

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
TUESDAY, MARCH 25, 1980

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

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

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to inform the hon. House that I intend to present the Budget on Friday of this week.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. D. JAMIESON: I am back to my favourite subject with the hon. the Minister of Finance, given his most recent statement with regard to Petrocan's interest in Come By Chance. I believe the report was that there was some request by Petro-Canada to do an inspection of the facility. Is this just a casual once-over lightly - I mean, they have already been out there on a couple of occasions to the best of my knowledge - or can we now expect that Petro-Canada is going to do a thorough examination of the physical facilities, something of a very comprehensive nature that will give them a clear picture of what kind of a facility it is and how they might be able to make use of it? In other words, what is the current state of play?

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

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, hon. members will recall that Petro-Canada re-established contact with the receiver I think something like six weeks ago -

MR. D. JAMIESON: Yes.

DR. J. COLLINS: - and since that time they have had ongoing conversations. Our understanding is that during those conversations, they proposed to the receiver for passage to ECGD that Petro-Canada would like to do an in-depth inspection rather than just a visitation.

DR. J. COLLINS: Some consultants for Petro-Canada have already done a visitation to the refinery, but our understanding is that Petro-Canada wished ECGD to agree to allow them to do a much more detailed inspection than can be done just by visitation and they have put a proposal, we understand, to ECGD in that regard.

MR. D. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. D. JAMIESON: This continues to be my difficulty in terms of the planning or progress - I hope I can call it progress - with regard to the project. In other words, the hon. the minister has now said once again that the relationship appears to be almost exclusively between Petro-Canada and ECGD. And I understand if they were a normal, interested buyer and we were talking about a normal bankrupt situation, that would be the case, but earlier the minister indicated, and I was glad to hear him say so, that the government was now taking a much more active interest. In the absence of the Minister of Industrial Development (Mr. L. Barry), perhaps the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) could tell me whether, in fact, the role is still on the part of the Newfoundland Government a passive role, or whether they are actively encouraging and assisting in every way they can, Petro-Canada, and I use them because they are the ones who are front and centre right now, to

MR. D. JAMIESON:

become involved in this? In other words, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. the minister, is it just a question of saying, "It is a relationship with ECGD and we will wait and see what comes out of it," or is the Government of Newfoundland saying, "We would like to see Petrocan involved in this particular project, and we are prepared to, in a sense, hold their hand?" Because there are a number of things involved, as the hon. the minister will know, with regard to other than ECGD which might very well have to be part and parcel. I am thinking of the federal involvement in the wharf facilities, I am thinking about the environmental report of last year, and I suppose in summary I could ask the minister if in fact either his department or people in Industrial Development are indeed vigorously pursuing and encouraging and assisting Petro-Canada to become involved?

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. J. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish this to be thought of as a cop-out but I wonder if the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. D. Jamieson) will permit me to make this observation: During the Budget Speech there are usually reviews done of various sectors of the economy and various developments that are underway or government intends to get underway and Come by Chance clearly is that sort of thing and it would be covered in the Budget Speech. Now, as I say, I do not want this to sound as though I am coping out, but I think it would really be more appropriate and be more enlightening if I could leave a further statement to the Budget Speech when one will expect to lay out in some detail the facts that we have and I think that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition would be more satisfied with that process.

MR. D. JAMIESON:

I have waited this long, a couple of more days, I guess, we can wait.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. L. THOMS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question I would like to direct to the Minister of Health (Mr. W. House). Yesterday when I questioned the Minister of Justice (Mr. G. Ottenheimer) in connection with the Hagan case and I referred to the Hagan case and what happened in that situation, on January 5th, 1979 one Ross Goodyear was released from the Waterford Hospital, immediately drove to Brookfield, Bonavista Bay, where he obtained a shotgun and shot his wife and killed her. My question is, if I may ask the question, in view of those two cases that have been cited in this hon. House these last two days, is the Minister of Health prepared to request the Minister of Justice to order a public inquiry under the Public Inquiries Act?

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. W. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, on an occasion on television a couple of days ago, I had stated that we were looking at that particular Hagan case and that we were awaiting the outcome of a magisterial inquiry - a public court inquiry, I guess, is the right term now - and the same thing was stated yesterday by the Minister of Justice (G. Ottenheimer) and that still stands in that particular case. And I think the Minister of Justice did outline that there is ample scope in a magisterial inquiry to look at a fair number of aspects. We are waiting on that.

The other case, I had just recently heard of this, as a matter of fact, and I am going to be discussing that with officials but there has been no decision and I cannot say what we will do in that particular case. I want to point out that most of - we look at the Waterford Hospital, the admissions and the discharges of the Waterford Hospital, of course, are medical decisions and it is pretty well governed exclusively by the Mental Health Act, which was a new act - well, it was a new approach, I guess - which was passed in this House in June of 1971. And as has been pointed out by the administration, it is not really an administrative decision.

But I will just take the question under advisement and discuss it with both the Minister of Justice and, of course, officials of my department and the Waterford Hospital.

MR. L. THOMS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): A supplementary, the hon. Member for Grand Bank.

MR. L. THOMS: Some time ago, I asked a question in the House in connection with the psychiatrist who had hit the patient. At that time I was informed the NMA were investigating the incident, that the hospital board was investigating the incident. Is the Minister

MR. L. THOMS: in a position now to say what the results of these investigations were, and whether he is prepared to make it public?

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. W. HOUSE: It was an in-hospital board report. I have not seen the report, but I do understand that Dr. Paulse is back working at the Hospital. I have not seen the report. It is not my report and obviously I cannot indicate whether I could make it public or not.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. the Member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance, Sir. Some time ago the Deputy Minister of Finance and Comptroller of the Treasury resigned under some peculiar circumstances. And what I want to know now is if a replacement has been found for the Deputy Minister of Finance and, if so, would

March 25, 1980

Tape No. 611

DW - 1

MR. S. NEARY: the hon. gentleman tell us if the appointment has been made?

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I am not certain what peculiar circumstances the hon. member is referring to. The former Deputy Minister of Finance did indeed resign from his post. Shortly after that we undertook a nation-wide advertising programme -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) the local preference.

DR. J. COLLINS: Local preference was not excluded by any manner of means and if any local person wants to apply he is most welcome to do so. But it was a nation-wide advertising campaign. We have had in a considerable number of applications and there will be a process of reviewing these and making the decision set up in the near future.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, under the Financial Administration Act in the event that a vacancy occurs as Deputy Minister of Finance or comptroller of the treasury under the great seal of Newfoundland, it is incumbent upon the minister to delegate the responsibility of comptroller of the treasury so that the public treasury will be adequately protected by someone else. Has the minister delegated this authority to anybody in his department?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. J. COLLINS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, one of the assistant Deputy Ministers, specifically Mr. Bernard Carew, has been appointed Acting Deputy Minister and he is also fulfilling the role on an interim basis of comptroller.

MR. S. NEARY: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): A final supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman indicated that a nation-wide advertising campaign had been carried on to find a Deputy Minister of Finance. I would like to ask the minister if it is not possible to find a Deputy Minister of Finance right here in Newfoundland? The government are taking of preference of Newfoundlanders in the offshore -

MR. L. THOMS: Newfoundlanders first.

MR. S. NEARY: - Newfoundlanders first, that is right, on the offshore regulations and the same thing applied in the Upper Churchill. Does the minister not feel that we can find a Deputy Minister of Finance either locally or is there somebody already in the department who can do that job and if not, if the answer is 'No' and I would assume the answer should be 'Yes', but if it is not would the hon. gentleman tell us after the applications that come in as a result of this nation-wide advertising campaign, if it is narrowed down, how many applicants will be brought to Newfoundland at public expense and how much expenses will they be allowed, you know, will be allocated to bring them in here for interviews and so forth?

March 25, 1980

Tape No. 612

NM - 1

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has asked quite a number of penetrating questions there and I hope I can answer them fully.

Firstly, in regard to whether a Newfoundlander could fill this post, I sincerely hope so. I do not see why a Newfoundlander could not. We undertook the nation-wide programme for two reasons, Mr. Speaker. Firstly, it is a very senior post in the Public Service and we felt that the Province would be best served by our looking over the whole field and attempting to get the very best man available to us. The second reason was that whoever did get it, local person or otherwise, whoever did get the post, it would be quite clearly visible then that they got it in the best of rights; it was not from a small field that they were picked but that they were picked from a very large field. So that whoever got the post, and, as I say, if it happened to be a local person there would be no doubt that that person fully justified getting it because he would have been up, or she would have been up against a nation-wide competition.

In regard to how many will be interviewed, I am afraid I cannot answer that at this time. A review mechanism for the applications will be set up and I suppose it will be up to the members of that mechanism -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) will be closed for applications.

DR. J. COLLINS: No, not strictly speaking. There was no closing date on the applications. We decided to leave it sort of open ended for the reason that we wanted to make sure that any worthy applicants would have every opportunity of applying.

MR. NEARY: Have you gone outside of Canada as well?

DR. COLLINS: Pardon?

MR. NEARY: Have you gone outside of Canada?

DR. COLLINS: We have advertised outside of Canada -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) interjection (inaudible).

DR. COLLINS: No, I am sorry. That is incorrect.

We advertised in Canadian papers. Now some of these papers clearly might have gone outside of Canada, but we did not specifically go into foreign papers. And in regard to the number of people who might be brought to the Province at public expense, again I cannot answer that. It will depend on the reviewing committee, how many they see fit to bring for interview.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. member for St. Barbe.

MR. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Transportation and Communications.

In view of the ever increasing traffic flow across the Bonne Bay area and the expansion of Gros Morne National Park, and in view of the fact that the existing dock facilities at Woody Point are only half as long as the boat that operates there creating immense difficulty for the traffic flow, I am wondering if the minister could give some indication at this time how high on the priority list in the upcoming budget might the upgrading, or the replacing of the facilities at Woody Point for the ferry landing?

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, it is the same answer to that question as the answer I gave yesterday with respect to ferries. The hon. member is aware that we have an in-house committee looking at all the ferry services in the Province and it includes that particular ferry and until such time as that committee reports I am unable to say what will happen to any ferry system in the Province.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. The hon. member for St. Barbe.

MR. BENNETT: I was not here yesterday so I missed that but just for the record I want to be sure, Mr. Speaker, that the minister makes sure that this particular one in the Bonne Bay area, which has been in limbo for a few years; so I understand, it has been shelved, it has been put back, has been delayed and I would certainly like to see priority given to that one because there is quite a heavy traffic flow and it is in a tourist oriented traffic flow within the National Park boundaries. So I would like to ask the minister will he then be sure that one, that ferry specifically gets priority?

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

MR. BRETT: To be quite honest, Mr. Speaker, I cannot guarantee the hon. member that that particular ferry will receive top priority. I am sure that the people on St. Brendan's, the people on Fogo Island and other people who live on islands would not be very pleased if I indicated that that particular ferry was top priority. No, I am sorry, I cannot give the hon. member that guarantee. I certainly cannot.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Mary's-The Capes.

MR. HANCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications also. In light of what happened today in Mount Carmel where 150 parents from the communities of North Harbour, Colinet and Haricot picketed the schools so subsequently there was no school in those communities today because they felt that the

MR. HANCOCK: road conditions were too treacherous to send their kids over, and rightly so, but also we had a meeting a couple of weeks ago with the minister pertaining to the bridge, the Rocky Harbour Bridge, which was built in 1924. Can the minister assure this House that an inspector has been sent out or when will an inspector be sent out to inspect that bridge?

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

MR. BRETT: The same day that the group from the hon. member's district visited my office, that same day I asked my Deputy Minister if an inspection had been carried out recently then to see that one was carried out. I do not know if the engineers have actually gone up but if they have not they have been instructed to do so, unless one was done quite recently. If not, then I would assume they will be going up shortly.

MR. HANCOCK: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. The hon. member for St. Mary's-The Capes.

