argument is purely the sum of money and the fact that money is not available and you cannot ask a magistrate to hop on a passenger plane to try and deal with small communities when he may be stuck - As he is now, in fact. The magistrate is now stuck in Nain for two days. He was supposed to leave this morning, will not get out this morning, and in fact may not get out again tomorrow. These are the problems that he faces when-

MR. HICKMAN: It is an ill wind that does not blow some good though.

MR. STRACHAN: Well, I am not arguing about it, because he is a good friend of ours and he visits our home and keeps my wife company.

MR. HICKMAN: Carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 703-02-01. Carried?

Items 703-02-01 through 703-02-04 carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 703-02-05.

MR. BIDEONT: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister could explain to us what this convention is all about.

MR. HICKMAN: Once a year the Newfoundland Magistrates meet for a week. It is under the heading "Convention." I would not want anyone to interpret that as meaning it is similar to a convention of a service club. It is very much a study convention and we bring in expertise in various branches of the law, several from Ottawa from the Canadian Judges Association. Last year, because of the restraint, we decided that there would not be one. The result was - and

MR. HICKMAN: I commend the magistrates for it: They realized that it was a time of constraint and that other public servants were being asked to cut back on these things - and last year they paid the shot themselves for the convention.

MR. RIDEOUT: Do they have a Magisterial Association?

MR. HICKMAN: They have a Magisterial Association and this really funds the Magisterial Association. Their prime purpose is to hold a convention. They also hold one or two seminars each year. There is also a major meeting of provincial court judges, not just provincially but federally, in Corner Brook on June 6th. which is a cost sharing thing. But that is what it is for and I think it is money very well spent and I commend the magistrates last year for being such good citizens.

MR. RIDEOUT: We agree. Carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 06, carry?

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Chairman, on 06 I see there is \$15,000 against last year's \$27,400. Again I bring up the question of lack of facilities and in some way we are probably supporting the Minister of Justice here. We are still seeing in court, for instance, a magistrate going into court and taking longhand evidence from witnesses.

MR. HICKMAN: Does Woodrow have -

MR. STRACHAN: Woodrow takes evidence by longhand. He sits down and writes everything out. A witness talks and talks, he will slow the witness, stop the witness, and write it out. Often his notes in some cases will be - because you can imagine if you are holding court, and without over-stating he may hold fifty cases in two days, and he sits and writes morning, noon and night in longhand, he takes evidence for fifty cases in two

MR. STRACHAN: days. To me it is ridiculous that a magistrate is in a position of not only being the magistrate, but he is also his own secretary. Also, looking into this thing here, he many times has to do his own interpretation because he requires translators and sometimes, and many times, and most times the translators are not experienced or trained court translators; with the result, for instance, we know people who are - the concept the native people use is the idea they do not understand the concept of guilty and not guilty. I do not quite believe that. I have different opinions of it. I think they know what guilty is. It might not be the word for guilty but they know what guilty is. But they have different concepts of offences, and they have no concepts of stating that, "I did it but there are extenuating circumstances." They have no concepts for that.

If I go and kill a duck out of season then I will admit that I killed a duck. They will not say, "I killed a duck because I had no food," nor the translator, and it is not done. It has only been in recent times that we have instilled in them in Nain to to tell the fact that, "We have killed a duck out of season but we had no food."

I know of a case just last year when Magistrate Woodrow was visiting and the thing is that he has no interpreter. Or if his interpreter is someone from the community, and many people from the community do not like interpreting because there is a strong feeling that if I interpret what the magistrate is saying to this fellow here, that I am passing sentence on him and therefore one night he might not like me too well and take it out on me rather than the magistrate or the judicial system.

There are no trained, and it

MR. STRACHAN: is important, you know -

MR. HICKMAN: It is.

MR. STRACHAN: - because there is a feeling.

