

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 26, 1980

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I wish today to

inform the House that -

MR. S. NEARY: Do we get a copy?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. J. MORGAN: -the operational review that has been ongoing of the Fisheries Loan Board is now nearing completion. I would like to inform the House of Assembly on the activities of the Fisheries Loan Board for the past three months, since I became the Minister of the Department of Fisheries, and the plans for the coming month of April.

Since the beginning of January of this year, 1980, the Fisheries Loan Board has been involved in an interim loans programme whereby the Board has financed various engine and equipment loans and financed the construction of a number of wooden fishing vessels in the range of forty-five to sixty-five feet. These activities are in accordance with the government's announcement made in December of 1979 that there will be no interruption in the provision of funds for loans to the fishermen to purchase engines and equipment in order to enable these fishermen to operate next fishing season, in other words, this coming fishing season.

Funds are also allocated to ensure there will be no interruption in the Province's plans for the construction of the inshore and midshore fishing fleets in the Province. To be eligible for this vessel financing programme, fishermen had to be qualified for the federal government's subsidy and agree to various other items. And after dealing with

MR. J. MORGAN: all the applications on file, I repeat, all applications on file with the Loan Board for vessels and for new vessels in the range of forty-five to sixty-five feet, it was determined that there were only twenty-eight fishermen eligible for assistance to construct one of these vessels. And the Fisheries Loan Board dealt with all of these qualified applications and approved a total of eighteen loans for construction of eighteen vessels in the range of forty-five to sixty-five feet under this vessel construction programme.

These eighteen vessels are now being built or have commenced construction in various shipyards around the Province; in fact, a total of eleven shipyards are involved. That is important, Mr. Speaker, as well because the shipyards were short of work in the Fall of 1979 and short of work as of the last two or three weeks and at least eleven of the shipyards in the Province now have one of these vessels, in some cases two of these vessels. The total value of these eighteen loans approved in the past three months amounts to \$4.3 million.

At the present time the report on the Fisheries Loan Board has been made by a special committee appointed by government. That report is now finalized and is made to government, The report, of course, is an overall review of

MR. J. MORGAN:

the operations of the Fisheries Loan Board and is now in the hands of the provincial Cabinet and the Planning and Priorities Committee. This report focuses on all aspects of the future operations of the Fisheries Loan Board, including the arrangements with the chartered banks and therefore I feel, Mr. Speaker, it is important that it be given a very thorough review. And also it is important to be reviewed in consultation with the Fishermen's Union.

And yesterday afternoon I met for approximately three hours with the Fishermen's Union executive board as the beginning of that consultation process before we put these new guidelines and policies and new eligibility criteria in place, a full consultation with the Fishermen's Union which is speaking on behalf of the fishermen of the Province.

So in this regard, the next two or three weeks I will be holding discussions with the Fishermen's Union to discuss particular items in the report and to get the opinions of the Union before the final plan is put in place. And in the meantime, I have also asked the Fishermen's Union to recommend to me at least the names of two fishermen - we are looking at possibly three, but at least two - recommend to me the names of fishermen whom we can appoint to the Fisheries Loan Board.

Also, in the meantime, we are holding discussions with the Federal Government concerning fishing vessel assistance policy. There is now established a Federal-Provincial committee consisting of senior staff in Mr. LeBlanc's department and the senior staff of the provincial department and they are looking at and reviewing the overall program of fishing vessel assistance and policy for the future. And that is ongoing now and it now seems

MR. J. MORGAN: it will be finalized in the month of April.

So, Mr. Speaker, while this is on-going and until the 1980 Fisheries budget is approved for new funds to the Loan Board, the operations of the Fisheries Loan Board will continue on an interim loans basis until the new funds are allocated from this year's budget, and until the estimates are approved in the House of Assembly here. And the Loan Board will be processing as many applications as possible-and I want to repeat that - as many applications as possible. However, giving priority to those applications from fishermen who are eligible and who need new equipment, new engines and new boats and which we consider to be hardship cases, to give these priority and in the meantime to process as many as possible of applications on file on the interim basis until new funds are put forward from this year's financial allocation and from this year's fisheries budget.

So, Mr. Speaker, these are the present situations of the Loan Board and an outline of what took place the last three months. And I will say before I sit down, Mr. Speaker, I have made a decision that I am now inclined to agree with certain members of the House that all information, all information pertaining to the Loans Board - this is my policy as minister for the future-that all information regarding loans made and how they were made and who they were made to,

MR. J. MORGAN: who received the loans and the amounts of the loans, all information. There is no secrecy in the Loan Board in the future and any information regarding the past performance will also be made available.

MR. S. NEARY: When?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. J. MORGAN: In fact, I have answers today which I will later on give to questions asked yesterday in connection with the operations of the Board last year. And it is my policy that no information will be held back in connection with the operation of the Loan Board because I am determined as minister to make sure the Loan Board in the future is carried on in a businesslike manner. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. L. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of my colleague who is the spokesman on fisheries, I would like to respond to the non-statement. It has been traditional and I would like to know whether the minister, in this no secrecy mood that he is talking about, did he intend to provide us with a copy in advance as is the custom? Was it an oversight or was it just ready?

MR. J. MORGAN: I just arrived from out of town (inaudible)

MR. S. NEARY: It was on your desk twenty minutes before that.

MR. J. MORGAN: I was working.

MR. S. NEARY: That is unusual.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. L. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, the statement is a non-statement and it may be a non-statement because he has to get approval from the Premier because that is essentially a

MR. L. STIRLING: repeat of the Premier's statement which he gave in this House in October 1979 and that is that the priority would be to build, I think the Premier said twenty boats. In the comments made by the minister, he was very careful to say that there were only twenty-eight eligible applications in the forty-five to sixty-five foot class. He did not tell us how many people were not deemed eligible because of what factors, and then eighteen out of the twenty-eight which happens to tie in to the same figures that the Premier announced last Fall, October 1979. He mentions a special committee report. I would presume that this minister has said that regardless of what happened in the past he is going to make a new clean look, a new approach. And we are seeing in this House, Mr. Speaker, an attempt to not only say, that seven years of the Tory Party was a previous administration -

MR. S. NEARY: Corrupt.

MR. L. STIRLING: - we are now saying that within this administration we are not responsible for anything that was done by a previous minister,

MR. STIRLING: that all they have to do is change ministers and this minister can come in and make a statement -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order, the hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. In my statement I gave no indication of any wrongdoing by my predecessor. I merely said I would make all information available from the past. That is all I said.

MR. NEARY: Well, make it available. What are you waiting for?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, I believe it is fair to say that there was not a particular point of order but the minister has taken the opportunity to clarify remarks that may have been attributed to him.

The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. STIRLING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Now I think that is indicative. I think if you will check Hansard you will find that the minister said, "I now agree with members from the other side that all of this information should be made available. And I, as a minister, will say that this is now going to be - regardless of what happened in the past - I am inclined to give you all that information." And now having sat down for two or three minutes and thought about it for two or three minutes, he wants to change that statement.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we now have a special committee report and this is an indication -

MR. MORGAN: Where is the Fisheries spokesman over there?

AN HON. MEMBER: He is not here.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, the minister in tabling his report said that a special committee had been working since last Fall, and it is typical of the way that this government seems to be approaching this whole business of the House of Assembly.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. STIRLING: An insult to the House of Assembly -

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

The hon. member is beginning to drift into the area of debate. I would remind him he has about half of the time that the minister had in presenting his statement and it is now reaching that time. I would invite him to clue up his remarks.

MR. STIRLING: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I presume -

MR. NEARY: By leave, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: By leave?

MR. STIRLING: - I presume that the Minister of Fisheries -

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. SPEAKER: I understand leave has not been granted.

MR. STIRLING: I presume that the Minister of Fisheries will table that special committee report. He is going to discuss it with the Fishermen's Union: What about the representatives of the fishermen who were elected in this House of Assembly to represent fishermen?

AN HON. MEMBER: Look out (inaudible).

MR. STIRLING: I presume it will be tabled. And, Mr. Speaker, in commenting on the very subtle change, the very subtle change sort of slipped in, that sort of said they are now asking for two fishermen, two fishermen. In other words, it was a board on which fishermen used to control the board, all fishermen; they are now talking about reducing that from eight fishermen, the entire board, down to two fishermen, and that is a complete change of policy and it

MR. STIRLING:

is a cowardly way to do it, by a Ministerial Statement where he does not give us a copy of it in advance.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! I would ask the hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Stirling) to withdraw the term 'cowardly'. It has been termed unparliamentary in the past.

MR. STIRLING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I withdraw the term 'cowardly'. It does not show the greatest of bravery and courage to present it in the manner in which it has been presented and I would conclude, Mr. Speaker, by taking the minister at his word that he will give us the opportunity to examine that special committee report, that he will go in and table all of the information on all of the loans, who they were given to, and that we will look forward to with this minister, for as long as he lasts, as a clean new look in the Fisheries Department.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear! .