MR. HANCOCK: Mr. Speaker, as far as I know, and the people in the area, the bridge has not been inspected for the last four or five years and to look at the bridge it looks as if it is ready to fall down any second. It is too late to send an inspector up there when there are sixty or seventy kids at the bottom of the bridge so I would ask the minister if he will look into the matter seriously and see if he can get an inspector up there within the next twenty-four hours, if possible.

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

MR. BRETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary.

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

MR. S. NEARY: Further to the point the hon. gentleman raised, Sir, would the minister indicate to the House what extraordinary steps the government are taking to cope with the road conditions in this Province at the present time, which are the worst since Confederation?

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

MR. C. BRETT: Extraordinary? I do not know if there are any extraordinary measures being taken, Mr. Speaker. We have all our staff and all our equipment working every day to try to keep the roads passable, and people being laid off have absolutely nothing to do. We are doing all that we can and I suppose that is all that is expected of anybody.

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

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

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Transportation mentioned that he has all the equipment working and all the manpower working that he can. How widespread is the situation throughout the Province that we have, for example, in the Heart's Content depot, four machines with three broken down, four sand trucks with two broken down, and we have Caplin Cove, which is a suburb of Hant's Harbour, if you will, presently being flooded out because of lack of ditching in that particular area?

MR. G. FLIGHT: Island-wide, rampant.

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

MR. G. FLIGHT: Right across the Island.

MR. C. BRETT: The hon. member is correct, right across the Island.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. C. BRETT: That is correct. And it is exactly what one would expect when that machinery had to work almost around the clock

MR. C. BRETT: for almost two months. So I make no apologies to the hon. member or hon. members. Machinery is broken down; and what machinery is broken down, we are doing our best to repair it. And we will continue to do our best to get it out and, as I indicated, keep the roads passable.

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

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

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that about three-quarters of the machinery is broken down in this particular depot, and we are facing serious flooding in the Province out there in Caplin Cove, would the minister undertake to get some private machinery into that particular community to do the required ditching?

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

MR. C. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, the minister does not have to undertake anything. The staff have the authority, Mr. Speaker, if it is necessary, to hire extra equipment - in the case of emergency, to do it - they do not have to come to the minister or anybody else. They can go and do it when it is necessary.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Bonavista North (Mr. L. Stirling), followed by the hon. the member for -

MR. J. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, a short supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. gentleman wish to yield?

MR. L. STIRLING: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Port au Port, a supplementary.

MR. J. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I would just ask the Minister of Transportation and Communications to explain why is it that this is the only province in the Atlantic region - and, of course, we have a particular type of weather here - why this is the only province that does not announce half load limits on our Province's highways? If you look

March 25, 1980

Tape 614

EC - 3

MR. J. HODDER: at the transportation report that comes out and is circulated at least to all the members in this House - at least I get a copy - which deals with the different provinces in the Atlantic region, each one of them has already had

March 25, 1980

Tape No. 615

DW - 1

MR. J. HODDER: half load limits put on their roads but this Province does not, Could the minister explain why that is?

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

MR. C. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, half load limits are placed on our highroads at certain times of the year.

MR. J. HODDER: It is never announced.

MR. C. BRETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, they are, they are always announced because there is always a fuss because usually there are people who do not want them on and there are another group who do. But unless there has been some recent change that I am not aware of, there are certain times of the year when half load limits or whatever are put on certain highways in the Province.

MR. E. STIRLING: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. L. STIRLING: I am inclined to ask a supplementary question. Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and it is a subject that has not been cleared up to my satisfaction. The minister may have been under the impression that fishermen who were fired off the Fisheries Loan Board had been notified, but as he found out in Wesleyville they have not been notified and I now have a letter from another member of that Board. Can the Minister of Fisheries now confirm whether or not those fishermen who have been fired from the Fisheries Loan Board will be advised?

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

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman seems to be persistent in indicating that the fishermen were fired from the Fisheries Loan Board. I do not know why but I will not get involved in reasons why after his performance in Wesleyville a few weeks ago. Mr. Speaker, the situation is that the fishermen who served on the Fisheries Loan Board -

SOME HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the Opposition seems to ask questions and wants to interfere when you are trying to answer the questions. Make up your minds!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

Allow the hon. the minister to answer the question.

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the situation is the fishermen who served on the Fisheries Loan Board in the past when they were appointed by my predecessor, their time expired in July 1979. And when I moved into the portfolio in January or February of this year I was of the impression that the fishermen were aware that the time expired because they were appointed with a certain time limit when they were appointed by my predecessor, and the time limit was up in July of 1979. There was no firing from the Board by myself as minister, I was of the clear impression that fishermen who were on the Board were knowledgeable in the fact that they were appointed to the Board for a certain period, and that period expired in July of 1979. And as for fishermen serving on the Fisheries Loan Board, it is my intention now to consult with the Fishermen's Union and ask them to make recommendations to me as to what fishermen will be serving on the Board in the future.

MR. L. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. L. STIRLING: The minister has now confirmed that he also agrees with his colleagues who have taken the

MR. L. STIRLING: the position that their term expired in July 1979. They did not get a letter saying that your term is expired or thank you for your services or anything.

I would like the minister to tell me by what authority did they approve the loans that were approved between July 1979, when this board had expired, and the appointment of the Interim Board in October 1979? You have one board expired and a new board not appointed until October, by what authority did they approve the loans?

MR. S. NEARY: Walter Carter's authority.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I will endeavour to get the information for the hon. gentleman. I was not in the department at the time but I know the board was active. In fact, the board was really active; it spent \$24 million.

MR. D. JAMIESON: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. D. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, for information purposes, and the hon. minister may have to look it up, but my memory is that his predecessor indicated that there were meetings of the board held after July, 1979 and I believe I can go back through Hansard and find those references. If that is the case, where in fact the fishermen whom he says had their terms expire in July on the committee, and did they meet at that particular time, would he undertake to find that out? If he does not know it already?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I will because I recall that as part of Cabinet, and not being involved with Fisheries, I recall that it came to the attention of Cabinet sometime, I think it was in September or early October anyway, that the Fisheries Loan Board was broke. They had no money. They had expended all the funds allocated to them in the past year's budget, in fact this present year's budget at the time, and they were asking for some additional funds. Now whether or not there

MR. J. MORGAN: were meetings held from the end of July, when the fishermen's time expired, and up until September, when the indication from the board to the Cabinet was that the board was bankrupt at the time, or there was no more funds, whether the board met and made decisions allocated for those loans, I do not know but I will check into it and find out and get the information back to the House.

MR. L. STIRLING: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Supplementary, the hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. L. STIRLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can confirm December 19th, if you check Hansard we were told that there were loans approved in the period from July until August because at that point, Mr. Speaker, nobody had decided that the board's term had expired. And this is why the minister can not have it both ways; either they expired or they were fired.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. member is entering into debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The point of order, I would rule that the hon. gentleman is getting into the realm of debate and he should ask the question if he so desires.

The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. L. STIRLING: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

A supplementary question, I expect that the minister is now going to decide whether they had expired.

MR. L. STIRLING:

or were fired and he does not know the answer now. Can he confirm that the other seven hundred applications that he mentioned to us the last time he made a ministerial statement, are there still seven hundred applications where fishermen do not know at this stage whether or not they are going to have loans approved for this year's fishery?

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

The hon.the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. J. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, the details of the present status of the Loan Board is difficult to indicate off the top of my head but I will endeavor to get the information. But I recall that approximately two weeks ago I told the House that there was then approximately seven hundred applications being processed by the interim Loan Board, Now with a new chairman, of course, a new comptroller, and fishermen will be appointed within the next couple of weeks or so upon meeting with the Fishermen's Union - In fact, this afternoon I plan to meet the Fishermen's Union, Mr. Cashin and his executive later on today - and the Board is being active now. The Board is dealing with all the possible applications it can deal with. There are funds in the Loan Fund and the Loan Board is dealing with all applications. They dealt with, over the past number of weeks, applications from twenty-six bona fide fishermen applying for boats in a range of forty-five - sixty-five feet and that is the total number of applications on file for that type of boat from all over the Province.

Now, these applications were processed and screened and eighteen of these were approved by the Board and now contracts have been arranged, in fact, I think it is a total of eleven to date, and the remaining number will be completed and arranged with a shipyard in the next few days. On the matter of equipment and new gear, like engines, etc., the Board is meeting at least once

MR. J. MORGAN: a week. In fact, last week they met, I think, twice for the one week. They are dealing with all the applications they can possibly deal with. It is an interim board with a new chairman now, but the fishermen are not yet been appointed to that Board. But they will be in the next two or three week period.

So the Board is doing everything possible to deal with applications on file from fishermen who need equipment and gear to get going in this year's fishery. Now, I emphasized yesterday in a public statement that we are not going to tolerate situations where fishermen are refusing to bring up to date their accounts with the Loan Board and we have situations, I have found in my own investigations, where fishermen have been in arrears for as long as seven and eight years and no action been taken by the Board.

So what I am saying is I am determined to have that Loan Board to deal with the fishermen's accounts in a business-like manner. So therefore, fishermen who are in arrears who are making applications now -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) boats and gear.

MR. J. MORGAN: - Mr. Speaker, fishermen who are making application now for loans, if they are in good standing with the Board and if they are eligible under the existing criteria for loans, they will get their loans approved and be ready to go fishing this year's fishing season. That is the situation.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please. The time for Oral Questions has expired.

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: I rise on a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

During the latter part of the Question Period a note was handed me and I elected to wait until the Question Period was over before bringing this to the notice of the House because I think it does bear on the privileges of the House. I feel it bears somewhat on my own privileges too. Perhaps if I read this it would be self-explanatory, Mr. Speaker.

It says, "There is a completely inaccurate story on page three of today's Telegram re the interview I had with you after the House closed yesterday. My original story said you would probably know today when the budget would be brought down. But someone in their "wisdom" at the Telegram included the fact that you supposedly told me it would be coming down Friday. It may very well be coming down Friday but that is certainly not what you said to me. In any case, accept my apologies for the monumental mistake and be assured that management down at the Telegram will get an earful from me. Thanks." And this is signed Bob Wakeham, and it was addressed to me. So I felt that I should bring that for clarification to the notice of the House.

000

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman raised a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman raised a point of privilege. I believe Your Honour has to deal with it but I fail to see what the point of privilege was. But it has to be dealt with one way or another. I am not telling Your Honour how to run the job, but it has to be disposed of.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): To the point of privilege, I would rule that it was merely a case for the hon. the minister to make a brief explanation about an error that was previously made.

NOTICES OF MOTION:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, just before we get on in this, this is the appropriate place to do it, in view of the monumental announcement by the minister to the effect the budget would come down Friday, I would like to move that the House when it rises on Thursday afternoon stand adjourned until 3:00 P.M. on Friday afternoon rather than ten o'clock in the morning as is provided.

MR. NEARY: Do we get the television coverage?

MR. MARSHALL: Well that is not a - you know.

MR. NEARY: Why? Why do you want it here then?

Why not ten o'clock?

MR. MARSHALL: Because of the printing and what have you, you know. Television is not a consideration at the present time. No, it is not.

MR. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. JAMIESON: In our usual spirit of co-operation I undertake, and I have so advised my colleagues - I do not know why, by the way, and we will get into that perhaps in the debate on interim supply - but if it is the government's wish to do it in the afternoon, I merely want to point out in fairness, and I think this is the appropriate place for me to do so, that we are into Tuesday now, and a great many of our members, I have no idea how the effect is going to be on the other side of the House, have earlier commitments, always assuming until this moment officially that the House would rise at one o'clock as is normal. And while all

MR. JAMIESON: of us will want to hear the pearls of wisdom that the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) will be throwing out, it is difficult and indeed in a sense, I would suggest, a bit unfair to all members, except those perhaps in the ministry, to do it in this particular fashion. But if the government has some special reason for doing so, we so agree.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I think that is a debatable motion.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to delay the proceedings of the House but I want to ask the hon. gentleman if they bring down the Budget on Wednesday afternoon, which seems to me to be -

MR. JAMIESON: Friday afternoon.