You can go into small communities and ask for an interpreter and they will not interpret for you because they are afraid of what you are going to say being a reflection of themselves. This here, this recording equipment, I do not know if the \$15,000 is totally allotted to magistrate Woodrow, but I would certainly say that there needs to be an expansion of this. In 1977 when a magistrate is sitting down for two days and in longhand taking down notes, morning, noon and night from witnesses - and also, the recording equipment, doing it that way, you could refer back to a case previously. If there is an appeal or anything at all then you are in real difficulty because you do not have very good notes. Because the magistrate at the end of two days is not writing a great deal, he is cutting his notes short.

I think there are some aspects of law which are irritating to people, that are noticed by people and is laughed at by many when they see it in this day and age. So maybe there could be something adjusted there. I just say this, and I mean it in a positive manner, that more money should be spent.

MR. HICKMAN: I thank again -

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Chairman, if the minister does not mind.

MR. HICKMAN: Oh, I am sorry. One from Baie Verte too.

MR. RIDEOUT: I just want to very quickly and briefly endorse what my colleague has said. I have noticed from time to time magistrates serving the Baie Verte area, and they are still doing it today, taking down every word that is said in Family Court, traffic, or

MR. RIDEOUT:

Whatever kind of court that have, taking every word down in longhand and I think it is a very inefficient system. I think it is inefficient as far as the service of justice goes because going back over those, if you want to appeal or whatever, it is not only hard on the magistrate but I would submit it is hard on the accused also. I think it is time that we provide the magistrates, I am not here to sing your song totally, but I think it is time we provide them with at least efficient equipment so that they do not have to sit down and write out every little word of evidence in longhand. I think the minister should go back to his colleagues and say, "Give us some more money so we get them all at least one little cassette transcriber."

MR. HICKMAN: Hear, hear, Mr. Chairman! I concur with every word that has been said. But may I say in response to this that we have over the past few years been building up the recording equipment for the various magistrates courts. There are not too many left without it. We will furnish more than two courts with \$15,000 because -

MR. RIDEOUT: Will that furnish everybody this year then?

MR. HICKMAN: I doubt if it will furnish every magistrate's court, but we are getting pretty close to it. And I have -

MR. RIDEOUT: You should do it and have it over with.

MR. HICKMAN: You sound like me when I -

MR. RIDEOUT: I mean, that is absolutely necessary.

MR. HICKMAN: I know. And we are doing our best.

MR. RIDEOUT: Cut back on the law books,

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Chairman.

MR. HICKMAN: Do you not want to get on to the police, "John"?

MR. NOLAN: Pardon?

MR. HICKMAN: Do you not want to get on to the constabulary?

MR. NOLAN: No. I am just wondering; first of all, there have been a number of cases obviously that have been held up. And I believe people sometimes suffer. There is no question about it. They do suffer as a

MR. NOLAN:

result of it. As a matter of fact, we were waiting here for some months on a decision affecting a member or members of this House in the past, all because of the transcripts and so on in the court. Now my understanding insofar as the courts on circuit and so on are concerned is that the ladies who have been hired do not want to travel, is that correct?

AN HON. MEMBER: We are talking about magistrate's court now.

MR. NOLAN: Well I do not care what court it is. It is under Supreme Court - Supreme, District and Provincial Courts. That is what it says, the heading.

MR. HICKMAN: We spent twenty minutes on that just now.

MR. NOLAN: Well did you cover that point?

MR. HICKMAN: Yes.

MR. NOLAN: All right. Well also on the recording equipment there was a lady who sat here in this House. There are other ways of transcribing rather than recording or doing it in longhand. I forget what you call the machine.

MR. MURPHY: Shorthand machine.

MR. NOLAN: Shorthand machine, is it not? Yes. Or whatever it is. And it seems to me that in a time of unemployment and so on surely to God there is a good case for hiring or training enough people right now in a very concerted and concentrated effort to provide the necessary expertise. And this is a very professional job that is required. I am aware of that. And it seems to me that we can put it off, we can argue, we can debate this thing forever. It seems to me we should take some people right now and start training them for jobs such as this because it requires a certain specific skill. And I do not think we should continue to put it off. As a matter of fact in this current session of the House I heard the hon. Premier suggest that we might be getting back to having someone here on the floor, one or two reporters, recording them as they did in days gone by and so on. And the minister

MR. NOLAN:

Don't recall that. But anyway I just thought I would mention it because it seems to -

MR. HICKMAN: It is being done now.