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) re the strike by Red Cross workers, and specifically I wonder if the minister can inform the House as to what is holding up negotiations, what are the matters or what is the matter of dispute, and what steps the minister has taken to bring both sides back to the bargaining table in an attempt to **resolve** the strike?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, about two weeks ago the Deputy Minister of Labour and Manpower, the Director of the Labour Division, and **the** conciliation officer for some days got both sides together in an attempt to get the people back to work and get the problems resolved with respect to the strike. That situation continued for four to five days and at the end of that period of time there appeared to be no break in the negotiations, that both sides were at loggerheads . I would not want to

MR. DINN: indicate what the items were that the differences centered around or all of the items. The fact of the matter is we have a conciliation officer still **who** is ready, willing and able to sit down with any of the sides if there is any indication at all that there may be a change. Basically what happens in these negotiations is when you get at **loggerheads** , when you find nothing giving from either side, that you break off negotiations and I believe that is the situation right now. I think they are due to get back together sometime early next week again and at that time I hope to have a further report, or I will be able to let the hon. members certainly know and the general public know, but right now it is in a situation where it is an

MR. J. DINN:

economic battle, where the union wants certain things and the employer does not want to give certain things away. And it is a very unfortunate situation because it seems to me, having read the latest report of the conciliation officer, that they are really not that far apart and there should be a resolution to the problem.

MR. T. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. T. LUSH:

There has been some suggestion, Mr. Speaker, that, as a result of the strike, there is a shortage of blood in some of our hospitals. I wonder if the minister can comment on this particular situation whether there is, indeed, a depletion of blood in the hospitals here in St. John's in particular, and whether there has really been a reduction, since the strike, in the number of blood donors? Just what is the situation? Is it a serious situation? Is it an acute situation? Just what is the situation in this respect?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. J. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, I would suspect that my colleague, the hon. the Minister of Health (Mr. W. House) would be more on top of that situation, as I know he would on a day-to-day basis. There have been times over the period that there were indications that there may be a shortage develop if certain things did not happen, but I am not aware of an acute shortage anywhere in any of the hospitals or I have not been informed lately that there is a shortage. But I am sure my colleague, the hon. the Minister of Health, would have more on it and would be able to elaborate on it.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. W. HOUSE:

Mr. Speaker, the department is, I think, in daily contact with the Red Cross and with the hospitals with regard to

MR. W. HOUSE: this, and we have not been asked to take any extraordinary measures. But there is no mistake about it, there is a little bit of a crisis, there is a problem. We saw over the weekend a cry coming out from one of the hospitals, for instance, through the churches to ask people to go, therefore, to give blood, go directly, I think, to the hospitals.

I have been advised there has not been any surgery delayed any appreciable amount, although in one case I was advised, in one particular case where a particular operation that required an excessive amount of blood, it was deferred until the situation got cleared up somewhat.

So from our point of view there is no major crisis, but the situation is not very comfortable.

MR. T. LUSH: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. T. LUSH: If I may have two minutes to clear it up, Mr. Speaker, since it relates to this shortage of blood, Does the minister have any contingency plans in the event that this strike continues? There certainly can be an acute shortage of blood and it can create a very serious problem in this Province. Does the minister have any contingency plans in mind that he is going to bring into action.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. W. HOUSE:

Mr. Speaker, I think that one of the kinds of contingencies is to make public appeals and there was last week a public appeal, and of course outside of St. John's, generally speaking, particularly in the smaller communities, it is direct donors anyway and if that happens I think the hospitals do have lists of people who they can contact. So there is a contingency plan in that respect, that they go directly to donors, and it is the kind of thing, I think, that, you know, when you make your appeal you will get the response.

MR. T. LUSH:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

I indicated a final supplementary the last time but nobody else is standing. The hon. member.

MR. T. LUSH:

I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. J. Dinn), the Throne Speech of 1978 said that it was the intention of the government to reassess the effects of strikes in the Public Service and to introduce legislation to alleviate some of the serious repercussions which such strikes inevitably cause. I am just wondering what has happened to this announced intention of the government, whether they plan action in this particular Assembly or what, since they announced it in 1977, or is it a matter like the blueprint now that that is discarded with since it was some plan of the previous government? Just what is the situation on this particular announcement?

MR. G. FLIGHT:

He does not know.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. J. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, we are always reviewing possible improvements to legislation. With respect to our labour legislation here in the Province, it is probably the best legislation in the country and probably the best legislation in the Western world. The fact of the matter is -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

MR. J. DINN:

- with respect to that particular situation, that is being discussed actively right now within the department and it will not be too long from now that I will be making some proposals to government with respect to changes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. G. FLIGHT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer). I wonder if the minister would inform the House - sometime ago, a year ago, the Justice Department made a decision that a correctional centre was required in Central Newfoundland, a decision that they would establish a correctional centre. Would the minister indicate as to whether or not a site has been chosen for that correctional centre at this time?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, no, a number of sites have been examined and studied in Central Newfoundland; no final decision with respect to the site has been made. I would anticipate such a final decision will be made in approximately a two month period of time.

MR. G. FLIGHT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. G. FLIGHT: Since it was obviously necessary to have a correctional centre in Central Newfoundland, and that is obvious from the minister's answer, would the minister indicate to the House just what the criteria is for the choosing of this centre, just what the department is looking for in the various towns? I know they have talked about Botwood, Bishop's Falls, Grand Falls, Windsor; just what is the criteria that will decide in which of those towns the correctional centre will be established?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, essentially the criteria would be sufficient services being there to keep costs minimal, an appropriate situation from the point of view of services, from the point of view of accessibility from various other matters, largely of a planning or engineering or architectural standpoint. These are essentially it once the general geographic area has been located, and that has, as Central Newfoundland.

MR. G. FLIGHT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary, the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans, followed by the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, all the criteria that the minister has indicated exist in every town that has been mentioned as a possible site for that correctional centre. So I wonder if the minister would indicate what the position of the various towns up until now has been? Botwood, Bishop's Falls, Grand Falls, Windsor - are they all positive, are they all prepared to accept the centre, and so indicated to the Justice Department and are waiting for a decision? Just what has been the reaction from the various towns we are looking at? And this is my last supplementary, would the minister indicate what this correctional centre is going to cost the Province?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge as of current date each of the areas being looked at, the official local government is in favour of it. There was one town in which they were not, or allegedly were not; but I understand the position has changed, it was based on either a misunderstanding of what specifically the correctional centre was going to be. So at present all of the communities which are among the possible ones are to the best of my knowledge the correctional centre would be welcomed there and I am base my knowledge of that, or my opinion of that, from the official spokesmen being the municipal councils obviously not a personal head count.

The cost is envisioned at around - it obviously has to go to tender; frequently these come in much more; very infrequently they come in less than what one envisions-but it would be hoped that it would be approximately \$400,000.

MR. G. FLIGHT: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile wishes to yield for a final supplementary to the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. G. FLIGHT: The minister indicated that all of the towns that had been approached up until now had indicated a positive desire to have that correctional institution established in their community. I would like to ask the minister if he has received official recognition from the four town councils concerned, to this date, that they indeed - he indicated that no there was a town that did not want it but then re-considered and has now indicated they do want it. And I would ask the minister if at this point in time there is official notification to the minister that that particular town -

MR. G. FLIGHT: he knows which town I am referring to-has indeed accepted the proposal and does indeed want the correct ional institution-established in that town?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, whether there is a - actually I got back into St. John's from Grand Falls, attending the inauguration of the new Bishop there, a couple of hours ago and I have not gone through my mail. I was told ,actually, when I was there by the mayor that either he had written me to that effect. I have not gone through my mail, I do not really know.

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

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, this seems to be the Minister of Justice's day in the sun. Could the minister tell the House if he has yet received the - and I referred to this yesterday, and the Minister of Finance referred me to the hon. gentleman, who was out of town - but the Mahoney Royal Commission of Inquiry into wrongdoing in the Department of Public Works, has the minister received that report yet? If not, would the minister indicate, beacuse this seems to be on the go quite a long time, when that report will be in the hands of the Department of Justice?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, no, I have not received the report. In a conversation with Mr. Justice Mahoney fairly recently, within the past couple of weeks or so, I did understand from him that within - I want to quote him as accurately as I can - within a period of approximately three months, and he may have said two to three or some such thing, but within a period of approximately three months or it may have been two to three, I am not sure, that he would expect to have it in.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary, the hon. the Member for LaPoile.

MR.S. NEARY: It goes without saying that the report will be made public, I assume, when the hon. gentleman receives it, but could the hon. minister tell the House how many Royal Commissions of Inquiry and how many police investigations are now ongoing, and how many have been concluded into the Moores' administration, into the final days and the activities of various ministers and various departments of government? How many police investigations are still ongoing and how many have been completed?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that there are any Royal Commission Investigations or Royal Commission Inquiries or police investigations into what the hon. gentleman alleges as or quotes as the "last days of the Moores' administration". There are no investigations into that specific topic. With respect to how many Royal Commissions are presently operating, I really have to ask somebody to inform me. I think there are around five or so, but I am not really sure. I know to the best of my knowledge that none have been appointed since I have been Minister of Justice and that is correct. There have not been any. So there have not been any to date. How many there are ongoing, I would really have to check. It is a numerical thing and I do not want to give the wrong information. It is not a question of opinion, it is a question of fact. You know, there are several. I really cannot say how many.

Police investigations? Of course, there would be no way. Police investigations go on without my knowing them -

MR. NEARY:

What about the Linerboard one?

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER:

- or start without my knowing them and frequently will start without anybody in the Department of Justice knowing them.

MR. S. NEARY:

Is the Linerboard one completed?

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

I will wait until the hon. gentleman asks a question.