MR. NEARY: - or Friday afternoon - which seems to be rather strange indeed. I believe it is the first time since Confederation that a budget was brought down on a Friday afternoon, which gives the Opposition very little opportunity to respond to the budget because you have the weekend coming up - but could the hon. gentleman tell us when we are going to start the budget debate? Will the budget debate start the following Monday or will the budget debate be postponed for some period?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, may I say first of all that there is no real ulterior motive in the government, no hidden motive. The reason for it is that in the afternoon, the primary reason is that there are certain proceedings that have to be gone through during budget day that are not really convenient in the morning. That is number one. Number two, as to when the budget will be debated, it is, as I think the hon. member may not know, but I think

MR. W. MARSHALL:

I should inform the House it is the government's intention and desire to adjourn the House for the Easter recess on Friday so that when we come back after the normal Easter recess, we will then immediately begin the Budget debate.

MR. S. NEARY:

When will that be?

MR. W. MARSHALL:

Well, that will be on - a two week Easter recess we will have, this is what the hon. gentleman is trying to pull out of me. But, you know, this is a normal time.

MR. S. NEARY:

It is not normal. It is abnormal -

MR. W. MARSHALL:

There is nothing that is abnormal under the sun, Mr. Speaker, about that.

But what we are planning to do, when we come back on April 14th, we will then go into the Budget debate and then we will proceed also with the reference of the various departments to the committees.

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT):

All those in favour, "Aye", contrary, "Nay", carried.

NOTICE OF MOTION:

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. J. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask this House to resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions for the granting of Supply to Her Majesty, and I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask this House to resolve itself into a Committee of Ways and Means to consider the raising of Supply to be granted to Her Majesty, and I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Public Service Pensions Act".

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. J. HODDER:

I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of all of the residents, Mr. Speaker, of Fox Island River and Point au Mal in the district of Port au Port. The petition is addressed to the hon. Lynn Verge, Minister of Education.

MR. J. HODDER:

The undersigned are very concerned parents. "We, the parents of the students from Fox Island River and Point au Mal, are most concerned with the condition of the road leading to our communities. Our children have to travel the road twice each day to attend school. The road is in a dangerous condition, and we believe that when the Spring break-up occurs that the road will be impassable and we will be forced to keep our children out of school. We are asking your support because we believe that you have genuine concern for the well-being and education of the children of our Province and this is not to be perceived as a threat or protest by any means, just to show that the above action may be necessary for the safety of our children."

Now, Mr. Speaker, while this petition is somewhat unusual in the way that it is worded, I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I can understand the concerns of the parents. Now, this road, for the information of hon. members who may have visited the historic district of Port au Port, runs from the community of Berry Head down along the coast to Fox Island River. The road, I suppose, is approximately ten miles long and it is an unsafe road. I have no hesitation, Mr. Speaker, in telling this House of Assembly that this road is totally unsafe. It has blind turns, it is narrow, it is rough. The bedrock shows through in many areas. The sides of the road are - not periodically, but frequently-eroded away by the frequent brooks and streams that run through the road. I, myself, had an experience there last Summer when I was driving along and found a great stick sticking up in the middle of the road. I suppose when the road was built many years ago there was something called corduroy wood underneath the road and now this is starting to come through, and the material that is used on this road is totally inadequate. The road needs to be totally rebuilt. With all of the school children from this particular community - that is from kindergarten to Grade XI - travelling over the road each day, I can well understand the concerns of the parents that some time a bus may leave and not return.

Mr. Speaker, this particular area of the Province is a very scenic area and has also become a sort of holiday

March 25, 1980

Tape 619

EC - 3

MR. J. HODDER: resort for the surrounding people in Bay St. George and there are a lot of Summer homes there, and a lot of people go there to enjoy the beaches. There are beautiful beaches there and the area is a good place for picnics

MR. HODDER:

and I think the people of the area and myself would like to see some day a provincial park in that particular area as you have every type of scenery within a square mile, I suppose, down nestled in the mountains with a beautiful seashore. As well, Mr. Speaker, the area has been undergoing a great deal of harbour development in the last four or five years and as well the Department of Regional Economic Expansion recently put a \$200,000 water system there which is intended to supply a fish plant which we do hope will come into being sometime in the very near future. At the present time the fish is being trucked from the Port au Port peninsula by heavy tankers which must travel this road, and which are a hazard on the road, I might say. I am not allowed to comment further on that particular aspect of it when presenting this petition, but I may comment on that sometime in the future when the opportunity arises. However, but most importantly, Mr. Speaker, the road is unsafe and if I were a parent of a child who had to travel on that bus for approximately twenty miles a day I would feel much the same as these parents do and I think it is incumbent on the minister to make sure that this road is upgraded and paved. This is one of three roads in the district which need work done. The other two roads are in similar condition. This one is as bad as any in the Province. The roads in the Port au Port area were pointed out in the Sullivan Transportation Commission, by the Sullivan Transportation Commission, that the roads in Port au Port were some of the worst in the Province, yet since that report has been down, two or three years now, Mr. Speaker, we have seen no substantial improvement. But, Mr. Speaker, we are hopeful and we know for sure that the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett), when the budget comes down, will have a certain allotment of money there for the roads in the district, and hopefully next year, Mr. Speaker, when I stand here I will be able to praise the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett). And I am sure that the Minister of Education (Ms Verge) will put every bit

MR. HODDER: of pressure that she can on him to make sure that these roads are properly upgraded and paved. So I ask that the petition be tabled and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak in support of this petition presented by my colleague in the adjoining district of Port au Port. The two communities to which he refers, the communities of Fox Island River and Point au Mal, are communities that were originally designated to die in the 1960s under the resettlement programme, and one of the first actions that I took when I became the member for Port au Port back in 1971 was to insist that that type of thing not go through, and it did not. So these two communities are now thriving communities as far as industry is concerned, especially the fishing industry. The people in those communities are to be commended in that regard. I think the point must be made that if we are going to maintain communities and allow them not to be resettled we must also provide them with the kind of services that are usual and are associated with growing communities. So I certainly support the prayer of the petition, but I will also point out that in 1971 there was no road to Fox Island River, there was a pathway there, but between 1971 and 1975 the road from Fox Island River to Point au Mal was completely built and in fact a major portion of it was paved. Also in the community of Point au Mal in 1974 or 1975, I am not sure which now, there was community pavement laid there. So there has been some work done there by this administration and I am sure that as the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett) brings down his priorities over the next few years that there will be room in it for upgrading on these two most important roads. It gives me great pleasure to support the petition, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I have received a message from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Addressed to the hon. the Minister of Finance, "I, the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Newfoundland, transmit estimates of sums required for the Public Service of the Province for the year ending 31st March, 1981 by way of interim supply and in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Act of 1867, as amended, I recommend these estimates to the House of Assembly.

Signed
Gordon A. Winter,
Lieutenant-Governor."

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I move that the Lieutenant-Governor's message be referred to a Committee of Supply.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Baird) Order, please!

RESOLUTION

That it is expedient to introduce a measure to provide for the granting to Her Majesty for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial year ending the 31st. day of March, 1981, the sum of two hundred and ninety-nine million nine hundred and fifty thousand dollars (\$299,950,000).

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. S. NEARY: To a point of order, to a point of information, I guess, I would like to get a ruling from Your Honour. Right now we are in the Committee of Supply, Does that

MR. S. NEARY: mean we are going to have now the - there are different ways of doing it, as the hon. gentleman knows - are we going to have the major debate now on the Interim Supply Bill, or are we going to have second reading when the Speaker is back in the Chair, or will we take it as we have in the past and go through it where we can speak for ten minutes on each heading as often you want? Is that the procedure we are using now?

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, my understanding is now that we are now debating the resolution, which is the way that all money bills, as the hon. member understands, are brought before the House. We will debate the resolution and after the resolution passes then, as is traditional, it goes through first, second and third reading without debate. So we will be doing the debate now and it will be the normal rules of Committee. I hope that edifies or explains the matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, the actual resolution we are debating, perhaps I should read it out. It says, "Be it resolved by the House of Assembly in Legislative Session convened as follows: That it is expedient to introduce a measure to provide for the granting to Her Majesty for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial year ending 31st day of March, 1981, the sum of two hundred and ninety-nine million nine hundred and fifty thousand dollars (\$299,950,000)."

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend really to speak to any extent at this time on this because really it is self-evident. The hon. members have the schedule before them that gives the headings under which this amount of money is to be allocated and those headings include all the departments of government and certain other services such as Consolidated Fund Service and so on.

It is traditional, Mr. Chairman, to bring in an Interim Supply Bill in anticipation of the main estimates because, of course, the debate on the main estimates can

DR. J. COLLINS: be expected to go on for some
considerable period of time and it will be well into the fiscal year
before the main estimates are passed and therefore the allocations
in the main estimates ratified by the House of Assembly. And until
that happens, of course, the government has no funds to

DR. J. COLLINS:

expend once the beginning of the new fiscal year starts. So the Interim Supply Bill is to allow the government, shall we say, a breathing space by which the expense of government can continue to be carried on and the expenses defrayed until such time as the hon. House decides to accept or otherwise the main estimates. I might just mention, Mr. Chairman, that in the Interim Supply Bill there is in the Department of Transportation and Communications some allocation for certain capital works that my hon. friend the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett) will wish to comment on particularly just to make sure the hon. House is aware of the particular import in regard to those capital works. So with nothing further at this point, Mr. Chairman, I move adoption of the said resolution.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. D. JAMIESON: Well, Mr. Chairman, first of all let me say that I concur in the remarks made earlier by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) with regard to the timing of this whole exercise. I find it—and I am sure that it would be very difficult to discover any kind of precedent when you have Interim Supply coming in in two days ahead of when the main Budget is coming down, when we are asked to pass a huge amount of money, nearly \$300 million, on the basis of a single piece of paper and without the slightest degree of explanation of anything that is in it, including huge amounts like \$65 million for Health, \$64 million for Education— it really does to a very great extent make a mockery of the whole Budget presentation process and of the ability of Opposition members, and we have heard a great deal about the freedom of private members on the other side, to do anything meaningful about what this government proposes to do during the next twelve months

MR. D. JAMIESON: on some highly significant item. For instance, we have here what must be, judging by the references that have been made from time to time by ministers opposite, a very significant portion of their total budgets. As far as I am aware, for example, the Transportation and Communications amount here of over \$50 million, if the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett) has not been too pessimistic, it will be interesting to see just what share of what we are going to get over the next twelve months is contained in this particular Interim Supply item about which, although we are assured he is going to make some word of explanation, there is nothing in this particular document that is before us today.

The second thing that I think may be properly said to be abusing the co-operation which we on this side have tried over the past year to carry out, is that we get this in printed form a few minutes, just a few minutes, quite literally, before we are asked to get up and pass judgement on whether this government--according to the words we just heard from His Excellency, the Lieutenant-Governor - whether we on this side are going to give this government \$300 million. And here it was just ten minutes ago that the document came forward, we have no idea what it represents in specific terms in relation to the total Budget that we are going to be hearing on Friday, we do not know any of the details. Members on this side and private members on the other side according to the Chair's ruling are perfectly entitled to ask all the questions they like. Over past weeks we have been hearing one member after the other get up and ask about roads in his district. We had five or six of them today ask about health care, ask about what is intended with regard to schools, inadequate schools - I am thinking in particular of the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) who has been literally, daily almost, talking about how poor

March 25, 1980

Tape No. 622

DW - 2

MR. D. JAMIESON: and how shocking the educational levels and the educational facilities are in his part of Newfoundland, - all of this comes in, \$60-odd million for Education, but no word to say whether, in fact, the response is going to be from the government positive to the kinds of representations that we have made. Quite literally, this is a blank

MR. D. JAMIESON: cheque for \$299,950,000. Somebody must have decided \$300,000,000 would look a little high so they lopped off a few thousand dollars, \$50,000, to keep it under, I suppose \$300 million dollars, a beautiful piece of carving it out nicely in that fashion.