MR. NOLAN: What is being done?

MR. HICKMAN: We have caught up with the reporting in the Supreme Court. We have nine people there now, new recording equipment. And hopefully, when we debated this about twenty minutes ago, the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) who was involved in that verified that the problems are over but we should be alert that they do not happen again.

MR. NOLAN: All right. Okay, okay.

MR. HICKMAN: All right.

On motion 703-02-06 carried?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does 703-02-07 carry?

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Chairman, what is the judicial council exactly?

MR. HICKMAN: The judicial council, Mr. Chairman, is a statutory body under the Provincial Courts Act consisting of Mr. Justice Nathaniel S. Noel of the Trial Division of the Supreme Court, His Honour Judge P. Lloyd Sower of the District Court of Pumber-St. George, Mr. George B. McCaldy, O.C., Deputy Minister of Justice, Mr. Leonard A. Martin, O.C., a nominee of the Benchers, His Honour Judge Geoffrey L. Steele of the District Court of St. John's West, and Chief Magistrate Hugh O'Neil. Their responsibilities under the Provincial Court Act, number one, to maintain the independence of the judicial. Government should never have any right to discipline or judge. That is a very sacred right.

MR. NOLAN: How often do they have to meet to decide that?

MR. HICKMAN: Wait now. But if a complaint comes in - and it is a new innovation that was in the legislation brought before this House and approved two years ago or three years ago, the new Provincial Courts Act - If a

MR. HICKMAN: complaint comes in now from a litigant, or a person who feels there has been an inordinate delay, or something has happened in a provincial court - now in the Federal courts I have no jurisdiction at all-but in a provincial court I can and I do send it to the chief magistrate. If he cannot handle it he can bring it to the judicial council.

MR. NOLAN: A question for the minister. When was the last time the judicial court had to meet to rule on something such as he is referring to? When?

MR. HICKMAN: Less than twenty-four hours ago. There was a full meeting that lasted pretty well all day dealing with a lot of matters.

MR. NOLAN: You mean they were threatened by the government to unseat them.

MR. HICKMAN: No, no, Mr. Chairman, It is a very, very commendable group of people doing an excellent job. They also, when vacancies occur on a provincial bench, they are the ones that interview all candidates to the magistracy and they are the ones who recommend those to be appointed.

MR. RIDEOUT: What did they spend the \$3,300 at?

MR. HICKMAN: Well they -

MR. NOLAN: Tea and coffee.

MR. HICKMAN: Let me give you an example; three magistrates were appointed this year, within the last four months, and there were in excess of fifty applications. The judicial council met here for two days, I think they met at Holiday Inn; they get a room there, and they eat there and those from out of town stay there - anyway some hotel, the Battery, I do not know where.

MR. NOLAN: What? Were they locked in? I mean they were only selecting a magistrate, not the Pope. Do they burn the ballots?

MR. HICKMAN: They are selecting men and women to serve on a bench that has jurisdiction in practically all cases except murder and treason. I think it is something that we can take some credit for, that I believe we were

MR. HICKMAN: the first Province in Canada at the provincial level to bring in the judicial council concept and I believe five have done so since we did two years ago.

MR. NOLAN: Carried, carried! Take it as read!

MR. HICKMAN: What about the constabulary now, 'John! so we can get on to that?

On motion, 703-02-07, carried.

MR. RIDEOUT: 703-02-08: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister could explain the doubling of the cost for traffic summonses from \$12,000 last year to \$24,000 this year? What does all that stuff mean, Mr. Chairman?

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, we have -

MR. RIDEOUT: Radar or what? Breathalizers, radar? I got stopped with the radar Sunday.

MR. HICKMAN: Anyhow I do not know how many this evening on Here and Now saw the programme where a police officer was being interviewed on this new stop - what do they call it?

AN HON. MEMBER: Check point.

MR. HICKMAN: Check point programme. This is the RCMP, the same in St. John's. There is no question about it that for once in Newfoundland's history we seem to be getting a handle on traffic. And also we have a new traffic court judge in the person of His Honour Jack A. White.