MR. NEARY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms)

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman knows what I am driving at, Sir. I am talking mainly about the investigation into the wrongdoing involved in Labrador Linerboard - secret commissions. The EGRET, the Bermuda Triangle, Would the hon. gentleman tell us if that case is yet complete, is the report in the hands of the minister or is the case still ongoing?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Justice was informed approximately

MR. OTTENHEIMER: ten days ago, give or take a few days, that the police enquiry has concluded and in the department's examination of the enquiry there was no evidence for any prosecution. That police investigation did conclude approximately a week or ten days ago.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A final supplementary. The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. gentleman tell us if his department has been asked for advice or have taken it upon themselves to look into an account in Hamburg, Germany that belongs to the people of this Province, the Labrador Linerboard - the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) knows what I am talking about, it is in the name of a company called Schurfeld in Hamburg, Germany, \$2.5 million in taxpayers' money that has never been recovered. Has the minister been asked for any advice on that or has the government taken any action to try to recover this money?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I think I would have to take that as notice. I am not aware of any work the department is currently doing or has been doing with with respect to an account in Hamburg, Germany but I would take it as notice. It could be that this was made before I became minister and has not come to my attention, so it would be preferable for me to take it as notice.

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

MR. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, this is really a related question to the hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) and it is something that I suspect disturbs him as much as it does me. Had it not been for the question from the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), for example, and this is the second occasion now on which this has happened, there does not appear to be any means through which the public is made aware that a police investigation has been completed and that in this case and in a previous case there was not adequate evidence on which to proceed. The

MR. JAMIESON: unfortunate part of that is that the knowledge is usually fairly general that there is a police investigation underway and very frequently people are under a cloud as a result of that. Has the hon. minister any technique or is there a method whereby indeed once there is public knowledge that someone is being investigated, no action occurs after the fact and that person or persons are still in the public's mind under some kind of suspicion which the police investigation has eliminated? Is there a technique and does he agree that there is a flaw here in this system?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I certainly see that there is a flaw or a difficulty. I am not sure what the answer is because as the hon. gentleman is aware there will be many police investigations which would start, come to an end, of which none of us would even know, I would not even know, and it could well be that nobody in the Department of Justice would know. But the specific area here is where it has become public knowledge and usually through a political forum, in a legislative forum, usually through that. In a sense I am thinking out loud here, one could certainly think that where police investigations have ended

MR. OTTENHEIMER: and there are no prosecutions following, obviously the file is closed, that one would make a statement to that effect. Then, of course, where no statement is made, you know, people would infer, it could be inferred it was still ongoing and, you know, I see the problem, I am not sure how to solve it. Because you could get yourself into a position whereby all other people or organizations which have become through the political process, knowledge that there was a police investigation on and no statement was said that it was over, then one would be directing attention there and to what extent that could prejudice an investigation. I certainly realize the problem. I am not sure of its solution but I will give it some thought and discuss it with some people who may well have some views on its solution.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the hon. gentleman one more question in connection -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary, the hon. member for Lapoile.

MR. NEARY: - with the Bermuda situation, the secret commissions. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that there was insufficient evidence, or did the police, because of the international complications, could they not go any further with the case? Did they reach a dead end and they could not really complete their investigation? Is that the situation or was there insufficient evidence to lay charges?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the police conducted the enquiry and they can only do what is in their power to do, and on the basis of their enquiry, of their investigation, came to the decision that there was nothing further that they could do, and the investigation ended, and the investigation does not give grounds for prosecution. I cannot be more specific.

MR. NEARY: It was never finished.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Well, the file is closed. It is completed. I suppose in anything of additional or new information comes to light, I mean obviously that then is not a continuation, I suppose that is really a new enquiry then if there is new additional information. But the situation here is that the investigation was undertaken by the RCMP. It is completed. And on the basis of that there are no grounds for prosecution of any individual or organization.

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

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Lands and Forests. The minister I am sure is aware that back in November there was a task force appointed to look into the very serious employment situation in the Roddickton area. I understand that the task force has reported, I wonder if the minister could tell the House what the status of the report is at the moment, when we might expect to be able to have a public view of the document so that people in the area, and others concerned, might be able to study the document and see what it contains?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Lands and Forests.

MR. C. POWER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, last Fall there was a task force organized and announced publicly by my colleague and my predecessor, the now Minister of Fisheries (Mr. J. Morgan), because we were extremely concerned as a government with the unemployment problems in Main Brook-Roddickton area. That task force report has been presented to government. It is presently being studied by Resource and Social Policies Committees of Cabinet and we hope to deal with it as a full Cabinet very briefly and for it to be announced to the public very shortly.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. the member for Baie Verte - White Bay.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: I thank the minister for his answer, Mr. Speaker. I wonder, without tying him down too much, if the minister could indicate publicly when he might be in a position to table the report in the House, as I would hope it would be his intention to table the report so that we could all have a look at it?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Lands and Forests.

MR. C. POWER: Mr. Speaker, again as in my earlier answer, the report will be tabled in the House as soon as Cabinet has a full briefing on the Roddickton Task Force Report which is now presently being done, and I expect it will be in a matter of weeks as opposed to a matter of months.

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

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

MR. J. HODDER: I am going to ask a different question on the report. Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if the minister could tell me what the criteria is for setting up a task force to look at high unemployment in an area? I represent an area which has from 70 per cent to 80 per cent unemployment in the Wintertime and from 40 per cent to 50 per cent unemployment in the Summertime. I was wondering if the minister would appoint a task force or have a task force appointed as well to look at that

MR. J. HODDER: particular area of the Province?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Lands and Forests.

MR. C. POWER: Mr. Speaker, again, the Task Force in the Roddickton - Main Brook area was organized because of the extremely high unemployment in the Main Brook - Roddickton area and also because of, certainly, their very strong background in the forestry area. It was done through the Department of Lands and Forests because of those reasons. Again, we sincerely hope, as a government, that in the area the member just spoke about where now there is extremely high unemployment, that that situation will be somewhat alleviated with the opening of the mill in Stephenville very shortly, and again, we hope that there will be no need for a task force report in that given area.

MR. J. HODDER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Bonavista North (Mr. L. Stirling), unless he wishes to yield for a supplementary.

MR. L. STIRLING: I will yield, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. J. HODDER: In listening to the minister's answer, I might put this to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. J. Morgan) because the Port au Port area of the Province has a high unemployment problem which was there while Labrador Linerboard Limited was operating; and that same figure was there in 1975 where we had specific statistics. And I would put a question, perhaps, to the Minister of Fisheries. We know we are not a forestry area, but could the minister, perhaps, support a task force to look at the unemployment there from a fishery point of view? Or perhaps if the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. L. Barry) were here, we could talk about some of the mineral resources we have which are not being utilized.

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

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I recognize the hon. gentleman's concern in that area, and in fact it is only a few days ago

MR. J. MORGAN: that we approved a licence for the National Sea Company and also a -

MR. J. HODDER: (Inaudible).

MR. J. MORGAN: - the hon. gentleman does not want information regarding his district?

MR. FLIGHT: Sit down! (inaudible) about unemployment. you are talking about (inaudible)

MR. J. MORGAN: It is going to help the unemployment situation. You asked about - you know, if you are against the idea of us doing something to create jobs in your district, I will sit down. If you want information, I will give you the information.

The situation is there is high unemployment in the hon. gentleman's district and with the help of my colleague, my good friend from Stephenville (Mr. F. Staqq) the last few months -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. J. MORGAN: - with his help, we did make every effort to alleviate the problem on the Port au Port Peninsula. And through the effort of my colleague and friend from Stephenville and his representations, we did get some achievements through National Sea whereby we are now arranging a lease situation - which is going to be a long-term lease, a ten year lease on facilities in Piccadilly which will mean a substantial development in the fisheries in the hon. gentleman's district.

MR. HODDER: You are misleading the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. J. MORGAN: There is going to be a major processing plant built by National Sea - Nickersons, which will mean a substantial number of jobs in this area.

MR. HODDER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. J. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister one question on the whole statement which he used to try to put himself in a good light. The question is - and it is something that I have

MR. J. HODDER: talked about with your predecessor
and have talked to you about, for crying out loud.

MR. J. MORGAN: (Inaudible) very much.

MR. J. HODDER: This National Sea thing that you are
trying to let the public of Newfoundland know is a great effort by your depart-
ment - and I would like to, as a preamble to the question, say that
National Sea has been operating there for some years but because they
have not been able to get together with the government in order to work
out the land that they were on, all the government has presently done now

MR. HODDER: is to tell them that they have a lease which they did not know they had. How many more jobs will that provide in an area that has from seventy to eighty per cent unemployment?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. HODDER: More than were there before.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, as of last week I sat down with Nickerson's and I had an approximately four hour discussion with National Sea and Nickerson's, which is now all in one company in our Province. And that company has invested \$25 million in the last eighteen months in our Province, in the fishery development, mainly in the processing sector.

MR. HODDER: In Port au Port?

MR. MORGAN: And we discussed what their plans are for the Port au Port general area. And they are not merely going to get a lease from us without us knowing what they are going to do with that lease. If we are giving them a long-term lease, Mr. Speaker -

MR. HODDER: What are you going to do? What are you doing?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: - and they decided they are going to invest a substantial amount of money, in fact millions of dollars over the next year or so in Piccadilly, to put a major processing facility in that area, which will mean a market for the fishermen and an increase in the fishermen catching in the harvesting sector, and a major number of jobs in the processing end.

MR. HODDER: They would have done it last year if they could have gotten the lease.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Bonavista North.
We have time for one quick question.

MR. STIRLING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. One quick question for the Minister of Fisheries. How many meetings were held by the Fisheries Loan Board between July and October?

MR. JAMIESON: 1979.