MR. L. THOMS: But is \$300 million dollars.

MR. D. JAMIESON: But what is in effect, \$300 million dollars.

We hear the Minister of Fisheries a few minutes ago telling us of what a terrible condition that the Fisheries Loan Board was in when he came to its rescue and about how efficiently and how effectively he is going to deal with it in the future. Right here we have got \$9,080,000 in interim supply for Fishery. What is that for? What is the designated expenditure that that is going to overcome? Is it going, some of this, to the Fisheries Loan Board? We do not know. We are not given any of those facts, any of that information.

And I could go clear on through the whole group of items that are here. Mines and Energy - \$7, 530,000. Has that got any relationship to the Newfoundland case, as it were, with regard to offshore oil and gas? Is it part and parcel of some kind of training program so that our younger people are going to be able to take these wonderful jobs that appear off there in the future someplace? Is that related to that, or is it something entirely different?

There just is not a single solitary word of explanation.

Now, Mr. Chairman,

that would not be a bad move except that we are here deliberately by the government put under the gun because no matter what we want to do with this, there is a timetable involved here and it is the same old ploy which has been used time and time again to say 'Fellows, you cannot keep this debate going, you cannot ask the questions, you cannot go into it in as much detail, why?' 'Because, come the end of

MR. D. JAMIESON: the month or whenever it is 'the old age pensioners will suffer or people will not get their salary cheques' or some other kind of device which always winds up in a position where interim supply is cavalierly treated by the House, because there is no alternative. There is literally no alternative. There is no way that we on this side would be prepared to say, 'That it is just the tough luck of many poor people in Newfoundland on Social Security and the like, it is just their tough luck that we did not put this interim supply measure through.' We cannot possibly do that.

And because the government is perfectly well aware that we cannot do that, because they know full well that it has to be done within a certain time frame, and by the way that has been squeezed even further now because we have got a full budget coming on Friday and this coming in two days ahead, I repeat that it surely must be an unprecedented kind of move. And furthermore, you almost feel that this is a useless, frustrating, empty kind of exercise.

What is the percentage in us saying that we do not believe that X amount for such and such a department is either adequate or is too much? What is the sense? Because, I repeat, it has to go through anyway and half of the impact or pretty close to half of the impact, of all the budget measures which the Minister of Finance is going to come down with on Friday, are negated to a very great extent by the decision that we are going to have to make.

Well, let me assure hon. members opposite that, I repeat, they are the governors of this Province for as long as the Newfoundland people are prepared to put up with this kind of what I regard as sloppiness. And from our point of view

MR. D. JAMIESON: you can have interim supply. We will see that the people who need the money that is implicit in this bill before the end of the month get it. Because, I emphasize once again, we have no choice in the matter. But if this government is sincere and genuine, and I have no doubt that many of its members are, but if they really are sincere and genuine in saying they want full discussion, they want total and open cooperation with the opposition, I ask you, and I ask the public of Newfoundland through you, Mr. Chairman, is it fair to the Opposition? Is it fair to members opposite who are not members of the Ministry, who are not privy to the secret? Is it appropriate to come in here two days before the budget, the main budget is due and say, 'give us \$300,000,000?' I say that that is an abuse of power and it is one that really ought not to happen again.

Now, last year, much
against the better judgement of some of my colleagues whom I respect,
I think it is fair to say that the majority of us said that we

MR. JAMIESON: would agree to certain changes in the rules of this House in order to expedite business, in order to make for a better feeling and better spirit of co-operation. I believe on balance, although there are some still who disagree and there are great flaws in the rules as they presently exist, but on balance the process worked reasonably well.

But there is another problem with regard to dealing with Interim Supply and that problem is that every minute we take in debating \$300 million, every minute we take is lopped off the amount of time that we are entitled to have on the total budget. So, therefore, what we are up against is a situation in which if we say even if there is time, which there is not, there are only a couple of days at the outside in which we can deal with this by the sheer necessity of the main budget coming in on Friday, but even if we decided we were going to do this we do it at the erosion of our capability to deal thoroughly and fully with the main estimates.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am one of those who believes that the rule changes were all right, that they moved in the right direction, but I have already said informally to the President of the Privy Council, I have already said informally to him, and I say it to all members here present now, that I would hope that the government will, when the main budget is presented, also see to it that the report stage, when the findings of the Committees come back to this House, stops being the charade which it was under the rules as we established them last year. Because all that happened last year on those reports,

MR. JAMIESON: which was, I know by the way, unsatisfactory even for some of the ministers concerned, was that we had another mini debate which simply resulted in a whole series of speeches being made and at the very bitter end the minister concerned was allowed to make a few comments. I think that if the Committee system as we structured it last year is going to work then the House Leaders must get together and must make that report stage more sensible, more realistic, more meaningful rather than having it like a re-run of a television movie, in a sense; people getting up in the House and merely making speeches at each other instead of being able to do what we should be able to do, and what I am sure, by the way, most ministers would want to have happen, and that is to have the opportunity on the report stage to deal with it in the manner in which all estimates were normally dealt with, that is by way of interventions and the like in the Committee stage here in the House. I think it would infinitely improve the capacity of members on this side, and those on the other side who may wish to participate, it would infinitely improve the flow of information to the public and it would also give to members who are not on particular committees, who cannot attend particular committees the opportunity to ask specific questions that may wish to do.

I notice that I have been given an indication that my time is running out here, at least for now, but let me end by saying again what I said at the beginning, that if the government genuinely wants to have our co-operation, if they genuinely wish to demonstrate that we have a democratic, truly democratic process in this Province, then they

MR. JAMIESON: will cease and desist
from this kind of really quite shameful advantage-
taking of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. JAMIESON: I cannot see that we
can legitimately deal with the country's business when
we are given a piece of paper five minutes or so before
the debate starts, when we are told, 'Sorry, boys, but
whatever time you take is off your regular allocation
of time on the full estimates'. And then they say to
us, 'And, of course, it has to be put out of the way
within the next few hours because if that is not done
then the whole process grinds to a halt'. At the
very least it reflects upon the competence of the
government and of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins)
that he should find himself in this position,

MR. JAMIESON: that he had not been able to bring in his main budget in time and had to scramble, really - that is what it amounts to - scramble at the last moment to put something together. I cannot believe, I simply cannot believe that here we are, two days before the minister is going to make his main speech, and he says, "I cannot really do anything other than bring in an interim supply measure of this kind."

Well, Mr. Chairman, let us have no illusions about it. Insofar as we are concerned, I repeat, we will take whatever time is necessary, and whatever time my colleagues feel they want to take, to express themselves on this measure. We will try to be co-operative for all of the reasons that I mentioned. But I would not only urge the Minister of Finance, if he is there when there is another budget brought down, to avoid this kind of awkward and, for us, difficult situation. But I want to say too that if we are going to continue in the spirit of co-operation that I hope we have demonstrated that this kind of exercise will now be at an end.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, I would just like -

MR. NEARY: A point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am not quite clear that we are following the proper procedure here now. I asked the hon. House Leader when we went into Committee of Supply whether we were debating the resolution now in Committee and then doing an item by item analysis of the Interim Supply Bill, and the hon. gentleman, in his answer, said, "We will debate the resolution as we have done in the past and the rules of debate of the House would apply." And I would assume that under these rules my hon. friend could have taken

MR. NEARY: all the time he wanted to debate this resolution. Otherwise get the Speaker back in the Chair and we will debate the resolution and then go into Committee of Supply and deal with the subheads. This is a complete abuse of the privileges of this House, an abuse of power to limit the Leader of the Opposition to debate on the resolution to fifteen minutes and then have the minister get up and close the debate, because that is what the hon. gentleman will do if we are going to follow the rules of debate of this House. I would like to get a ruling, Mr. Chairman, on this now. If we are debating the resolution and the government is not prepared to let us have the time that we are allowed under normal rules of debate of this House, then get the Speaker back and we will debate the resolution in the proper way.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): To that point of order, this House will recess for five to ten minutes to research same.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): Order, please!

With respect to the point of order raised by the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), it should be noted we are in Committee of Supply and Standing Orders, dealing with the estimates procedure as set forth in Standing Order 116 through to 122, apply. To be more specific I will read 116; "(1) The procedure in Committee of Supply shall be limited to not more than seventy-five hours to be reduced in accordance with the provisions of this Part. (2) For the purposes of Standing Order 116(1) 'Committee of Supply' includes the Committee of Supply on the main estimates and on interim supply forming a part of the main estimates."

The time for each speaker during estimates debate is set forth in Standing Orders 118, paragraph (5), which reads; "Notwithstanding Standing Order 49, the Minister introducing his estimates and the member speaking immediately in reply shall not speak for more than fifteen minutes and every other member shall not speak for more than ten minutes at a time during Committee of Supply, or during the debate in a committee or committees established under Standing Order 117."

In Committee of Supply it has been the practice of this House that both the resolution and the bill are debated in Committee, when the time limit is as set forth in the estimates procedure. After the resolution and bill have passed the Committee, the bill goes back to the House and the first, second and third reading are treated as formalities and no debate occurs.

I thank the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) for raising this point of order and providing me this opportunity to clarify the correct procedure.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, if I just may.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. House Leader.

MR. MARSHALL: Before we resume, it would not be our intention to attempt to stifle any debate that legitimately a member may -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: - legitimately wish to be engaged in, so that if the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, speaking of course, in behalf of the Opposition to this major Interim Supply Bill, you know, it would not be our wish to interrupt his address at ten or fifteen minutes, so I am quite sure, speaking from this side of the House, that we will certainly give leave if the hon. gentleman wishes to continue on for the full period.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Baird) The hon. member for Lapoile.

MR. NEARY: That is very generous of the hon. gentleman, Sir, but I would like to point out to the House that the only reason the resolution is in the Committee of Supply is because the Opposition agreed to let it go there to take the place of second reading.

MR. MARSHALL: Not so.

MR. NEARY: That is so, Mr. Chairman. We can have second reading when Your Honour rises the Committee and reports back to the Speaker. Now we have to decide now whether we are having second reading where the rules of the House, the ordinary rules will apply, and then fifteen and ten minutes on the subhead. That is what we have to decide now.

My understanding in the beginning was that we agreed that this resolution is now going through second reading and I believe that -

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. House Leader.

MR. MARSHALL: I do not wish to prolong the debate, Mr. Chairman. All I wish to do is to show a certain spirit of co-operation. I do not want to get bogged down into technicalities. But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that we are in Committee of Supply, and the hon. gentleman is slightly confused; now I do not believe the hon. gentleman, Mr. Chairman, is really confused. I think he knows the rules as well as we all do, so I should not begin -

MR. NEARY: and as well as the hon. gentleman knows the rules.

MR. MARSHALL: So I should not begin to tell the hon. gentleman what the rules are because he sat here longer than I have, he will not sit here for longer than I in the future, but he has in the past. The situation is that all money bills, and we have a money bill before the House - I do not want to get into a procedural wrangle, we could quote May and Beauchesne, we could quote everything, we could even quote Neary in times past, Mr. Chairman - but the fact of the matter is that all money bills are introduced by a resolution. The debate takes place on the resolution.

MR. NEARY: Right. And we are allowing second reading now.

MR. MARSHALL: And the resolution is considered in Committee of Supply.

MR. NEARY: Right.

MR. MARSHALL: Standing Orders 116 to 122 contain the framework within which we operate in Committee of Supply.

MR. NEARY: Right.

MR. MARSHALL: Now that is the way it is. So it was not the case of me asking the Opposition to do something unusual.

MR. NEARY: No, no!