MR. NOLAN: Hear, hear! A fine man.

MR. HICKMAN: And let me tell you -

MR. RIDEOUT: His salary does not come out of that.

MR. HICKMAN: No, no! But let me tell you he is processing the summons.

MR. RIDEOUT: Well what is the argument? What is the cost for the summons? Is that the cost for the paper that they are written on or what?

MR. HICKMAN: No, service of summonses.

MR. RIDEOUT: Service. What do you mean? To go out and serve a summons.

MR. HICKMAN: Yes. That is right.

MR. RIDEOUT: It cost \$24,000 for St. John's.

MR. HICKMAN: Yes, that is right. Not just St. John's.

MR. RIDEOUT: \$12,000 more than last year?

MR. HICKMAN: No, courts generally. Not just St. John's, but St. John's is where you have to be -

MR. RIDEOUT: For the court to serve a summons?

MR. HICKMAN: But the summonses are served by bailiffs. The summonses are served by deputy sheriffs, the summonses are served by policemen.

MR. RIDEOUT: Right. They would have been paid anyway.

MR. HICKMAN: Wait now. No, no. We are pulling the policemen off the serving of summonses as much as we can because it is a waste of a police officers time, and the reason for it is that a policeman having been given a summons to serve most likely is not the same policeman who witnessed the - I have a figure here somewhere. I do not know if I can lay my hands on it, the cost of having -

MR. MURPHY: Great numbers have been delivered of these.

MR. HICKMAN: Yes. Wait now. It is very interesting because the cost of having a policeman serve a summons in time is \$2.77 for a policeman to serve a summons.

MR. NOLAN: What does he go by, dog team?

MR. HICKMAN: No, we take into account his salary. The fact that if he serves the summons -

MR. NOLAN: He would have to be paid anyway.

MR. HICKMAN: No, if he serves the summons he has to go back and appear in court quite often, because the court sets their own hours. They do not set hours to suit the shift of the police officers and it may be -

MR. RIDEOUT: Time and a half, I suppose.

MR. HICKMAN: And it may be overtime. The other thing is that the policeman who serves the summons most likely will not be the police officer who witnessed, say, the traffic offence. So you have two policemen. You have one chap who has to get in the witness box and

May 17, 1977

Tape 2916

JM - 4

MR. HICKMAN: prove that he did indeed serve John Jones, and then the other police officer has to get in the box and say, "I saw John Jones going down Pine Bud Avenue at forty miles an hour in a twenty mile zone."

MR. HICKMAN: And it is a pretty expensive little hobby but the return is not bad.

MR. FLIGHT: Will the Minister permit a question?

MR. RIDEOUT: What is the return on this stuff?

MR. HICKMAN: Well, there is the occasional dollar comes in.

MR. RIDEOUT: Are we making money on it?

MR. HICKMAN: I would be inclined to think so.

AN HON. MEMBER: \$10,000 to give a near estimate.

MR. HICKMAN: There you go. \$10,000 -

MR. RIDEOUT: Malarkey!

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Minister, the vote has doubled from \$12,000 to \$24,000 for the servicing of summonses. Now, is the Department of Justice indicating they expect the number of summonses issued to double? The cost of servicing has doubled so it would automatically seem that the Department is expecting the summonses issued to double. Is that logical or is that -

AN HON. MEMBER: There is a backlog.

MR. HICKMAN: There has been a backlog, but I give you an indication as to how many summonses were served out of the Traffic Court alone in St. John's last year, Mr. Chairman. There were 10,263.

MR. FLIGHT: So, is there going to be 20,400 this year? Why the doubling of the vote?

MR. NOLAN: Why do you not give us the amount collected?

MR. FLIGHT: Why the doubling of the vote?

MR. HICKMAN: I do not have that but if there is anybody listening outside I might have that before we get out of Committee. It does not show in my estimates because all the money goes into the Exchequer Account.