MR. STIRLING: Yes, 1979.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. minister for asking the question because I had intended to answer the question he asked yesterday, the same question, in the Answers to Questions. And I want to clarify a situation that has been somewhat misconceived that fishermen were fired from the Fisheries Loan Board because I have here the Minute-in-Council, which is an Order of Council, of Cabinet, which appoints the fishermen that were on the Fisheries Loan Board in '79, they were appointed July 1st., 1978 for a one year period and the term was to terminate the 1st. day of July 1979, which was last Summer. So the fishermen, when they were appointed to the Fisheries Loan Board, knew they were appointed for a one year term. They were told this by the minister at the time and by the Chairman, Mr. George, at the time.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. MORGAN: Now when they -

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

MR. MORGAN: - when they were appointed for a one year -

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: The time for Oral Questions has expired.

MR. MORGAN: By leave. By leave.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I have not said what I am about to say yet. The time for Oral Questions has expired. Is there leave for the minister to complete his answer?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): By leave. The hon. Minister of Lands and Forests.

Unfortunately today is Private Members' Day and four o'clock a Private Member's motion must be put so there may not be time for Answers to Questions.

The hon. minister by leave has leave to answer the question.

MR. MORGAN: Or I could answer it in the other section under Answers to Questions.

MR. SPEAKER: There may not be time.

MR. MORGAN: By leave.

MR. SPEAKER: By leave, the hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I want to clarify that because they were appointed for one year and the fishermen who were appointed, there is no reflection, and I want to make it quite clear, by the present officials in the Loan Board and the Department of Fisheries or anybody else who was there in the past, no reflection on the work carried out by these fishermen, none whatsoever. Now the question is, how many meetings were held from that period? Mr. Speaker, what happened was when their period or term expired the 1st. of July, the Chairman of the Board asked the fishermen to carry on after the 1st. of July, so that question, the technical question of whether or not they were supposed to be there or not was overlooked. They carried on making loans. So from the 1st. of July to the time the Chairman resigned, and Chairman Mr. George resigned as Chairman of the Loan Board in August, 1979, effective the end of August, so from the 1st. of July to the end of August there were a total - there were two board meetings held, two Fishery Loan Board meetings held involving the fishermen, despite the fact their time had expired the 1st. of July; the meetings were held on August 6th., and on August 30th. On the August 6th. meeting there were forty-four loans dealt with by the Board,

MR. MORGAN: and on August 30th. there were fifty loans dealt with by the Board.

MR. NEARY: Did they have a quorum?

MR. MORGAN: And this total of ninety-four loans were two meetings after the time of the expiration of the fishermen and then, of course, Mr. George resigned, there were no more meetings held by the Loans Board until the situation was brought to light by the department to Cabinet, that there was no more money left in the Loan Board, and then the Cabinet appointed an interim board. The interim board -

MR. NEARY: How many -

MR. MORGAN: The interim board consisted of Mr. -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: - Mr. Speaker, consisted of - I had the notes but I lost them now - I am sorry. Consisted of - well the interim board did consist of civil servants, but not all of them Fisheries. For example, we had the Federal Fisheries man responsible for bounties, federal bounties on boats -

AN HON. MEMBER: Parrott.

MR. MORGAN: - Mr. Parrott was on the board. We had the Assistant Deputy Minister of the Department of Industrial Development on the Board.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Eric Wells was seconded from the Department of Finance and a man from Treasury Board and, of course, a man from the provincial Department of Fisheries. So if you say civil service that is right. The Interim Board consists of civil servants, but as I mentioned earlier the fishermen were not fired from the board, their time expired and fishermen will be appointed to the board on the basis of consultation with the Fishermen's Union and the Fishermen's Union will recommend to us fishermen, to a point, but they will have representation on the board.

MR. NEARY: How many members -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order please! Standing Order 53(4) notes that the ordinary daily routine of business shall end not later than 4:00 and at that time the Private Member's motion shall be called by the Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: We decided this just before we came into the Chambers, otherwise we would have informed Your Honour beforehand, but it is the wish of the Opposition and the agreement of the government that Private Member's Day today will be dispensed with and we will get on with Interim Supply.

Mr. STIRLING: A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order. The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. STIRLING: Just by way of clarification, Mr. Speaker, and I am not quite sure whether you said that Question Period time has expired because it is four o'clock on Private Member's Day or has it expired because the time has expired?

MR. SPEAKER: Well, just for clarification, I assume that is why you asked the question?

MR. STIRLING: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: I called time for Oral Questions at three minutes to four because time had expired, but according to Standing

March 26, 1980

Tape No. 655

AH-2

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):
anyway at the latest.

Orders it must conclude by four o'clock

So we are now into Motion No. 1.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Butt)

Order, please!

Bill 33, head 1

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to

delay this subhead but I want to get a little more information on the public debt. Could the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) tell the House here how much, out of the annual budget, goes into a sinking fund to take care of the public debt? And do we have to - for instance, this year, will we be showing a deficit on current account to try to take care of the public debt? What percentage, what portion of the budget is now being set aside, allocated, to take care of the public debt which I believe the minister told us yesterday is \$2.6 billion or \$2.8 billion.

AN HON. MEMBER:

About.

MR. S. NEARY:

Well, which is it? There

is a difference of a couple of hundred million. I would like for the minister to confirm how much the public debt is, first, how much we have to set aside every year, are there any difficulties, are there any problems? And do we have to borrow - I think this is probably the key question - do we have to borrow money to pay the public debt because if we do that is a very serious situation? I would like for the minister to give us a little more information on the public debt.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. J. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, I have almost the

precise figure here but I have not got it quite precisely. It is \$2.745 billion, that is the public sector debt. Now, I may be out. It might be \$2.743 but it is certainly \$2.74 - something-or-other. That includes, as I mentioned yesterday, both the direct debt, that is the debt that the Province itself is directly responsible for and the debt that the Province directly contracted, plus the debt that the Province guarantees on behalf of school boards and certain companies and so on and so forth.

DR. J. COLLINS: So that is the overall debt of the Province. I do not have the precise figure for the direct debt but it is very close to \$1.8 billion; most of that is direct debt.

Now, as far as sinking funds go, I can certainly get the hon. member that precise information but it would be something of the order of \$20 million to \$30 million - around there - that is what goes into sinking funds per year, something of that order. I think it is nearer \$20 million than \$30 million but I can get that precise figure.

The hon. member asked, "Is the current account balanced?" I think that is what his question was. Over the past several years, anyway, I think it certainly goes back five years and I suspect it goes back beyond that, there has been a contribution to capital account from current account. In other words, we had been in a positive balance on current account for quite a number of years. There usually is a small balance, perhaps one per cent, perhaps two per cent, something of that order, on current account and that goes as a contribution to capital accounts. Out of capital account, which is essentially borrowed funds, comes our money for expenditures on things like hospitals and schools - well, we are not directly responsible for them but we are responsible for giving grants to the DECs to erect schools. So the capital works of the Province come out of the capital fund there.

The hon. member said, "Are we borrowing to take care of our debt?" Well, I suppose everyone borrows to take care of in terms of roll overs. I mean, we will have certain debt coming due, just like the federal government will have it, just like the U.S. government will have it, just like any government will have it, we will have a certain amount of debt coming due and then we will issue new bonds to repay that, we will roll over the debt. But I think the important question, and this is what the hon. member, I feel certain, was getting at,

March 26, 1980

Tape No. 656

SD - 3

DR. J. COLLINS:

on our debt?"

"Do we borrow to pay the interest

MR. S. NEARY:

That is right.

DR. J. COLLINS:

interest is in current accounts and we are in a positive balance on current account. So, we do not borrow to pay the interest on our debt obligations.

And that is not the case, no,

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Butt)

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to delay this particular subhead, but it is very important; we are on the matter here of the public debt.

MR. NEARY: It never ceases to amaze me how the minister can get up and have the face to tell us that we are in a good situation. Am I assuming right when the minister says that this year in current account we have a surplus that will be a transfer to capital account? Is that what the minister is saying, that this year there is a surplus again in current account?

DR. COLLINS: Would the hon. member permit me?

MR. NEARY: Yes, sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN(Butt): The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: No, I did not; at least, I do not think I said this year. I said for the past numbers of years because - I am not saying there is not in this year but I do not want to anticipate what I am going to say on Friday. I am just saying that for the past number of years, going back at least five years and, I suspect, longer, there has always been a surplus.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, that brings me to the question of what about this year? Do we have to wait now for the budget or can we find out while we are doing Interim Supply if there is a surplus or a deficit in current account? Has the minister been able to transfer any funds from current to capital account in this fiscal year? That is one question, and the other question I want to ask the minister, when he talked about a \$2.7 billion debt which, incidentally, has gone up from \$800 million back in 1972, in the Smallwood era, it took the Smallwood administration

MR. NEARY: from 1949 up to 1972 to incur a debt of between \$700 million and \$800 million and it has taken the P.C.s, the P.C. Administration, mainly the Moores administration, seven years to more than triple the provincial debt in this Province. Remember, between \$700 million and \$800 million when the Tories took over in 1972, on January 18, now \$2.7 billion, and that is a staggering debt, Mr. Chairman, for the people of this Province to have to bear. I would not mind, but we have nothing to show for it. We have nothing to show for it, not a thing. No new hospitals, very little in the way of new roads and road paving apart from the Trans-Canada Highway, apart from money that has come from Ottawa via DREE. No new industries, no new schools. The school boards are struggling. Every public service in Newfoundland is deteriorating and yet this administration, which is a continuation of the Moores administration, a continuation, Mr. Chairman, have gone from a provincial debt which we were told by members of the Opposition at that time, we were told by Mr. Ank Murphy, we were told by Mr. W.J. Browne, we were told by Jim Greene, we were told by the present Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer), we were told by the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey), we were told by the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), who is now the Government House Leader, that Joey was putting her under, there was no way that Newfoundland could survive, we were bankrupt. Everyone of these gentlemen got up in this House, one after the other, and told us day in and day out, 'Joey has sunk her, she is bankrupt'. And the debt at that time, remember, was between \$700 million and \$800 million. And now it is \$2.7 billion and nothing to show for it. Mr. Chairman, it is shameful! Shameful!