MR. MARSHALL: What we are doing is we are debating interim supply in the same manner in which all supply bills historically have been debated in this House.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. MARSHALL: Now that being so,

MR. MARSHALL: each member has fifteen minutes and they have to sit down and get up again, again and again. Now my point is this, that the hon. Leader of the Opposition was speaking as the main speaker on Interim Supply and it certainly is not the government's intention to stifle him because of strict, stringent rules of debate. And if he spoke for ten or fifteen minutes - unfortunately I was out outside at the time and I do not know to what stage he got in his debate - and if he needs more time, the hon. Leader of the Opposition can have all the time in the world to debate continuously and consecutively Interim Supply.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman does not have to give him more time, he has it by right.

MR. MARSHALL: Well, he can. Whether he has it or not, he has got it. Wherever he gets it, he has it.

MR. JAMIESON: Mr. Chairman, this is really most unfortunate because in reality I think it was perhaps a genuine misunderstanding or a difference of opinion as to what the hon. Government House Leader said initially. I have to say, and I checked this with some of my colleagues, and I must confess that I was under the impression that we were, through this process, going to debate the resolution - I think this was the point that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) raised, was whether we were going to deal with the resolution in the committee stage but with the rules in effect as they would be with the Speaker in the Chair, dispose of that and do that - and incidentally we would have done it; I had no intention of speaking for very much longer in any event, I thought we were going to dispose of that, then we would go on the process of ten minutes and if a member wanted to rise more than once such would be the case, but that the time limitations as they relate exclusively to the resolution, that these would be the same as if we were, in fact, with the Speaker in the Chair. Now if the hon. House Leader on the other side is agreeable to that procedure, then I think we can carry on. I can say to you that that certainly was - I have canvassed - the general impression that we had. We can carry on in that way and then there will be no more difficulty. Otherwise, I suggest we would have to then ask ourselves, whether we need

MR. JAMIESON: another ruling as to what happens in separating out the resolution itself from the individual items and that, I suggest, would be an unnecessary waste of time. I would like to propose that the normal rules of debate as if the Speaker were in the Chair should apply with regard to the resolution itself. The alternative to that, if I may suggest without once again raising another point of order, the alternative to that is as, I think, triggered the intervention by my hon. friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary), was the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) was rising immediately following my speech -

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. JAMIESON: - which had been indicated to me was limited to fifteen minutes, he was rising presumably, therefore on the resolution discussion, it is conceivable that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) could have risen after every speaker on this side, that was not the intention.

MR. MARSHALL: There will be no intention (inaudible).

MR. JAMIESON: Is it agreeable then that we proceed on the basis of the time limitations that I have spoken of?

MR. MARSHALL: Now, I do not want this to be quoted as a precedent in the future, so I think we can take a note of that in capital letters, but the fact of the matter is really all the government is interested in doing is bringing the Supply Bill before the committee and the House and to have it debated in the most effective manner possible, and if the Opposition wish it to be that way we are quite willing to - because as far as we are concerned we have put the position there, the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) can ably answer any questions that are asked, so whatever is needed in order for the effective and the efficient examination of this bill can be afforded to this committee with a heart and a half, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY: Well, what is it you are asking? You want to combine the two and let the Committee of Supply rules -

MR. MARSHALL: What is the hon. member talking about, combining the two?

MR. NEARY: The resolution and the - once we are finished the debate then it is all over.

MR. MARSHALL: Well, that is the way it usually is in this. You have one debate on the resolution. The hon. gentleman knows that. The hon. Leader of the Opposition can see the hon. gentleman and he can see him smiling at me, and he knows it as well as I do that this is the way it usually is.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I am going to have a few words. I do not know whether I am allowed thirty minutes or ten under the rules that the Government House Leader just made.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): The hon. Government House Leader.

MR. W. MARSHALL: I would like to answer the hon. gentleman, if I may. The hon. gentleman might like to yield to his leader, to extend to him the same courtesy that we were prepared to afford to him, if he is finished his remarks. If the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jamieson) is not, I rise to his defence and to his support as against the hon. member.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am not sure if I have thirty minutes or ten minutes, but I will follow the ruling given by Your Honour and I will assume that the resolution and the item by item analysis of the Interim Supply Bill that the Leader of the Opposition has fifteen minutes. I can take ten, but if I wanted to stand by my rights I could take thirty minutes or get the Speaker back in the Chair and we will have second reading of this Bill. So you can have it either way, but I will take ten minutes because I can get up and down then. The point has been made, Mr. Chairman, and I believe our rights have been properly outlined.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say at the outset that this is a most unusual procedure. It is the first time, I believe since Confederation, that we have had an Interim Supply Bill two days before the main Budget is brought down, or three days before the main Budget comes down. And, Mr. Chairman, the unfair part of it is that the Interim Supply Bill was brought into the House with the ink hardly dry on it, it just came from the printers, which goes to show that it was obviously put together in a hurry and that may explain why we did not get a satisfactory explanation from the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) of why he is asking for almost \$300 million in this Interim Supply Bill

MR. S. NEARY: without very little explanation to the House. I think that probably explains it, it was put together in a hurry.

Now, Mr. Chairman, during the Oral Question Period today I asked the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) if he had found a replacement for the Deputy Minister of Finance and Comptroller of the treasury and the minister told us that he had not found a replacement, that they carried out a nation-wide campaign but they had not yet made a selection. And that the authority for the Comptroller of Finance was now placed in the hands of a Deputy Minister - an Assistant Deputy Minister of Finance. It was not quite clear which - although I believe the minister did mention the name of the Assistant Deputy Minister who was now comptroller of the treasury. What I want to say, Mr. Chairman, is that that is unsatisfactory; the Comptroller of the Treasury is the most important civil servant in this building, the Comptroller of the Treasury is the man who protects the Public Treasury under the Financial Administration Act and God only knows the Public Treasury needs to be protected in this Province. We just came through seven years of corruption, seven years of Tory corruption, we had a corrupt government in this Province for seven years -

DR. J. COLLINS: What about before that?

MR. S. NEARY: The Moores administration was the most corrupt administration, far worse than anything in Canadian history -

MR. L. THOMS: You can get on Show and Tell on Thursday.

MR. S. NEARY: - far worse than anything in Canadian history. And now the chickens are coming home to roost. We have been vindicated on this side of the House,

MR. S. NEARY: everything we have said in the last three or four years when government members were pounding on their desks, everytime the former Premier got up in this House and lied about questions, lied about policy, lied when questions were put to him and we were accused - sometimes our own supporters fell into the trap - we were accused of lowering the decorum of the House, of smear tactics, of not doing our job. We were too negative, we were told. And now, Mr. Chairman, we find out we have been vindicated and we have only seen the tip of the iceberg in these political polls -

MR. J. CARTER: Tell us about John Doyle.

MR. S. NEARY: Yes, I could tell the hon. gentleman all about that too and all about how he was -

MR. J. CARTER:

Words fail you.

MR. S. NEARY:

- no, they do not fail me, I just have to be careful what my words are - of how members of the former administration tried to shake him down -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

- tried to shake him down and then sicked the RCMP on him to cover up their tracks.

MR. J. CARTER:

Rubbish!

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to be drawn into any crossfire with the hon. gentleman.

I want to come back to the point that I was making about the necessity of filling that vacancy in the Department of Finance, the Deputy Minister of Finance and Comptroller of the Treasury, quickly. And when I asked the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) - I said the Deputy Minister resigned in sort of a peculiar fashion. Probably that was not the right choice of words, Sir. What I means was, it was the suddenness of the resignation of the Deputy Minister of Finance and Comptroller of the Treasury (Mr. W. Fearn), who, I am sure, Mr. Chairman, did not decide on the spur of the moment to resign the top civil service post in this Province. He just did not decide that on the spur of the moment. And we have not been given sufficient reason as to why the Comptroller of the Treasury, who is appointed under the Great Seal of Newfoundland, as to why he suddenly resigned from his position. Was he fired? Was there a disagreement? Did he do his job? Did he amply protect the Public Treasury?

The hon. the Minister of Finance cannot just brush it off, slough it off, by saying, 'He resigned.' Well, why did he resign? We have a right to know. The people of this Province have a right to know. Was he disgusted because the Public Treasury was being ripped off? Mr. Chairman, whether the Minister of Finance likes it or not, whether the government likes it or not, whether we like it or not, the Comptroller of the Treasury was responsible, next to the minister, for the disbursement of public funds. And if we were doing our job in this House,

MR. S. NEARY: we would summon the Comptroller of the Treasury before the Bar of this House to tell us why money was paid out of the Consolidated Revenue fund, why money was paid out of the Public Treasury to Devine Advertising and to McConnell Advertising for a film done of the Tory convention in Gander. And we should do it. We should find out how much more of this skulduggery went on.

MR. THOMS: Show your protest, boy. Come on over.

MR. NEARY: When we were over here laying out day after day examples and cases of skulduggery and corruption - and I tell you, it was awfully discouraging. The news media of this Province followed up on none of it, just took the Premier's word there was no corruption, took the minister's word there was no corruption, and accused us of being negative and using smear tactics; and 'There is Neary down there repeating himself over and over again,' not worth reporting. The biggest scandals in Canadian history right under their noses and you would not get away with it in any other province of Canada or any State in the United States. The newsmen would not allow the government to get away with it. And now, Mr. Chairman, it took the Auditor General to give us one case. How many more cases are there?

MR. J. CARTER: You blew your own credibility.

MR. S. NEARY: I did not blow my credibility.

I guarantee you that I can look the hon. gentleman in the eye and I can look anybody in this Province straight in the eye and say, 'I did my job. I tried to protect the Public Treasury.' Because that is what we are here for. Our number one job in this House is to protect the Public Treasury. And for seven years, that hon. gentleman supported a corrupt administration and left the Public Treasury wide open to Mr. Moores and his crowd of rogues that he had with him.

MR. THOMS: And still condoning what happened.

MR. S. NEARY: And still condoning it, Sir. I would like to find out the real owners of Adlatok at the present time. I would like to find out why Mr. Lundrigan resigned from the Cabinet and went out and played the stock market and made all kinds of money on oil stock. And I would like to find out why a few other people in this Province want

MR. S. NEARY: out and bought oil stock and made themselves a mint and are now down on Torbay Road in a luxurious office, buddy-buddy, the two of them together after allegedly falling out over the Grand Falls hospital. I would like to get to the bottom of that.

And then we are asked, Mr. Chairman, to approve \$300 million without as much as an explanation from the hon. gentleman or any guarantee that the Public Treasury is now being adequately protected. What about the Mahoney Royal Commission of Inquiry

MR. NEARY: into wrongdoing in the Department of Public Works? Is that report in yet? And if it is not in, when will it be in?

DR. COLLINS: The Minister of Justice -

MR. NEARY: Oh, the Minister of Justice. The hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) should be interested in it.

DR. COLLINS: The Minister of Justice (inaudible) has just said (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Every minister on that side of the House should be interested in it.

And, Mr. Chairman, while all of this was going on there were the trained seals over there thumping on their desks. The Premier of that day used to get up in this House and lie day in and day out - down they would pound on their desks.

MR. THOMS: And the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) pounded the hardest.

MR. NEARY: That is right, he certainly did.

Now we have one example. I would like to know how many more examples. I should like to see the whole George McLean era, the whole George McLean dealings with this government placed under investigation by this government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we saw -

MR. J. CARTER: Leave no stone unturned.

MR. NEARY: That is right, leave no stone unturned. We had - pardon?

MR. STIRLING: Ask the member why he resigned.

MR. NEARY: Why who resigned?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: No, he was flung out. He

MR. NEARY: did not resign, he was flung out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: He was flung out.

MR. NEARY: And so, Mr. Chairman, I am going to say again, and I will repeat what I have said so often in this House, and I could not care a damn whether the press reports it or not, whether they are interested enough to look under the rocks, to look at the can of worms that has been opened up several times, not only once, any number of times in any number of reports by the Auditor General, that we just came through seven years of corruption in this Province, seven years of corruption, Mr. Chairman, that cannot go unnoticed, that cannot be swept under the rug, and no evidence before us, no assurance given us by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) that the public treasury is now being adequately protected.