MR. NOLAN: Has the Minister given any consideration to - as I recall in the St. John's Act passed, I believe, in 1969 or 1970 in this House there was provision for meter maids - those in women's liberation movements do not like that term particularly, so call them

MR. NOLAN: maids or men or whatever that you want to - surely there is a cause for some employment there. Take the policemen off the meters and let someone else do the job, and put them at the job where they are efficient and trained and so on, not to be going around like ghosts in the night planting tickets around down on Water Street. Is the Minister going to give any consideration to this or will he go on avoiding and evading the issue as he has for so many years?

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I would think that is more properly under the Newfoundland Constabulary, but there was a report.

I think it was made by Chief Brown quite recently in a speech to the Kiwanis Club dealt with the question of meter maids being used instead of policemen. The City of Moncton, I think it was, and one other city switched to meter maids, and have gone back to the use of police officers.

MR. NOLAN: Why?

MR. HICKMAN: The reason for it was that how do you distinguish between one breach of the law and another. They found that because they were not using law enforcement - now this has nothing to do with the service of summonses - because they were not using law enforcement officers to enforce their non-moving traffic violations in these two cities it did not work and they had to go back to using police officers.

MR. NOLAN: Why?

MR. HICKMAN: Well now, that was their experience. The other thing is that using police officers -

MR. NOLAN: You do not need to go to law school to put a ticket on a car.

MR. HICKMAN: Police officers do not go to law school.

MR. ROWE: They have a lot of training.

MR. NOLAN: The Minister still has not answered why it is that another man or woman other than a police officer cannot put tickets on a car on Water or Duckworth Street. Can we not get a straight answer?

MR. HICKMAN: There is no reason why you cannot.

MR. NOLAN: Well, when are we going to get to it?

MR. HICKMAN: - The professional advice I get is against it but I am game to try.

MR. NOLAN: Would you care to say who and what the professional advice is?

MR. HICKMAN: The police.

MR. NOLAN: What police?

MR. HICKMAN: I told you, the Chief of Police made that statement.

MR. NOLAN: The Chief of Police says, 'no'. All right, Sir.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. FLIGHT: I am going to try it once more to get an answer as to why the vote for the issuing of servicing of traffic summonses has doubled from \$12,000 to \$24,000. Now the Minister in his opening remarks indicated that the record of our highway patrols and traffic cops and the rest is commendable and it has improved vastly over prior years. Last year we spent \$12,000 issuing traffic summonses. Now what is the rationale behind doubling that vote? It would seem to me we are going to double the amount of traffic summonses issued, and I am asking the Minister why the doubling of the vote. A short answer.

MR. HICKMAN: All I can say, Mr. Chairman, is, and I repeat, the estimate this year, particularly arising out of the reorganization of the Traffic Court in St. John's - and that is the big one - indicates to my officials, they are satisfied, that there will be a very substantial increase in the number of summonses, particularly for traffic violations that have to be served.

May I, while I am on my feet, in answer to another question - the revenue from fines last year hit the \$1 million mark.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. RIDFOUT: No wonder you are going to double the number of summonses!

MR. FLIGHT: Now we know why! Two million dollars this year.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Chairman, a couple of questions for the hon. minister in regard to summonses. As I recall, unless they have changed it in Nova Scotia, I believe, or New Brunswick, if you were driving along the road and exceeding the speed limit the Mounted Police would come along, give you a ticket and you can pay it on the spot. Now that solves one little problem that the hon. minister seems to have. I would like to know, one, why that cannot be done here provided you have the cash on you? If you want to pay apparently you can. Otherwise you go to the courts and so on or whatever.

MR. MURPHY: Where was that?

MR. HICKMAN: In Nova Scotia.

MR. RIDEOUT: That saves a lot of money. We do not need to do that.

MR. HICKMAN: Yes, it is a good system.

MR. NOLAN: And the second thing I would like to ask is if that is so, or even if it is not so, why could you not give the money from the summonses to the municipalities concerned. For example, you collect monies from traffic violators in Conception Bay South or Bonavista South or wherever, that the money go to the municipalities. I mean, does the minister have to be the great grab all of every nickel on the highways?

MR. HICKMAN: No. Mr. Chairman, I was going to say I would change places any time at all with the Attorney-General of Nova Scotia with respect to his scheme for the service of summonses and municipalities, because he sloughs off on the municipalities the cost of policing, the total cost of policing.