MR. NEARY: You talk about mortgaging your future and mortgaging your children and your children's children! I would not mind if we had something to show for it. We do not have a thing to show for it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in connection with that \$2.5 billion debt, the hon. gentleman just made a statement that we so far, and I think he was referring to the past several years, we have been able to manage to have a surplus in current account. I have grave doubts about that. I will have to see the budget. Well, I have seen the other budgets and I must say the gentlemen in Finance who altered their accounting procedure a few years back were pretty good at playing with figures, pretty good at it, and came up with a new accounting system, I believe when Crosbie was there, to make the government look good when, actually, it is all paper. It is all paper, it is not hard cash.

Will there be a surplus this year that can be transferred to capital account? Will there be a surplus in the current account? And also, Mr. Chairman, while the minister is answering me, could the minister tell us if included in that \$2.7 billion

MR. S. NEARY:

is the debt of Newfoundland Hydro? Are the loans and the outstanding debts of the Municipal Finance Corporation included in the \$2.7 billion? And all the loans or guarantees that are made to private business and industry and made to school boards and so forth, is the minister including all of that in the provincial debt? I yield now, Mr. Chairman, just to hear what the hon. gentleman has to say. But before I take my seat I want to reiterate, Sir, -

MR. FLIGHT:

Hit them while you can.

MR. S. NEARY:

- yes - that we are all rather taken back by the fact that the provincial debt - I am sure the hon. Minister of Education (Ms. Verge), in her innocence and in her simplicity, when she was running for election back in June of last year, when she was campaigning on the Status of Women in this Province, they had to have their representation in government, and the hon. minister was interested in pushing the Matrimonial Act in this House -

MR. F. STAGG:

Relevance, Mr. Chairman.

MR. S. NEARY:

Yes, it is relevant. Everything is relevant under this, it is a wide-ranging debate. We are talking about the public debt and the Consolidated Funds. The minister did not realize and did not tell her constituents or did not tell all the little pressure groups around her that the government that she was trying to become a member of had more than tripled the public debt in this Province over a seven year period. The minister has no pangs of conscience at all about -

MS. VERGE:

Look at all the schools (inaudible) Cabinet.

MR. S. NEARY:

Well, I would gladly entertain debate with the hon. minister on all of the schools that have been built since 1972. I would be more interested in hearing the minister's views on all of the schools that were built from 1949 up until 1972.

MR. S. NEARY: According to the minister's logic, if you triple the public debt you should triple the number of schools. The Minister of Health (Mr. House), who should be in Education, by the way, the Minister of Health should never have been put in the department he is in. The Minister of Health should still be back in Education, and we are finding that out in the last several weeks.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) a great minister.

MR. S. NEARY: No, I have a place for the hon. Minister of Education (Ms. Verge), I have a place for her. But anyway, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Education did not tell her constituents that the public debt had tripled in this Province and that we had nothing to show for it. I asked the minister and she said look at all of the schools. I wonder if the minister could pay a little attention to what I am saying. The minister just told me that a few minutes ago. I will gladly yield and have the minister stand up and tell me all the new schools that have been built since 1972 out of this tripling of the provincial debt. Would the minister care to accept my invitation?

MS. VERGE: I am captivated by you.

MR. S. NEARY: You are passing?

MS. VERGE: I am captivated by you.

MR. S. NEARY: Well, I am rather captivated by the beauty of the hon. minister, too. The only time I can get a chance to talk to her is across the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY: But I would be very happy if the minister would accept my -

AN HON. MEMBER: Challenge.

MR. S. NEARY: No, not a challenge - I would not be that harsh on her my invitation to get up and tell the

MR. S. NEARY: people of this Province and tell her constituents just what we have to show for this tripling of the provincial debt. I would be very interested in hearing -

MR. HOUSE: Ask the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts).

MR. NEARY: Yes, the member for the Straits -

MR. HOUSE: Every school that has been built in his district since 1972 - I officially opened 60 schools in three years.

MR. FLIGHT: Sixty? Extensions, showers put in, that sort of thing.

MR. HOUSE: Extensions? Erections!

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, it is wonderful, you know. The hon. gentleman need not get jealous because I am zeroing in on the Minister of Education there -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) how many 'Steve'?

MR. S. NEARY: Now, the hon. gentleman just made another statement there that I would like for him to elaborate on. I mean, this is a wide-ranging debate, anybody can get into it, members on both sides of the House can get up on the Interim Supply Bill just the same as you do when we are talking about Estimates even though we are not allowed to have an item by item analysis of the Estimates in this House now, that has been taken off the floor of the House, but

MR. NEARY: thank God we still have the Interim Supply Bill where we can get into Committee of Supply and ask a few questions. But I would be very interested in hearing what the minister has to say about all these new schools and tell us where they are so we can make a list of them and check and just see if they are extensions to schools, improvements to schools or are they new schools. Then we will have some comparison to make to the Liberal years, and then the minister can also tell us, while he is up on his feet, how many new hospitals, how many new hospitals have been built since 1972?

MR. FLIGHT: Or extension.

MR. HOUSE: \$65 million for one we just opened there (inaudible).

AN HON. MEMBER: One Steve. One Steve.

MR. NEARY: That is a wonderful answer, Mr.

Chairman. 'We are paying for the one started by the Liberals.'

MR. HOUSE: That is right. You are saying it is our debt.

MR. NEARY: The actual fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that this administration put a freeze on hospital construction in this Province.

MR. HOUSE: They had to bring some sense to it.

MR. NEARY: They had to bring some sense to it, the hon. gentleman is saying. They had to put a price tag on it, put a price tag on the people's health in this Province. They promised a hospital to Port aux Basques, where God only knows it should be the number one priority of this government, to put a hospital in Port aux Basques. What can I say about the hospital in Port aux Basques that has not already been said? I do not want to paint too bad a picture. Mr. Chairman, I would be reluctant, I would hesitate to put my cat in there. And I am not talking about the staff. The staff are excellent, they are out of this world, they are doing a magnificent job under desperate circumstances. They are a good staff and we have a good hospital board out there, and the hospital board have been duped and they have been conned by this administration. They were told to go and purchase the land

MR. NEARY: and the hospital would start. I believe it was back in 1975 they were told it was going to start and then in 1976. And there is no sign yet of construction starting on that hospital, and the people out in Grand Falls are waiting for their hospital extension. That was promised. We had a resignation, at least it was allegedly over the fact that they did not get the extension to their hospital. I have grave doubts if that was the reason why that hon. gentleman resigned from the Cabinet, but I am not going to talk about that now, I will talk about that later. But they are still waiting for their extension out there. And now, down on the Burin Peninsula, the hopes and expectations of the people are built up again, they are expecting on Friday when the Budget is brought down in this House that a hospital is going to be announced, a new hospital for the Burin Peninsula. And the hon. gentleman just sat over there and kind of shook his head when I said that as far back as 1975 and 1976 this government had been building up people's hopes in Port aux Basques, on the Burin Peninsula, in Clarendville and in Grand Falls on new hospital construction. And if hon. members will recall, the present Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) the year that he got defeated, back in 1975, they even built up a little platform down there, a little grandstand so he could go down and get up on the grandstand and officially commence the construction of that hospital. I am not sure if they are going to leave the grandstand there as a historic site or not.

MR. STIRLING: The hospital in Channel is bad, I must say.

MR. NEARY: Yes, the hospital in Channel-Port aux Basque is bad. And there is a gentleman sitting in this House - I wish the gentleman was down on the floor, he did such a wonderful job in the Port aux Basques area on the Southwest corner of the Province and was so well liked that people still talk about him out there.

March 26, 1980

Tape No. 659

AH-3

MR. NEARY:

I am talking about a good and faithful servant who served the people of the Southwest corner of this Province for a good many years who is now retired and has a better attendance record, by the way, in the Gallery of this House than the members do here on the floor. Dr. LeGrow I am talking about. Dr. LeGrow did a magnificent job, I would say.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wish hon. members could go out and visit the hospital in Channel - Port aux Basques.

MR. W. HOUSE: (Inaudible).

MR. S. NEARY: Has the minister taken the opportunity to go and look at that hospital?

MR. W. HOUSE: No, but I will very soon.

MR. S. NEARY: Very soon. Well, I wish the hon. gentleman would take me along with him.

MR. G. FLIGHT: He went to Grand Falls.

MR. S. NEARY: He went to Grand Falls, I am aware of that. But there is a desperate, desperate need in the Southwest corner of this Province for a new hospital. That hospital serves a large area of the Southwest corner of this Province. It serves the Codroy Valley. People come up from the Southwest Coast on the coastal boats - I do not know how far away; probably they come from as far away - I know they come from Burgeo and Ramea. Do they come from as far away as Grey River and Francois? Do they come from that far away to that hospital? I would say probably they do.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Do they come from Stephenville to that hospital?

MR. S. NEARY: I do not know if they come from Stephenville.

MR. STAGG: I know they come to Stephenville from Burgeo.