Everybody laughed the other day when they read Wick Collins' column about the Norma and Gladys, the trips she made to Europe that cost, I would estimate, although we have never been able to get any figures in this House, I would estimate that the Norma and Gladys has cost the taxpayers of Canada and Newfoundland nothing under \$2.5 million to \$3 million. That \$2.5 million to \$3 million could certainly be put to better use. But we cannot get an accounting, Mr. Chairman. And members in government just laugh at Wick Collins when he says, 'Well, the Opposition are making the government look good. They should be asking questions about this, this and this'. Well, we have been asking questions for at least five years. I have put questions on the Order Paper, I have asked questions here in the Oral Question Period about the accounting of the expenditure of public money on that foolish Norma and Gladys escapade

MR. NEARY: and so far the government has refused to give it to us. Refused to give it to us! Now, are we being negative, Sir? Are we trying to smear the government? Are we doing our jobs? Or should we just sit here with our fingers in our mouths and say, 'No, that is all right, all the publicity, all the parties they had, all the booze parties they had, all the souvenirs they gave away, all this sort of thing, that is none of the public's business, that is only their money we are spending.'

We have been unable to get, Mr. Chairman, the names of those who received grants and loans from the Rural Development Authority. Up to this moment we have not had a list since 1973, seven years ago, and the government is using it the same as they used the Fisheries Loan Board, for pork barrelling.

MR. S. NEARY: What are they ashamed of? Anybody that comes to the government to look for a loan or a grant knows that his name is likely to be tabled in this House. It is public money. And what are they ashamed of? Why do they not put the information on the table? If it is straight and above-board and honest and nothing crooked about it, nobody is going to be hurt. Why do they hide it, Mr. Chairman. Why do they hide this information? What are they ashamed of?

There we are now asked to approve another \$300,000,000. And information we have been asking for for five or six years, we are still unable to get. My hon. friend has been quizzing the Minister of Fisheries about the Fisheries Loan Board.

MR. RIDEOUT: It is only names.

MR. S. NEARY: That is right. And the Minister of Fisheries keeps making, keeps getting kind of snarky with my hon. friend and he let it slip out this afternoon that \$25,000,000 was spent prior to the last Provincial election. He said, well, you know, he sort of indicated, what \$25,000,000? No wonder we got them fishermen off the Fisheries Loan Board. Was it the fishermen's fault, Mr. Chairman? The Minister of Fisheries can get up and do all the fancy stick-handling and fancy figure skating on thin ice that he wants and his own crowd can applaud him, pound on their desks all they want everytime he gives a smart-allecky answer in return to a question from this side of the House.

But the fact remains, Sir, that the people are not getting the information especially the fishermen about the Fisheries Loan Board that they are entitled to. And as a result, Mr. Chairman, here we are on the eve of the fishing season starting up, and no information about whether or not loans are going to be approved.

MR. S. NEARY: It is shameful, Sir, it is contemptible and I am surprised that the Premier, who is trying to portray the image of honesty, of integrity, of levelling with the people, of being open with the people, still refusing to give us a straight answer or have his ministers give us a straight answer.

I cannot complain about the Premier. Sometimes I get pretty straight answers from him but I cannot say the same about his ministers.

AN HON. MEMBER: Twisting again.

MR. S. NEARY: I am not twisting again, I am telling the truth. And I would say thank God for Wick Collins. He is about the only one left in the Province, and I do not know if that is a compliment or that we have sunk pretty low, but he is the only one left who gives a straight commentary on the political activities of this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. THOMS: You will get your Show and Tell, do not worry.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman has a right to speak in this debate the same as anybody else, and I hope he will get up and participate -

Mr. Chairman, there are so many things that I could talk about this afternoon, but I am only just getting warmed up. We will be back at it again when we get to the subheads. When we get to the subheads, we will have our ten minutes over and over again and as often as we want. But I want to say this, Mr. Chairman, that I agree with the Leader of the Opposition, that I think it is shocking, it is shocking that the government should come in two or three days before the main budget is brought down with an Interim Supply Bill that should have been brought before this House many days ago, many days ago, Sir, and now

MR. S. NEARY: we are told by the Government House Leader (Mr. W. Marshall) that the Budget will come down on Friday and there will be no debate on the Budget for at least two weeks. They all got their reservations booked now. They are all headed for sunny climates and we can not debate the Budget for another two weeks.

MR. D. JAMIESON: They have got to get out of town.

MR. S. NEARY: You would not know, Mr. Chairman, but we did not have any major problems facing the ordinary people of this Province. I think the government has become, in a short while, very arrogant, I think they have shown in this particular instance nothing but contempt for the people. I think the House should carry on, bring down the Budget on Friday, take our Easter recess and start up again.

MR. L. THOMS: That is what they intend to do.

MR. S. NEARY: No, that is not what they intend to do. They are going to shut her down for two weeks.

MR. L. THOMS: It will be more than two weeks.

MR. S. NEARY: More than two weeks, it will be slightly over two weeks, and they probably can not wait to get out of here to climb aboard the jets and head South.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to find out from the hon. gentleman when he rises in his place to give us some information on this Interim Supply Bill, if he will tell us if there is going to be an accounting done of Executive Council estimates for the whole Moores' years, from 1972 up to March 17th or whenever he resigned in 1979. Give us an accounting of the whole Moores' years--and I am not talking about a witch hunt. Do an accounting on some of the points that have been raised in this House and tell us, Mr. Chairman, whether or not there were leaks in Cabinet? Tell us whether or not there was a rip-off on Labrador Linerboard - \$500 million of taxpayers' money - tell us

MR. S. NEARY: whether the police investigation into EGRET, that offshore company in Bermuda where secret commissions were paid for every ton of Labrador linerboard that was sold, tell us whether that police investigation is finished and what the results of it are?

MR. L. THOMS: He is talking about graft and corruption now.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, tell us whether or not it has been possible for the government to audit the accounts of International Forest Products, a company incorporated down in Boston to sell Labrador linerboard, if it has been possible to do an audit of their accounts to see if this Province received every cent they were entitled to from the company that marketed Labrador linerboard?

Mr. Chairman, if hon. members think for one minute that all of this stuff is going to be swept under the rug then they had better think again. The lid is off now, the can of worms has been opened. It is time now that we took a look at some of these other matters that were raised in this House. It might be a good idea to open up the colour television case again.

Mr. Chairman, twenty-odd colour televisions were delivered one Christmas in this Province. We only had one investigation and that was into the former -

MR. THOMS: And that was before cable.

MR. S. NEARY: And that was before cable.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. S. NEARY: Twenty-two colour televisions were delivered and, you know, Mr. Chairman, at least two of these colour televisions were delivered to one hon. gentleman who is still a minister in that government - two colour televisions.

March 25, 1980

Tape No. 633

DW - 1

MR. S. NEARY: And that gentleman received a \$1,000 doghouse from the gentleman that he managed to get the contract for the first phase of water and sewerage down in Pouch Cove -

AN HON. MEMBER: Are you against (inaudible) down there.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I am against corruption and skulduggery of any kind especially when it comes to the Public Treasury. And the hon. gentleman should not treat it so lightly. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask Your Honour a question; Mr. Chairman, should we in this House, if we have evidence of corruption and skulduggery, whether it happened last year, the year before last involving the Public Treasury, should we now sit back and just forget it as if it never happened? Is that what we should do, Mr. Chairman, is that what we should do? I can hear the press, 'No, there is nothing new in that, boy, he is down there shooting off his face again'. Well, I have made some pretty strong statements here this afternoon. I said the Moores administration-in case it did not register with them-was the most corrupt in Canadian history. That is not bad, that is not a bad statement, Nothing new in it!

All you have to do is turn over the rock of Labrador Linerboard, if you want to find out how corrupt the administration was and how corrupt George McLean was, and he was jammed in the middle of every little deal that Frankie baby was involved in, every little deal.

MR. L. THOMS: He was not easy to jam.

MR. NEARY: No, he was not easy to jam. He needed three seats on Air Canada to get him around.

MR. STAGG:

Now raise that outside the House, boy,

not in here.

MR. S. NEARY:

Say it outside the House? I

was elected to speak in this House. Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman, I know, is treating it lightly but we have enough evidence now before us to warrant an accounting, if nothing else, an accounting of all the money that was paid out to Mr. George McLean, what it was paid out for, whether or not there was politics involved, whether he was - we have a right to know, Mr. Chairman, and I have flung this out on the floor of this House so often, we have a right to know why there is \$3 million of Newfoundland's money over in a bank in Hamburg, Germany that this government has not lifted a finger to collect, and why not? Why not? Almost \$3 million in a bank in Hamburg belonging to Labrador Linerboard, belonging to the people of this Province. And have we been able to get an explanation of it in this House, Mr. Chairman? I asked the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) for the contract with that company, I asked the liquidator for a copy of the contract with that company, I wrote the company and I asked them for a copy of the contract, and after several months of correspondence back and forth across the Atlantic - the minister's department, the liquidator, Labrador Linerboard - what did I get? I got brushed off by saying the RCMP has seized all the documents and you will have to go to them. I wrote them several weeks ago and I have not got a reply yet. Can you imagine? An elected member of the people of this Province asking for a simple document like a contract with a company in Hamburg to market Labrador linerboard and I cannot get it. And this is the government that is going to level and be honest and open with the people! I think it is shameful, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to know before I vote for this Interim Supply Bill what the minister has done about that \$2.5 or \$3 million dollars that is in that bank in Hamburg that we have been

March 25, 1980

Tape No. 633

MB - 3

MR. S. NEARY: able to get very little infor-
mation in this House on. What is being done about it? Has the

MR. NEARY: money been recovered? Is the matter settled or have the government just ignored it as they did up to a few weeks ago? So, Mr. Chairman, I have a lot more to say about this Interim Supply Bill yet. I would like to find out about Grade 12. The Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) seems to be procrastinating on that for some reason. You would not know but we were pioneering Grade 12 in Canada. I have heard so many foolish arguments and obstructions thrown in the way of Grade 12 so that it would make you laugh - an ignoramus like myself - it would make you laugh. You would not know but we never had Grade 12 in Newfoundland before, and we had it at two colleges in Newfoundland at one time. They have Grade 13 across Canada, and we cannot even -

AN HON. MEMBER: One province.

MR. NEARY: - in one province - and we cannot even get Grade 12 in Newfoundland. We have to have committees studying this aspect of it, that aspect of it. We have to listen to that one. We have to -

MR. THOMS: She cannot get -

MR. NEARY: No.

MR. THOMS: She cannot get anything through the bullies in the Cabinet.

MR. NEARY: No wonder we are the laughingstock of the rest of Canada. We do not even know how to put Grade 12 into the education system in this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: How about two Grades 6?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I will come back to some of the other points that I want to talk about later on.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Grade 6 twice, that is right, yes.

But, Mr. Chairman, I am not satisfied. Well, actually, there was no explanation given by the minister other than he just wanted us to vote for this without any justification at all, just go ahead and vote for it. 'Give us \$300 million and we will go out and spend it' - did not

MR. NEARY: tell us how they are going to spend it.

No explanation. Well, that is not good enough, Sir, and I think that is an insult to the intelligence of members of this House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Baird) The hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, as I understand the rules of this House, if I speak for a few minutes that then gives the member for Lapoile another chance to get up and speak and I would like to hear him say some more, but I have a few questions I would like to address to him. When the Estimates were heard in the sub-committees, the hon. gentleman did not appear. Certainly he did not appear in the committee that I chaired and I understand he did not appear in any of the sub-committees. You know, it is a good thing that hypocrisy is the homage that vice pays to virtue, because I suggest that the hon. gentleman is a hypocrite. If he were really interested, if he were really interested in information, he would have come into those committees. The rules, they were extremely flexible. There was no limit, no practical limit to the amount of time that could be spent on any one subject. It is true that an individual member only could speak for ten minutes at a time, but all another member had to do was clear his throat and this gave him another ten minutes and another ten minutes and another ten minutes. The various committees were extremely flexible in the way they would schedule the sittings, so that any hon. member who wanted to appear at all three sessions would have been able to do so if he had given a sufficient amount of advance notice. So I suggest that the hon. member for Lapoile, his attitude is extremely hypocritical. I daresay he intends to boycott the sub-committee hearings again this year, and I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition should be ashamed of him, utterly ashamed of him, and I hope he takes him to task in their caucus.