MR. FLIGHT: So do you, except for St. John's.

MR. HICKMAN: No, I do not, not on your life. When we come to the vote under policing look at the vote under P.C.M.P.

MR. FLIGHT: Municipal policing?

MR. HICKMAN: No, Sir, we do not, Mr. Chairman, by any stretch of the imagination. And I think this can be more properly discussed under police protection.

MR. NOLAN: You do not charge the city of St. John's directly for the policing of St. John's. That is nonsense.

MR. HICKMAN: That is right. That is right. That is what I am saying, that we -

MR. FLIGHT: But you tell the town of Windsor to supply their own policemen.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, we have a system in this Province that I think is superior to what is in our sister provinces in Atlantic Canada. There historically they have sloughed off onto their municipalities the responsibility for law enforcement. What it means is this; that a city with the tax base of Halifax can have a very strong police force. But a town the size of, say, New Glasgow cannot. They have no training programme because they cannot afford it. Now with respect to what the hon. gentleman raised, the idea, as they do in Nova Scotia, of paying a fine. Incidentally, the minimum fine in Nova Scotia for a first offence for speeding when you pay it right on the spot is fifty dollars, fifty dollars minimum. And I will not tell you how I know, but I know. It is fifty dollars.

MR. RIDEOUT: Is the minister speaking from experience?

MR. HICKMAN: I am speaking from experience. It is fifty dollars. But again the motorist is given the choice, and must be

MR. NOLAN: That is right. Yes, I said that.

MR. HICKMAN: Do you want to pay your fifty dollars or do you want it to go to court? I believe that in Nova Scotia, where they have tried that primarily as an experimental basis, that they find an awful lot of motorists say "I want my day in court. I want you to prove it." Now if you come up with a radar reading it is kind of hard to disprove it.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Chairman, the hon. minister again avoids the question. Is it possible to get a straight answer from the minister?

MR. HICKMAN: I hope not.

MR. NOLAN: The experiment that the minister is talking about in Nova Scotia, the experiment was underway ten years ago. I mean, who is he kidding? I was found, I know.

May 17, 1977.

Tape 2918

PH - 3

MR. HICKMAN: What?

MR. NOLAN: Fifteen dollars.

MR. HICKMAN: Now, \$50.

MR. RIDEOUT: And the Minister of Justice for Newfoundland.

MR. NOLAN: And the Minister of Justice got hit obviously.

MR. HICKMAN: I did not say I got hit.

MR. NOLAN: So, fifty dollars.

MR. HICKMAN: I saw a person getting hit. I saw him with my own two eyes.

MR. NOLAN: You should, you were driving.

MR. HICKMAN: Paying out \$50.00.

MR. NOLAN: Anyway the question was if it is costing us a great deal of money to collect, to summonses and to deliver them and so on, is there any reason why we cannot ask a person to pay on the highway or to go to court and let them pay. Now the minister has an answer. That -

MR. HICKMAN: No reason at all.

MR. NOLAN: Well will you do it? And when?

MR. MURPHY: We will start tomorrow morning, nine o'clock.

MR. NOLAN: Thanks, "Ank".

MR. HICKMAN: No, no, no. The new ticket His Honour Judge White is designing now is just for that very purpose within the city of St. John's. My understanding is that my officials are talking with the R.C.M.P. about the same thing. Police do not like that. They do not like to be collectors of money on the spot. They do not like the responsibility of collecting that money and then having to account for it. But I see no reason why we should not move toward it. Last year too we passed an amendment to the - I do not know if it was the Summary Jurisdiction Act - but one piece of legislation which gives us the right in certain very minor offences to serve summonses by registered mail. The problem you got to get around there is what happens if a person comes in and says "I never got a letter. It never came to my house. And I do not care who signed for it - my wife or my son - he or she did not tell me." That

MR. HICKMAN: may not be proof of service but I thank the hon. gentleman for Conception Bay South. It is a good suggestion. If we can move toward it quickly and effectively we will.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Chairman, I am still not satisfied.