MR. S. NEARY: But anyway, Mr. Speaker, there is a desperate, desperate need. So if the Minister of Education (Ms L. Verge) and the Minister of Health (Mr. W. House) have a contribution to make to my strong condemnation and criticism of the administration for tripling the provincial debt and having nothing to show for it, then I have an open mind. I would be glad to listen to their argument. And if they have a good

MR. S. NEARY: argument, if they say they have their priorities straight, there have been no extravagance and waste in that tripling of the provincial debt, there have been no trips around the world for the Norma and Gladys, no Bob Cole contracts, no setting off explosions on either side of the Strait of Belle Isle to the tune of \$110 million, there have been no extravagance and waste in connection with Labrador Linerboard, there have been no sweetheart deals made for renting office space, no political patronage, no political appointments, all the money was spent on things that are worthwhile to the people of this Province, I have an open mind. And if the newly elected member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. H. Andrews) can convince me in his wisdom that I am wrong, that the priorities are straight, well, I will have to concede that the hon. gentleman is correct.

MR. FLIGHT: There has been no Norma and Gladys.

MR. S. NEARY: No, there has been no Norma and Gladys! All this talk about waste of money, that is all Opposition propaganda, that is all nonsense. There is no Bob Cole, that is just a myth, that is just something in somebody's mind. That never happened. You have to blot out the 1972 to 1979 years - blot that out of your mind, that did not exist. Well, I am open if somebody can convince me that all this money was well spent, that the public services of this Province are not deteriorating, that roads are not deteriorating, that roads are in as good a shape as they were when this hon. crowd took over in 1972, that the ferry services around the Province are as good as they were in 1972, that health services are as good, water and sewerage. I mean, I am open, I can be persuaded. But I have to say this, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, public services have deteriorated drastically in this Province since the Tories took over -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY: - have deteriorated drastically, Sir, and, Mr. Chairman, this is going to be a long, hot Summer in this Province. Here are people out on a day like this, demonstrating down in Twillingate. They were out down in one of my hon. colleague's districts the other day - in Fogo district, I believe it was - out demonstrating already

MR. S. NEARY: and this is only, it is not even the end of March yet, not even the end of March and they are out in full force. It is going to be a long hot Summer.

MR. MORGAN: There were more roads paved in the last seven years (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, let me say something to the hon. Chaw-mouth, let me say something to the hon. gentleman- who so far has not levelled with us on the Fisheries Loan Board or we will take him up on his offer this afternoon - that we would have had a better deal on the Trans-Canada Highway if it was not for the stupidity of the hon. gentleman.

MR. MORGAN: What stupidity?

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman wanted to get in bed with the Maritime Provinces, he wanted to be the big-shot. He wanted to be the big-shot.

MR. MORGAN: (inaudible).

MR. S. NEARY: And the hon. gentleman was warned not to get in bed with the Maritime Provinces but he wanted to and he did because the Maritime Provinces they have been in Confederation longer than we have, their roads are much better, their needs are less than they are in Newfoundland, and the hon. gentleman joined a delegation from the Atlantic Provinces to go up to Ottawa, to go up to Ottawa looking for a ninety - ten deal.

MR. MORGAN: Initially.

MR. NEARY: Initially, a ninety - ten deal and Ottawa said, "Well, hold on now, Maritime Provinces. Not Newfoundland."

Then the hon. gentleman finally came to the conclusion that he had put his foot in it. And then he decided to go it on his own. It was too late then, too late then,

MR. MORGAN: It was not too late. The Premier pulled out then.

MR. NEARY: And that is why, Mr. Chairman, we did not get a ninety - ten deal on the Trans-Canada Highway, it was only seventy-five - twenty-five, because Ottawa could not, in conscience -

MR. MORGAN: It was fifty-fifty.

MR. NEARY: Well, fifty - fifty. It was what?

March 26, 1980

Tape No. 661

EL - 2

MR. JAMIESON: It was fifty - fifty, seventy-five down to twenty-five.

MR. S. NEARY: Right, it was seventy-five, twenty-five and it was dropped down, gradually dropped down to fifty-fifty. But, could Ottawa have done any better for the Maritime Provinces? New Brunswick, P.E.I. and Nova Scotia had all roads, they were in Confederation longer than we were and they had gotten more benefits and their roads were in better shape. But no, the minister had to be the big-shot, and as a result of that stupidity and that blunder on the part of the Minister of Transportation of that day, we got a lousy deal. And then he comes into this House and has the face and the gall to blame it on Ottawa when it was done through his own stupidity.

We should have went it on our own in the first place -

MR. MORGAN: They can change it now (inaudible) -

MR. S. NEARY: Oh, they can change it now after the minister bumbled it and blundered it and -

MR. MORGAN: You are still blaming me now, are you?

MR. S. NEARY: No, Mr. Chairman, this is the first time I have told this story in this House, the first time I have told it, and I think it should all hang out because we have had so much bluff, we have had so many attacks made on Ottawa by the Tory administration in this Province as a diversionary tactic to get the heat off themselves, to cover up for their own mistakes and their own blunders and their own mismanagement. Blame it on Ottawa and if they do not blame it on Ottawa, blame it on John C. Doyle. That is what we have seen for the past seven or eight years in this Province, Mr. Chairman.

MR. JAMIESON: Or the past administration.

MR. S. NEARY: Or the past administration. And once in a while, it is getting less and less all the time, Joey's name is getting mentioned less and less in this hon. House. He is now being considered as the elder statesman of this Province and but for

MR. S. NEARY: the savage hatred of the Member for Mt. Scio and the President of the Council, his name is hardly ever mentioned now in this hon. House. And that gentleman, who was accused so often in this House, I had to sit here in this House when I was on that side and listen to the abuse and listen to the criticism that was heaped on the Liberals for bankrupting the Province. And the media, the Evening Telegram, not so much the Daily News, I do not think, the media -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY: No, the Daily News was not owned by the same people then; Mr. Currie was there. But, apart from as I said yesterday,

MR. NEARY:

apart from Wick Collins, who seems to be the only real political commentator left in this Province - thank God we have one - the only real one -

MR. MORGAN:

Can I ask you a question? Why

would you suddenly change your opinion towards Mr. Collins when he moved from one paper to another? Is it because The Daily News is now his employer?

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman -

MR. MORGAN:

You hated him last year.

MR. NEARY:

- the hon. gentleman is asking

me a question and I can only answer the hon. gentleman by saying it does not make any difference what paper Mr. Collins -

MR. MORGAN:

But you hated him last year, you said

so in the House.

MR. NEARY:

No, no. But I am not saying now whether

I like him. All I am doing is making a statement. I said yesterday that because he is the only one left, I do not know if we have sunk that low in Newfoundland or if that is a compliment to him, and he can take it whatever way he wants.

MR. MORGAN:

Playing a role (inaudible).

MR. NEARY:

But I will guarantee you this he

is playing a role in this Province. Thank God there is one left, that is all I can say.

MR. J. CARTER:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt):

A point of order.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Chairman, for the last

twenty minutes or so we have listened to a very interesting delivery but it has been delivered at such a high decibel count that it is wearing our ears. This House or this Chamber has a sufficient recording system and a system for magnifying our voices. There is no need for us to sit here and be shouted at. I urge your, Mr. Chairman, to tell that hon. gentleman to keep his voice down to a decent, sensible level.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Is the hon. member for LaPoile

going to speak to the point of order?

MR. NEARY: No, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN (BUTT): Well since his voice is having an affect on some hon. gentlemen's ears, I would ask him if he would just lower it a little bit. Thank you.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Chairman, I will not, not even for the Chair. It is up to me. If I want to raise my voice or lower it in this House that is my business. And if the hon. gentleman does not like it, if it is not too wet he can go back to his savoury patch for the day.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Name him! Name him!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, we have a couple of members on the other side who are very low class and I can name them if Your Honour wants me to. The member for Mount Scio (Mr. J. Carter) is very low class. The member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) is very low class. They have no style, no class. They have no class or no style, Sir, and that is part of the problem with this administration. Apart from not having class or style, they are immature. They are tilting at windmills all the time and they are using Ottawa and other excuses as a decoy for their own failings, for their own mistakes and their own blundering.

I will go back to where I started, Sir. I started off talking about the tripling of the provincial debt. And all this has to do with it because I am laying out a case in this House that this government have more than tripled the provincial debt and have nothing to show for it: No new schools worthwhile, no new hospitals, no industry, no mines, nothing, no paved roads worthwhile apart from the Trans-Canada highway paid for by Ottawa, the Great Northern Peninsula paid for by Ottawa, the Road to Burgeo paid for by Ottawa. Liberal governments up in Ottawa, Liberals paying for it, Liberal, Liberal, Liberal. This crowd trying to get credit for it, trying to climb aboard the Ottawa bandwagon, trying to upstage Ottawa, trying to make announcements before they are made by ministers in Ottawa. That

MR. NEARY:

is what we have had. We have not had a government govern this Province in the last seven or eight years. And now we have a Premier who is completely on the defensive, going around Canada ranting and raving trying to defend himself for his anti-Confederate speeches and utterances and remarks that he has made in this Province, anti-Confederate. Now he is out trying to defend himself and trying to defend the administration.

MR. STAGG:

There is only one anti-Confederate in this House.

MR. NEARY:

Yes, you are darn right there is only one anti-Confederate in this House.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He is not here now. He is in Nova Scotia.