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. member give us a spirited defence of the former premier?

MR. CARTER: It would be easier to give the hon. House a defence of the former premier than to give them one of the former former premier, that is for sure, considerably easier.

MR. CARTER: I would very much like to hear the member for Lapoile get up and explain to us why it was that he not only boycotted the meetings of the sub-committee on the Budget last year, but probably intends to do the same thing this year. Therefore, I suggest to the members of the press who are obviously listening that the member for Lapoile (Mr. Neary) is not serious. All he does is get up and make a lot of sound and fury, and in addition to some of the charges that he makes that may have some substance, most of them are extremely ill-founded and, upon serious investigation, have been

MR. J. CARTER:

found to be full of nothing but hot air. So I should like to take my seat and give the hon. member a chance to get up and explain why he does not take these matters more seriously.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): The hon. the member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Chairman, I would be very surprised if my friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) would lower himself to come in and explain anything to the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter), anything.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMS: A member of this House who just a few days ago had the audacity to sit in his seat, he did not have the guts to stand in his place, and call my friend from the Strait of Belle Isle -

MR. STAGG: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order.

MR. STAGG: Mr. Chairman, we are discussing an Interim Supply Bill here. This is obviously irrelevant what this hon. gentleman is referring to. He is being engaged in debate that is totally irrelevant.

MR. F.B. ROWE: To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) be given the same latitude as the hon. the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) when he is speaking.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, that is not a point of order because Your Honour knows full well, and the government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) knows that the debate that we are now into is on the resolution, it is a far-reaching debate, wide-ranging debate, it is almost the same as the Throne Speech debate or the budget debate and my hon. friend is completely in order. So I would ask the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) to restrain himself and let my hon. friend carry on with his address.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): With regard to the point of order, there is no point of order. But I would suggest to hon. members that we are straying somewhat from the bill and I would suggest that we get back on track.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: (Inaudible) the point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On another point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: No. The hon. gentleman, when he was speaking, he referred to the hon. the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter), he made the statement that, 'He has not got the guts' to do something. Now I refer Your Honour to Beausheue, page 107, which is -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) honourable.

MR. MARSHALL: No, it is not a real honourable word, it is a word that is unparliamentary. It is an unparliamentary word.

MR. JAMIESON: The Arts Council would approve of it.

MR. MARSHALL: The Arts Council might approve of it but I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the persistent use of words such as this is a mode and a method by which the proceedings of the House and Committee can get out of order and I know the hon. member

MR. MARSHALL: would probably want to
withdraw it anyway.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Chairman, I will
certainly be only too happy to withdraw the accusation
'that he does not have the guts' and say he does not
have the intestinal fortitude to stand in his place.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. THOMS: Are you going to rule on
that point of order? That was a point of order.

MR. STAGG: Is the hon. gentleman
finished?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER: The Chairman has ruled
on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN(Baird): Order, please!
With regard to the point
of order, I think the hon. gentleman withdrew the
statement in question and now that clears up the point
of order.

The hon. the member for
Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Thank you very much, Mr.
Chairman.

MR. STAGG: Now just start it the
right way this time boy.

AN HON. MEMBER: If you would shut up he
might.

MR. THOMS: I doubt if the hon. the
member for Stephenville has any intestinal fortitude
either.

MR. STAGG: Yes, boy, I have.

MR. BENNETT: You sure do not show it.

MR. THOMS: He certainly does not show
very much common sense when speaking in this House. As

MR. THOMS: a matter of fact, if I ever decided to run against the hon. member in Stephenville what I would do is I would go and get Hansard and I would copy his speeches and I would send them to every voting member in his district and I doubt if he would get the nomination, let alone win the election.

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible)

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. THOMS: Mr. Chairman, I have said before in this House and I will say it again, and I will probably say it again in the future, that it is amazing the arrogance, particularly of the ministers of this particular administration.

MR. STAGG: Ah come on!

MR. THOMS: Arrogance! The absolute utter arrogance. My heart goes out to the Minister of Education (Ms Verge) and particularly to the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mrs. Newhook). My heart goes out to them. Can you imagine trying to get Grade XII through that lot?

MS. VERGE: We have (inaudible)

MR. THOMS: Through that lot? Do you get a chance to speak at all in Cabinet? Do you actually get a chance to speak at all or do they just brush you aside?

MR. S. NEARY: Status of Women. Only the Status of Women.

MR. L. THOMS: - the same way the Minister of Health (Mr. House) this afternoon, in my questions. Can you imagine the audacity. We have a doctor at the Waterford Hospital -

MR. F. STAGG: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): A point of order.

MR. F. STAGG: This hon. gentleman obviously has nothing to say. You have already indicated to him earlier that he should become relevant. He gets up, persists in the same kind of irrelevance and irreverance, Mr. Chairman, so I think he should be ruled out of order and let somebody have something to say who is going to be relevant, like me.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the point of order, the hon. the member for Grand Bank.

MR. L. THOMS: Have you ruled?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want to speak on the point of order?

MR. L. THOMS: You go ahead and rule.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the point of order, there is no point of order. But I would like to remind all hon. gentlemen that we have allowed some degree of flexibility, which I think may be getting out of hand, so I would remind all hon. gentlemen of the rule of relevancy.

MR. STAGG: Almost a point of order.

MR. THOMS: Almost a point of order. That is as close as the hon. gentleman is ever going to come to a point of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: He is frustrated because he never got to be Deputy Speaker.

MR. L. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I was speaking of the arrogance of this administration, an arrogance that is made quite plain and quite clear.

MR. L. THOMS: by the fact that they bring in a bill saying, "Here, boys, I want \$300 million dollars. What is \$300 million dollars? Let us get it voted on, let us get it out." Well, Mr. Chairman, \$3 million dollars is a lot in my district.

\$3 million dollars, ten percent - or is it one percent, or what? \$300 million staggers me. I was elected to this hon. House on June 18th. of this year. Since that time there has been, - what? - \$1,000 million, is it? A \$1,000 million in Interim Supply gone through this House. We had \$600 million in the last session. And now here we are, two days from the budget and we are asked to approve \$300 million.

MR. STAGG: So you can get paid.

MR. NEARY: Oh, come on now. Do not be so low. Do not be so low.

MR. L. THOMS: If that is the reason, if that is the reason -

AN HON. MEMBER: What else do you expect from (inaudible).

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Ignorance!

MR. JAMIESON: Do not pay any attention to him.

MR. L. THOMS: Mr. Chairman, talk about saying things outside the House -

MR. STAGG: Hold your (inaudible). Your money is in there the same as mine, that will change your mind.

MR. L. THOMS: I am telling you, there is not \$300 million dollars in there for me and to be quite frank with you I do not know what the \$300 million dollars is in there for. I mean, there is the scedule. Department: Consolidated Funds Services \$140,000; Mines and Energy \$7.5 million. That is going to give the Minister of Mines and Energy a good weekend in New York, \$7.5 million.

MR. FLIGHT: Over there?

MR. L. THOMS: Well, as far as I know. I am not given any information, any more than I was given the information when I asked the question of the Minister of Health.

MR.L.THOMS: You do not get any information. That is why I got it on the Late Show, Mr. Chairman, because I did not get a satisfactory answer. And what do we see? We see the \$300 million dollar Finance Minister get up this afternoon and present this very little, if any; I did not hear any real explanation of what it was all about. I mean, here am I, you know, I am fairly well educated.

MR. STAGG: Are you?

MR.L.THOMS: But \$300 million dollars is far beyond my comprehension, certainly without some explanation of what it is all about. And what do we get? The hon. gentleman from Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) is so smart, why does he not get up and tell us what the \$300 million dollars is for, what is contained in that \$300 million?

MR.CARTER: (Inaudible)

MR.L.THOMS: The hon. gentleman from St. John's North, (Mr.J.Carter) when we debate the Arts Council Bill, will have his time in the House for his Show and Tell.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR.L.THOMS: Now, look, actually if you wanted to, if you wanted to, you know, the rule of relevency - the hon. gentleman spent three years in the Chair and learned nothing - but you can, if you want to stand up this afternoon

MR. THOMS: and show us the pretty pictures you have over there to show us if that is what you want to do. You are not going to get cheated, you will have your time but -

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible) unparliamentary.

MR. THOMS: Well, the word 'guts', you know, is certainly as parliamentary as traitor; Judas Iscariot, it is as parliamentary as that one. I have yet to look across the other side of the House and call anyone a traitor but I can not say that for that side of the House.

MR. STAGG: Let me say this about that (inaudible).

MR. THOMS: You can say what you like about what you want.

MR. F. STAGG: All the heavyweights are (inaudible).

MR. THOMS: Mr. Chairman, it just is not fair. You know, you sit in your first session of the House and you vote in favor of \$600 million in Interim Supply without any explanation because that is the way you think the thing is done. By the time you get to the second session and somebody pokes \$300 million under your nose, you sort of feel obligated to question it, to find out what it is all about. And I hope that the minister when he concludes this debate will give me a little more information. We have to vote for it because if not we will get the same situation as we had in the last House when the House Leader comes running across the House saying, "Look, if we do not approve this this afternoon the bank is going to bounce the Civil Service cheques." And we certainly would not want the Civil Service to go unpaid. I certainly do not want the welfare recipients in this Province to be unpaid and this is what is going to happen if we do not vote for it. But we are forced to vote for it, we have no choice but to vote for it. There is a shotgun to our head and this is unfair.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. THOMS: This is a shotgun approach.

MR. L. THOMS: And, Mr. Chairman, I resent that.

I am sure that Interim Supply could have been brought in days ago. It did not have to be brought in today and tomorrow being Private Members Day, we have Thursday and then Friday afternoon we have got the Budget coming in. Maybe it could not have been brought in but I would like to know why, I would like to know why the shotgun is put to my head.

MR. FLIGHT: \$140,000 for Mount Scio.

MR. L. THOMS: Before I die that is one thing I would like to know and it is not very much to ask of the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) of this Province, that he give us an explanation of why I am expected to vote for granting supply in the amount \$300 million. And that is all I ask, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman -

MR. D. JAMIESON: Excuse me.

DR. J. COLLINS: A point of order?

MR. D. JAMIESON: Mr. Chairman, no, just clarification because we have been in such a tangle here on this this afternoon. Since there does seem to be some confusion as to whether the resolution part of the debate is separate from the individual item, is the Minister of Finance now, in a sense, talking on the resolution or would the House Leader (Mr. W. Marshall) be agreeable - we would be - to let the resolution, if it has to be passed, pass, and let us get on to the - whether it is clause by clause or item by item. So that means we -

MR. W. MARSHALL: Then we call item by item and we are into Committee.

MR. D. JAMIESON: And the normal time periods, etc., will apply.

MR. W. MARSHALL: We were in it before except we gave latitude, you see.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

March 25, 1980

Tape No. 637

SD - 3

MR. D. JAMIESON:

Just to make it clear, okay.

MR. W. MARSHALL:

Yes. That is right now, and then

we can call the heads.

MR. D. JAMIESON:

Call the resolution.

MR. S. NEARY:

The point has been made, Mr.

Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:(Baird):

On motion, resolution carried.

On motion, enacting clause carried.