MR. HICKMAN: Well, I cannot do any more for you.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member says that we are going to move toward it. Now from my past experience with the hon. member when he starts to move toward something, by the time it is done Geoff Carnell will be lowering me down in Belvedere somewhere. I cannot afford to wait that long. I would like to know if you are going to do it, when, and as for what the police like and what they do not like, they do not like being in the Mental Hospital either but they are in there. Now let's get at it. Next item. Carried.

Item 703-02-08 carried.

Item 703-03-01 carried.

Item 703-03-02.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Chairman, I was looking for the sections here in which members killing ducks out of season could be caught, especially members who eat ducks knowingly out of season. However, Fees and Expenses of Witnesses here.

AN HON. MEMBER: That has nothing to do with poaching.

MR. STRACHAN: Yes, it has. I could tell you a story. We have had experience, and again I refer only to my own recent experience, of the people who are transported, carried, for instance, to a trial, as witnesses to a trial - and again here I think it should be looked into - that they are often carried to a trial one way only; that many people who are moved out of small isolated communities and brought as witnesses have often been brought by RCMP plane, for instance, to the court case, and once the court case is over have not been brought back. They have been left. I could give names and occasions and the actual court case, the trial, in which people have been left. In fact, if it had not been

MR. STRACHAN: in one case for the generosity and the kindness of the defence lawyer who had argued the case getting the witnesses back, the witnesses would have been in difficulty. So, again I question this expense of witnesses and the travel cost and so on involved in getting witnesses out. I think that it should be done, it should be a system in which all witnesses, not only the prosecution witnesses, police prosecutions and prosecutions from the department here but also defence witnesses should not be left high and dry where they are left where they cannot get back home. again, or where there has nothing been taken care of and they cannot get back. So I would like to bring that point up to the minister here, because I think it is wrong in this day and age when you have to bring witnesses out - we cannot bring the courts to them. We can see reasons for that and we believe that - but when witnesses are brought to court there should be a very clear system in which these witnesses are taken care of and also provided for and returned to their homes.

In a number of cases - I have been involved in one in which I arranged the return travel of witnesses; in one other case the lawyer, Gerry O'Brien, arranged for the return of the defence witnesses. The prosecution witnesses were returned by RCMP plane, the defence witnesses had to find their own way home. The point is this, if you cannot take the court to people, defence witnesses, in which it comes through Legal Aid - and I imagine this would come to expensive witnesses under Legal Aid - then if you can only transport the prosecution witnesses, and you cannot transport and provide accommodation - this was in this case provided for. Accommodations were provided for but the return journey was not provided for - and these witnesses, many of whom had no money whatsoever, were required to get loans and to return back home. I think this is tremendously unfair in a system in which only prosecution witnesses

May 17, 1977

Tape 2919

1b-3.

MR. STRACHAN: are taken care of or given transportation and the defence witnesses are not taken care of at all. I would like to bring that up on this point here.

MR. HICKMAN: I think I was following what the hon. gentleman was saying. The Crown has a responsibility to transport witnesses for the Crown. The amount paid per day for witnesses is kind of meager. We did pass an act last year in this House which says that no employer has the right to deduct any wages from a person who has been subpoenaed to give evidence as a witness.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Carried, carried!

On motion, 703-03-02, carried.

MR. NOLAN: 703-03-03: Mr. Chairman, just very briefly for the minister, on the Jurors Fees and Other Expenses. I would like to know - some years ago, you may recall, we made it possible for ladies to serve on the jury. Some questions were raised of concern that it was very difficult to get ladies to serve on the jury. Are you still having this problem and, if so, to what degree?

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, to my knowledge there has been no problem within the last eighteen months.

On motion, 703-03-03 and 04, carried.

MR. RIDEOUT: 703-03-05: Mr. Chairman, could the minister tell us how many deputy sheriffs we have in the Province today?

MR. HICKMAN: Thirty-eight, Mr. Chairman.

MR. RIDEOUT: What is that, one for each magisterial district?

MR. HICKMAN: No, no, the appointment of deputy sheriffs is in the hands of the High Sheriff of Newfoundland, and the High Sheriff sort of responds to need which I guess would be communicated to him by magistrates.