MR. NEARY:

One followed by thirty-one, one anti-Confederate followed by thirty-one. And Mr. Cashin yesterday put his finger on it. If I am out of time now, Sir, I will sit down and I will take a few more minutes so we can talk about what Mr. Cashin thinks of this administration. But I still want to come back to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and the public debt. And I want to find out if Newfoundland Hydro is included in that debt, municipal financing corporations, school boards and if this year we are going to have a surplus in current account that can be transferred over to capital account as we have seen by manipulating figures in the past six or seven years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN (BUTT):

Order, please!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Before I recognize the hon. President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), I would just like to clarify a couple of points for some hon. members who asked me. I understand by leave of the House that we are discussing the schedule head by head because we would ordinarily do it in one complete package and I am simply pointing this out because I do not want to set a precedent here. And we would ordinarily call the clauses, clause by clause first, and then call the schedule. And the one other point that has been brought up is the time limit and I also understand that by leave of the House on yesterday that all hon. members would be given up to thirty minutes rather than the usual ten minutes that has been the procedure in Committee of Supply.

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: It was my understanding that we were to debate yesterday. Because of the confusion which arose yesterday we were to use the House rules, one half an hour speaking time when we were discussing the resolution. Now the resolution is now passed and we are now on the schedule, which is items one to nineteen or however many are there, and that we were then going to revert back to the Committee of Supply for the fifteen minutes a person. This was my understanding.

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

MR. JAMIESON: Yes, I concur in that as being the understanding. Perhaps it might be helpful to hon. members as to whether or not, since this is an unusual document in the sense of clause by clause, is the hon. the President of the Privy Council saying that we should go under the different heads of expenditure and just confine ourselves to Finance, if that is the one, and dispose of that? Or my own view is that given the nature of Interim Supply, staying with the rules of the Committee, but it might be more appropriate to permit the - if you wish to call it - the package

MR. JAMIESON: to be discussed on whatever matters that a member wishes to embrace within the time span that he has?

MR. MARSHALL: I am not talking about relevance. I am not talking about relevance, Mr. Chairman. I mean, on just about any of these heads when you are talking about money, anything is really relevant until one gets, you know, rather - you can get to certain ridiculous heights, but you would have to go pretty far. What I am talking about is the time allocation. I think the hon. member was a half an hour, but it is fifteen minutes, though.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Butt) It is ten minutes.

MR. MARSHALL: Ten minutes, yes, ten minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the hon. House Leader will permit?

MR. MARSHALL: Yes, go ahead.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed now that we will debate the schedule in ten minute intervals? Is it agreed by both?

MR. HODDER: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: A question to the Government House Leader. Many of those items here that we will be debating require that the ministers be in the House. You know, I have some questions for the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. Windsor) when he gets in and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge), and none of these ministers are here. I wonder would the Government House Leader undertake to see that the ministers are here so that we can ask a few questions?

MR. MARSHALL: You know, when we get to their heading they will be here for the purpose of answering questions. In the event some of them have meetings, like, for instance - and I do not know whether every day one has to get up in the House and make observations as to why who is here and who is not here, whether it should be like a school, we have a roll call. I am not referring to the hon. member's remarks here a moment ago, but I am referring to a purported statement that was made - I did not hear - this morning on radio to the effect about the absence of ministers and members from this side of the House.

MR. MARSHALL: If the reporter had cared to inquire, he would have found that members, not only on this side but on that side as well, were engaged, many of them yesterday, in a very legitimate endeavour out at the installation of the Bishop of Grand Falls and Harbour Grace.

MR. JAMIESON: It was not anybody from the House who made that statement.

MR. MARSHALL: No, no, no, no. I am pointing this out that this was made by, I understand, some member of the press here this morning. The point I am trying to make is we do not want to get into a roll call, and I am pointing out to the hon. member that the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. Windsor) was unaware that this was going to be called this afternoon. Before Interim Supply returns, if possible, we will have the ministers here, and I am certainly sure the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing will be here and the Minister of Education because they are in the building at the present time.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): I understand now from the hon. House Leader's remarks that we will, by leave, discuss head by head of the schedule with ten minutes as the rules apply in Committee, ten minutes per hon. member.

MR. D. JAMIESON: Certainly not by leave.

MR. W. MARSHALL: No, not by leave, by rules. You see, it is the rule of the House - Order 116.

MR. CHAIRMAN: By rules.

AN HON. MEMBER: We are resorting to the normal rules.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Standing Order 116.

Now, Mr. Chairman,

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: I just want to speak a few words on this heading and address myself to a few of the remarks made by the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. S. Neary) in his triple time -

MR. J. CARTER: Disgusting!

MR. W. MARSHALL: - and particularly with reference to the public debt. I make this because I want to put it on the record in case some of the friends of the hon. member tomorrow have it emblazoned in headlines that Neary accuses the government of increasing the debt to \$3 billion and compares that we have run it up by \$2 billion while the administration of which he was a part is only responsible, he says, for \$800 million when in actual fact it was \$1 billion at that particular time.

I point out again, as I pointed out year after year after year, so hopefully this might find itself at least a footnote in one of the papers - the morning paper anyway, it might be under the obituaries but perhaps it will be there tomorrow to the effect that, you know, the debt did not stop in 1970, there was interest on that public debt which had to be paid and this was a real commitment, it amounted to an anchor around the neck of this Province, an anchor around the government of this Province, it affected very much the programmes that could be brought

MR. W. MARSHALL: in because every year \$100 million a year compounded in interest on that debt so that consequently it is not right to say there is \$3 billion because, I will just point this out, we will hear it again and again from the hon. member, but it has to be pointed out that the world, even though the hon. member went into the Opposition in 1970 and even though he thinks the world came to an end at that period of time, in fact, the world did not come to an end and what has happened over the past ten years has been interest on interest on interest so that if you want to trace it you can really find it between \$1.7 billion and \$2 billion attributable to the regime of which he was a member. So I think that answers the question or at least I hope it answers the position being put forth.

Now, with respect to this whole matter, Mr. Chairman, may I point out, many of the questions asked by the hon. member will be answered and I think all of them, pretty well all of them, I know all of them will be answered to the satisfaction if not to the hon. member and his colleagues opposite to the vast majority of the people of Newfoundland at such times as the details of the budget are brought forth in this House on Friday and on the debate ensuing. It is very difficult from Interim Supply, when you are giving Interim Supply from the government's viewpoint, of answering in great detail the questions which have been asked because obviously the budget must remain a secret document until such time as it is delivered. And in giving the answers with respect to what is entailed in the one-sixth amount which we are asking for the two month supply in every head of expenditure, we end up thereby in giving the answers about the budget itself. And this is obviously something which we can not do.

I have viewed, I must say with a certain amount of amusement, the remarks made by, as I always do about 99 per cent of the remarks made by the Opposition about the fact that, you know, the government is flexing its muscles, trying

MR. W. MARSHALL: to run over the Opposition, bringing in Interim Supply a few days before the budget without telling them what it was before because I remember, and I think if anyone wishes to consult Hansard last year that when Interim Supply was brought in it was brought in at a time when the time for the bringing on of the budget was not known. And there was a great hue and cry then from the hon. members opposite about the fact that they were being asked to vote for Interim Supply without knowing when the budget was coming in.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. W. MARSHALL: So, obviously, you can not please the hon. members there opposite. Now the fact of the matter is what this is required for at the end of March of this year all authority the government has to spend money will cease, will terminate and this is in accordance with the Constitution. Interim Supply asks the Legislature to give supply,

MR. MARSHALL: give the government supply for two months. You are not being asked to vote for anything really, to give a blank cheque or anything like that. What we are really doing is we are being asked to give two months' supply and in the space of, now, forty-eight hours, the hon. the Minister of Finance will bring in his very significant document, the Budget Speech, which will contain full details. Now I am going to suggest to the hon. gentlemen there opposite, and it ill-behooves me to suggest how best to expend their time, that it would be more profitable to be able to discuss these headings, which will come up again in the Committees and in the House in April, when we are able to give the full and complete details with respect to them.

We are now discussing specific headings. All of the specific headings more or less represent two months' supply. When the House resumes we will immediately be getting into the budget debate, we will immediately be getting into the Committees, the Committees of Supply. All of the details which are being asked for will then be supplied and I think that the debate can then be much more effective.

Now I have to point out before closing - and I point this out again because it seems to have escaped from the statements made by the hon. gentleman yesterday - that I think insofar as the hon. gentlemen, and their supporters who get on T.V. from time to time, as we saw yesterday, who make statements as to the effectiveness of this government; I think one of the tests of the effectiveness of this government -

MR. F.B. ROWE: (inaudible) supporters?

MR. MARSHALL: Yes, I assume their supporters speak for them anyway.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Who are they?

MR. MARSHALL: Well, you have many supporters on openline and verious other places.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: Well, anyway, Mr. Chairman, one of the most effective bench marks of this government, one of the most effective measures of it competence -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: Tell the hon. gentleman, Mr. Chairman, I am not afraid to name names, but I do not choose to have interruptions from the hon. gentleman.

MR. NEARY: No, but you introduced it. You introduced it.

MR. MARSHALL: If I introduced it, Mr. Chairman, that is just fine. If the hon. gentleman wishes to get up and debate, and debate with me, he can debate. But I just do not choose to be interrupted by the hon. gentleman.

Now, the situation is that one of the most effective measures of the effectiveness of this government is the fact that I think that this is probably the first time in many, many years, if it is not the first time ever, that the budget has been brought in before the beginning of the financial year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Now, I think that that is yet another major accomplishment. So when there is a great hue and cry and a hullabaloo from people saying that the government is trying to ram through Interim Supply, they do not know what Interim Supply is, they do not know what the purpose is. Their criticisms would be well founded, I would submit, if we were putting through Interim Supply and we were coming up and we were saying, 'We will bring in the budget some day in the

MR. MARSHALL: future' not naming a day. Or even if we are saying, 'Oh, we will bring in a budget in May'. But what we are doing, Mr.Chairman, is we are bringing in Interim Supply and we are saying we want Interim Supply on a budget which is to be introduced two days hence, the first time, I think, that people have been told exactly when the budget will come in. And believe you me, Mr. Chairman, if the situation were that we had brought in Interim Supply without telling them when the budget was to be brought in, we would be hearing about that.