On motion, title carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN (BAIRD): Shall Head (1) carry?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), Sir, could tell us the state of the provincial debt at the moment? I believe last year we were told that the provincial debt was \$3 billion. Where do we stand now and is there any provision made in Interim Supply to pay off any of the provincial debt? And what is happening now regarding the exchange on the Canadian dollar versus the American dollar? Are we borrowing in the United States this year, or is all our borrowing done now in Canada and in Europe? I am trying to determine what effect the exchange of the American dollar is having on our borrowing in the United States if indeed we are borrowing. And I believe the hon. gentleman told us the other day about the credit rating. That is in the process of being sorted out right now and perhaps the minister might indicate if he anticipates any change in our credit rating this year, in this financial year and if it will be for the better or for the worse. I believe we should know that when we are passing this particular subhead.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the number of points that have been brought up to date by various speakers, I do not know really if there are any particular ones that need reply at this stage except for what the hon. member for LaPoile just asked. I might just say that I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jamieson) did ask if in the fisheries vote there was something for the Loan Board and indeed there is. There is a total of approximately \$4 million in there for various aspects of the Fishery Loan Board activities. And he also asked if there was anything in there, particularly in the **Mines** and **Energy** vote, for our case in regard to the Upper Churchill. Not specifically, **There** is nothing in there specifically in that regard.

The hon. member for LaPoile asked about the public debt. I do not have at hand the precise figures but as far as I recall our public sector debt is somewhere between \$2.6

DR. COLLINS:

billion and \$2.8 billion. That is the public sector debt. That is direct provincial debt, plus guaranteed debt.

MR. NEARY:

Direct and indirect

DR. COLLINS:

Yes. The direct debt is approximately \$1.8 billion, between \$1.8 billion and \$2 billion.

MR. NEARY:

Well, you are talking about close to \$4 billion.

DR. COLLINS:

No. The total amount, that is indirect plus guaranteed debt, is between \$2.6 billion and \$3 billion. That includes both. If you want to separate out of that total amount the direct debit is \$1.8 billion, approximately. So that means there is the difference, about \$800 million to \$900 million, guaranteed debt.

MR. NEARY:

So we are talking about a debt of over \$3 billion.

DR. COLLINS:

Just under \$3 billion for the total— about \$3 billion for the total public sector debt.

The hon. member also asked about our borrowing in regard to the exchange rates. We have not borrowed in the United States, I think, since 1977.

MR. NEARY:

But it would have an effect in Europe, too, would it not?

DR. COLLINS:

Yes, we have borrowed in Europe more recently than that. I think we borrowed in Europe in 1978, if I remember correctly.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) Eurodollars.

DR. COLLINS:

That is in Eurodollars.

We are not ruling out borrowing in the United States this year because the markets are such that it is likely that one will have to borrow where it is most advantageous. Things are changing so rapidly we are not ruling out any market. However, we will certainly preferentially look to the Canadian market because exchange rates are changing so haphazardly or so rapidly that one would try to stay in Canadian funds if at all possible. However, we are not the only borrowers in the Canadian market and the Canadian market can only take so

DR. COLLINS:

much public borrowing plus corporate borrowing. So whether we will have to borrow in the United States remains to be seen.

MR. NEARY:

What about Alberta's Heritage.

Fund? Will you be getting anything out of that?

DR. COLLINS:

We will expect to go to the Alberta Heritage Trust Fund again this year and we have every anticipation that they will look favourably on any requests we make to them. We have no guarantee in that regard but last year we had a distinct understanding that they would expect us to make another request. At the present time, our fiscal agents and our own

DR. COLLINS: officials in the Department of Finance say that we should not go to the markets, the usual markets to borrow now, that there are a number of other mechanisms available; there are private placements available, there are guaranteed bank loans available. These are on much shorter term. You can get in and get out of these things much more readily and not be locked into long-term borrowings at very high rates. So we have a certain amount of flexibility there and this is what we will do until we see that it is to our advantage to go to more long-term borrowing.

MR. JAMIESON: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. JAMIESON: To the hon. the Minister of Finance apropos to borrowings, the system used to be in effect where provincial treasurers or ministers of finance and the federal people, as well as major utilities, there was a consultation type of process to ensure that not everybody hit the market, in a sense, at the same time and each province or each utility was aware of what the other's intentions were. Two questions: is that process still in place and, in terms of, for instance, the various people who I suspect are likely to be seeking to draw on the Alberta Heritage Fund, is there any consultation? I say this because I saw a news item recently indicating that some other province had the same intention, - or do we, through the hon. the Minister of Finance, just simply go when it suits our purpose best to do so?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is in place in the same, shall we say, regular

DR. COLLINS: fashion that consultative process between the various provinces, the federal government and various public utilities at the present time. I think this may be related to the recent political events in Ottawa, going back to - when was it? - you know, last Summer type of thing. We are in formal consultation, mainly through the officials in the Department of Finance, with other provinces and with officials in the federal government, in the Department of Finance in the federal government, almost on a daily basis, so that we have prior knowledge when the various provinces and the utilities are intending to go to the market and so on. This information is passed back and forth quite readily but on a, shall we say, somewhat less formal basis.

In regard to the Alberta Heritage Trust Fund, we have had a number of conversations with them expressing our intentions to go and we have had good answers back. We have not actually set any times or any amounts or whatever, but they are fully cognizant of the fact that we are intending to go and they are in full expectation that we will go. I might add that up to now, the Province of Quebec - that was the most recent one, they went for roughly something like \$200 million I think it was - other than the Province of Quebec it has really been the Atlantic area that has taken advantage of the Alberta Heritage Trust Fund, except in one instance. I think Manitoba went - I think it was a first borrowing - a number of years ago, and they have not gone back since. New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and ourselves and Quebec on that one instance, Quebec Hydro, have gone to the Fund, and we will certainly be using it again. I think that the reason why we will be using it again is that we can expect to get better rates there than we will get almost anywhere else. We will not get the same rates we got last

DR. COLLINS: time, because interest rates have changed in the interval, but we will get better rates there than we would get in any other circumstances.

MR. JAMIESON: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Baird) The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. JAMIESON: An observation and a question. It seems to me that a more formal kind of mechanism, I suspect that the Minister of Finance is going to find necessary as time passes, and I mean months, because the advice which the minister is getting about not going to the market if it is at all avoidable is probably being given, perhaps not with the same severity as it is in the case of Newfoundland, regrettably, at the present time, but, nevertheless, I am sure that no one is going to advise going after very high interest rate long-term loans at the present time and particularly do I think this is the case where you are dealing with a provincial

MR. D. JAMIESON: loaning agency because I can see that even with the great amount of money, massive, I guess, by our standards, that might be available in the Heritage Fund, there are going to be limits to even how much is going to be available from that source and probably, also, and I ask the minister this, does he know if the rate charged by Alberta is in some way associated with and related to the current market rate? Is it one per cent under par, one per cent under prime, what is the formula? What I believe is likely to happen is that that money, while it will be somewhat cheaper, is also going to increase in cost because I cannot imagine them functioning in any way other than having a linkage between their rate and what you would have to pay in the outside market. Is there a formula that the minister is aware of and that he can, in a sense, use as the basis for his projections on planned and future borrowings particularly if they are from the Alberta Heritage Fund?

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

MR. NEARY: Before the minister stands to answer that question, I wonder if I could throw one at him so that he could answer both questions at the same time?

I am curious about this new policy of private placement short term borrowing. I wonder if the minister could elaborate on that? Is it going to be - Will the government deal exclusively with banks, or will trust companies be involved, or where will the private -

AN HON. MEMBER: Pension fund -

MR. S. NEARY: The pension fund, that would not be private, would it? A pension fund in private industry, not the Canada Pension Plan?

AN HON. MEMBER: No, no, no. C.N.R.

MR. S. NEARY: Where does the minister - Could he elaborate on this new policy, apparently, that seems to be developing in our borrowing procedure?

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Baird)

The hon. the Minister of

Finance.

DR. J. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, first in regards

to the Alberta Heritage Trust Fund the hon. Leader of the Opposition asked in regard to rates. Hon. members will recall that last year the Board of Directors of the Trust Fund established, really, a new guideline or by-law, or a new way of operating, and this was really at our urging and that was that they would lend to any province at the rate of the best province. Previously to last year

MR. JAMIESON:

(inaudible) get in the private sector.

DR. J. COLLINS:

Yes. No, I am sorry. The rate

that will be applied to any province by the Alberta Heritage Trust Fund will be the rate that any province borrowed in the public market, the lowest rate. In other words - Ontario is probably the best credit risk, it is 'triple A', so whatever Ontario borrows at, Alberta Heritage Trust Fund will lend at that interest rate to any of the Canadian provinces at that point in time. Now, Alberta's rate will change with time and therefore the rate at which the Alberta Heritage Trust Fund will lend to the other provinces will change with time. But in a particular time period whatever Ontario can borrow at that is what the Alberta Heritage Trust Fund will offer the other provinces. The Federal government, a little while ago, borrowed at just below 14 per cent. I would imagine that the Ontario rate would be one-eighth higher than that, say around 14 per cent because the Federal government borrowed just under 14 per cent. So at this point in time Ontario would probably borrow at 14 per cent, so if we went to the Alberta Heritage Trust Fund now we would expect to borrow at 14 per cent. Now, the information we have and, of course, there is a certain

March 25, 1980

Tape 640

MB - 3

DR. J. COLLINS: amount of crystal balling
to all this, the information we had is that interest rates
will likely come down in the not too distant future, at
least for a period of time, in perhaps over the next quarter or
whatever. So we feel this is not the time to go but we will
be watching this closely and if we go we will get the rates
as good as any other province.

MR. D. JAMIESON: Can I just throw in a question?

DR. J. COLLINS: I was going to answer the -

MR. D. JAMIESON: Very brief.

MR. JAMIESON: I am prompted because you say interest rates may go down. If Ontario and, therefore, we borrow at 14 now -

DR. COLLINS: Right.

MR. JAMIESON: - is that subject to review or revision if, in fact, the rate goes down in the market in six months or twelve months or are you stuck with it for whatever the term is of the borrowing?

DR. COLLINS: Well, in the normal circumstances, yes, you would be stuck at that term, but we could pick our term. You know, we could go, say, for five years or seven years or ten years or twenty-five years, whatever we wish, but whatever term we pick we would essentially be stuck with that. In regard to the way the Alberta Heritage Trust Fund currently works - now this gets on to what the hon. member for Lapoile (Mr. Neary) asked. He asked about the short-term, private placements - there are mechanisms where one can go to private - not to the open market but to private placements. These would be a consortium or a consortia of banks, and there are available instruments there whereby they will lend for a relatively short period of time, say, two years or whatever, and then you can roll it over and stay in there if you wanted to.

MR. NEARY: Can you give us an example of a consortium of banks, you know?

DR. COLLINS: Well, yes, you know, Bank of Montreal, Bank of Nova Scotia, the usual - in Canada - chartered banks, and in the United States there would be Bank of America, Chase-Manhattan, you know, these sorts of banks. Those would be the ones that our fiscal agents would set up for us as a consortium if we wanted to go this way. If we borrowed there, we could get out after two years without penalty. That is the usual thing for these short things.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) trust companies or insurance companies the same way?

DR. COLLINS: There could be, although we would have the opportunity, we would have the prerogative of deciding who should be in our consortium -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

DR. COLLINS: - yes, yes, that is our say and -

MR. NEARY: That is why I am asking the question.

It could be the mafia (inaudible).

DR. COLLINS: We would almost, certainly, stick to banks and major banks. So I think that possibly - I would, at this point in time, wish to wind up the debate, if this is what hon. members wish.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no!

MR. JAMIESON: No, there are a few questions - do it Thursday afternoon.

MR. MARSHALL: Rise the Committee.

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

MR. SPEAKER(Butt): The hon. the member for Humber West.

MR. CHAIRMAN(Baird): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the resolution on Interim Supply to them referred, and an Interim Supply Bill consequent thereto, and have directed me to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow Wednesday at 3:00 p.m. and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 26, 1980 at 3:00 p.m.