On motion, 703-03-05, carried.

MR. NOLAN: 704-01: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, if I may. I missed one here. I apologize, but going back to 703-09 just briefly if I may.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 703-09 was not called.

MR. NOLAN: It was not called. I thought you were gone ahead of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is not called. It is voted in another department.

MR. NOLAN: I am sorry. The alterations one on construction I am after.

MR. HICKMAN: Well that would be under - If you would ask me the question - If the hon. gentleman would ask me the question under 704-02. If he is going to ask about - What are you going to ask about?

MR. NOLAN: I am interested in information on the new buildings for

MR. NOLAN: the police.

MR. HICKMAN: Oh, that is under 705.

On motion, 704-01, carried.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Chairman, travelling - Mr. Chairman -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, the hon. member.

MR. RIDEOUT: 704-02-01- travelling - Penitentiaries. This year it is estimated at \$31,600 and last year at \$12,600, I wonder would the minister mind addressing himself to that dramatic increase.

Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, just a bit of trouble over here.

MR. HICKMAN: Yes, yes. I would be delighted to. Thank you.

MR. RIDEOUT: Yes, just a second. My colleague got in trouble here. If the minister would explain that. I will let him do that before I make any other comments.

MR. HICKMAN: I welcome the opportunity, and this may be the last bit of exciting information that I have tonight for the hon. House, but as hon. gentlemen know we have started construction of a community correction centre in Stephenville that we have been doing a great deal of work on during the past year. The contract has been let and work has started and it is scheduled to finish this fall. The increase in the sub-division reflects the anticipated - of travelling, that is - the anticipated additional cost in travelling associated with staff training and related travelling resulting from the opening of the Stephenville Correctional Institute. This will be under Superintendent Malcolm Squires of HM Penitentiary, who will have responsibility for the penitentiary, the Salmonier Correctional Institute and the Stephenville Correctional Institute. People hired from the area will be coming in here to take training at Her Majesty's Penitentiary and some will be going out, and there will be a great deal of travel in the first year of operation and in the setting up of the Community Correctional Centre in Stephenville. It is a great step forward in the field of rehabilitation and custodial care in this Province, and I thank the hon. gentleman opposite for giving me the opportunity to give this information which I have to confess I would

May 17, 1977

Tape No. 2920

EC - 3

MR. HICKMAN:

have overlooked otherwise.

MR. FLIGHT:

Oh, oh! Sanctimonious!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Chairman, I have done the minister the kind favour of asking him that question.

Now I want to ask the minister whether or not this \$31,600 reflects any travelling cost for prisoners -

MR. HICKMAN:

What?

MR. RIDEOUT:

The transfer of prisoners, for example, from Corner Brook to Her Majesty's

MR. RIDEOUT: Penitentiary in St. John's.
Would that come under that particular Head, Mr. Chairman?

MR. HICKMAN: No, no.

MR. RIDEOUT: That would just be for what
the minister said. It would not be prisoners or anything
of that nature?

MR. HICKMAN: No, no.

MR. RIDEOUT: Okay, I will speak to it a
little later down the Head.

On motion, 704-02-01, carried.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move, unless
hon. gentlemen want to keep going until twelve o'clock -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, No. .

MR. RIDEOUT: No, Sir. You will need unanimous
consent for that.

MR. HICKMAN: I was about to rise the Committee
but everybody looked so happy over there because you have
been getting so much information, so valuable, and I think -

MR. FLIGHT: You are not like the Minister of
Rural Development.

MR. HICKMAN: No, seriously, Mr. Chairman, I
think this is the kind of way a Committee should operate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKMAN: The facts that have been coming out
tonight are exciting in the field of justice, and I move
that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to
sit again.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of
Supply have considered the matters to them referred and
have directed me to report having passed estimates of
expenditure under the following Headings, number VI, Education,

May 17, 1977, Tape 2921, Page 2 -- apb

MR. CHAIRMAN: number XVI Rural Development,
all items without amendment, have made further progress
and ask leave to sit again.

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

On motion, the House at its
rising adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 18, 1977,
at 3:00 p.m.