So that is the situation and, Mr. Chairman, I think this speaks well for the way in which this Province is being managed, as I say, that this is the first time that I can recall that a budget has been brought in before the people of this Province before the commencement of the fiscal year to which it applies. Nobody has been asked to vote for anything in blank, nobody has been asked to give a blank cheque. All we are asking is to allow the government to continue its operations for the two month period. We shall bring in the budget, we shall deal with the budget in the effective way in which we have set up the rules of this House and I think we will have a much more productive debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Chairman, I never cease to be amazed by the arguments advanced by the hon. the President of Council. I suppose one assumes that he believes in what he says but to suggest that the public debt of this Province, you know, was again attributable to the past Liberal administration, has got to be the most ridiculous thing -

MR. FLIGHT: He is living in a dream world, living in the past.

MR. T. LUSH: - that was ever uttered in this hon. House. Then, Mr. Chairman, to again suggest as a major accomplishment of this government is the fact that they are going to bring in a budget before the end of the fiscal year and before the commencement -

AN. HON. MEMBER: Name once when it was done?

MR. T. LUSH: - of the fiscal year to which it applies, Mr. Speaker, again going to be a great accomplishment. Well, I want to say is that this hon. member will not measure that to be an accomplishment, the fact when the budget is brought in. What will be, what I will be looking for is what is in the budget. That is what is going to tell us whether it is a major accomplishment or not. What is going to tell whether it is a major accomplishment, whether it is really something that the people of this Province have never seen before, is what is in it. What is in it in terms of the dollars that are going to be allocated to education? What is in it in terms of the dollars that are going to be for transportation? What is in it in terms of the money that is going to spent for forestry and agriculture? What is in it for the district of Terra Nova? That is what this hon. member is going to be looking at, that is what this member is going to be looking at.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Where is the correctional centre going.

MR. T. LUSH: The fishery, that is what this hon. member is going to be looking at.

MR. T. LUSH: Every time I speak to a budget I have to bring up the point, the firm philosophy which was enunciated back, I think in the first budget that money would be distributed and spent on an equal, on an equitable on an equitable regional basis. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is something that hon. members ought to direct their attention to. That great principle, that great tenet, that great piece of philosophy of this administration, that monies will be spent on an equitable and regional basis or on an equitable - sorry-regional basis. Mr. Chairman, that is something this hon. member will be directing his attention to in this particular budget. So that is going to be the measure of accomplishment of this particular budget, not when it is brought in, whether it is next week or whether it is three weeks hence. It is what is in that budget is going to be the measure of success and the measure of satisfaction that the people of this Province will find with that particular document with that budget. Now, Mr. Chairsmn, one would certainly approve of this particular Interim Supply Bill if this administration and its predecessors had demonstrated that they have spent the monies, the public dollars of this Province, in a wise and prudent manner, certainly on an equitable regional basis as was this government's announced philosophy. But, Mr. Chairman, when one analyses all of the departments and looks at what is happening in this Province, one has to doubt that indeed this particular government has been spending the public dollars of this Province wisely and prudently. When one looks at the quality of education in this Province, Mr. Chairman, there has been a continual deterioration in the quality of education in this Province in the past four or five years, a continual deterioration,

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. T. LUSH: A continual deterioration, Mr. Chairman, a reduction in teachers, Mr. Chairman, a lessening of the quality of programmes in this Province, which add up to, Mr. Chairman, a continual deterioration in the quality of education in this Province at this time. When I look at my own district, Mr. Chairman, and see the types of schools that children have to visit daily to acquire an education,

March 26, 1980

Tape No. 666

RA -3

MR. T. LUSH:

it is absolutely ridiculous,

Mr. Chairsmn, that children should have to go to the types of schools that they go to in many communities in the district of Terra Nova and throughout many other places in Newfoundland

MR. LUSH: which I visited when I was, early this Fall, visiting the Port aux Basques area and the Southwest Coast and all along there, and looking again at some of the schools that some of our children have to go to, Mr. Chairman, that is absolutely ridiculous. Granted there has been an improvement in some of our schools, but we, to this day, have too many schools that are inadequate, too many schools that are not up to the 1980 standards, too many, Mr. Chairman, too many **for** anybody to get up and to try and take praise for the great developments in education today, **it** is shameful when, as I have said before, there is a continual deterioration in the quality of education in this Province in the last four or five years, absolutely ridiculous.

Transportation, Mr. Chairman. Again, the government tries to take a lot of credit for all of the work that is going on around this Province in terms of paving and maintaining roads. Mr. Chairman, you just want to listen to the media and hear of the various communities that are complaining about the conditions of roads in **their area that** will certainly illustrate that we are not spending money wisely and prudently. We are not getting good maintenance of our roads, and the tremendous amount of paving that we are talking of doing around this Province is, again, attributable to the funds that we are getting from the federal government in Ottawa. I look down, Mr. Chairman, I look down at the money spent in transportation, the \$50 million, \$50 million, for the monies allocated, and not one single penny of that, not one single penny, was put into reconstruction, upgrading or paving of roads in Terra Nova. Well, that is so much for distributing and spending money on an equitable, regional basis, Mr. Chairman - not one penny, not one cent. Indeed, over the past eight or nine years I can say beyond a shadow of a doubt that there has not been a million dollars spent on reconstruction and upgrading of roads in the Terra Nova district.

Mr. Chairman, we could look at the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing and look at what has gone on there and look at where the money has been spent and how it has been spent. Here we are, Mr. Chairman, approving funds for the government that do nothing for municipalities in this Province on a wide

MR. LUSH: basis, but in the last year to bring in a Municipalities Act that is really only a delaying tactic, really, to get the government off the hook for the next five or six years in giving money to municipalities for water and sewer. This is going to be the effect of this particular act, Mr. Chairman. It is just a delaying tactic. They are out there scores and scores of municipalities that are not going to receive any funds, not going to receive any funds this year and, of course, the excuse is going to be because they have not brought in the property tax. That is going to be the excuse. They are not going to get it and, Mr. Chairman, I venture to say that, when the Budget is down and when the monies are allocated, that a very large percentage of that money is going to go to urban Newfoundland, and the rural communities of Newfoundland are going to get a very small fraction of the monies allocated for water and sewer systems in this Province. There is going to be a very small amount going to the rural areas of this Province, and the excuse is going to be, Mr. Chairman, that the council of Gander and the council of Corner Brook and St. John's have the property tax in place. That is why places like Glovertown and places like Eastport -

MR. FLIGHT: And Badger.

MR. LUSH: - and places like Gambo and all of these places, Badger, **that** is why they are not going to get any monies, because there is no property tax in place. But, Mr. Chairman, we will see, we will see when the Budget comes down and we will see when the monies are allocated how correct that assessment will be, and let us see if this Municipalities Act is not used as an excuse not to send monies to rural Newfoundland. We will see, Mr. Chairman, we will see about that.

MR. FLIGHT: Who knows the truth (inaudible).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH: Mr. Chairman, hon. gentlemen opposite - once it was referred to by the member from Lapoile (Mr. Neary) - they are expert at using diversionary tactics, experts at it. I think I said in this hon. House some months ago, in talking to that topic when **they would use** diversionary tactics, blaming Ottawa for all our ills,

MR. LUSH: when I mentioned that they blamed everything on Ottawa from flat feet to migraine headaches. Mr. Chairman, they still do that, and the great diversionary tactic now, of course, is oil and gas, oil and gas, to avert or take away the public's attention from the state of the economy in this Province and the high level of unemployment. That is the diversionary tactics,

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Chairman, that is the diversionary tactics they use, blaming Ottawa and now, of course, the off-shore oil and gas that is going to be the cure to all the problems of this Province. Just diversionary tactics, Mr. Chairman, to cover up for the ineptitude and the inaction of the government in terms of really getting down to dealing with the problems of this Province, improving the public services to our people, improving the level of education, improving our transportation system, improving water and sewer services. Mr. Chairman, that is the kinds of diversionary tactics that have been used.

Mr. Chairman, the state of the economy in this Province and the level of unemployment are matters that this government must come to grips with. These are matters that we must in this hon. House direct our attention to. It is not enough to talk about them but we must have action. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, a number of points need answering there. The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) asked what the direct debt of the Province was and in round figures it is \$1.8 billion, as I had indicated. I have since checked out that figure, it is \$1.8 billion for the direct. And as I have already mentioned, it is the \$2.7 billion for the public sector, for the whole of it.

MR. S. NEARY: What is the total?

DR. J. COLLINS: The total is the \$2.7 billion before as I mentioned and the direct part of that is the \$1.8 billion, so that is correct.

The hon. member for LaPoile asked what is the surplus this year. Well, not only really is he asking me to anticipate something that is going to be in the Budget in a day or so, but really in this Bill

DR. J. COLLINS: we are talking expenditure, You can only talk of surplus if you are also considering revenues and really this Bill is not addressing itself to revenues. So I do not really feel in a position to answer the question but I can assure the hon. member that he certainly will get an answer on Friday.

MR. S. NEARY: What kind of shape are we in right now?

DR. J. COLLINS: I am in pretty good shape actually.

MR. S. NEARY: No, I am not talking about the hon. gentleman's physical condition because the hon. gentleman looks like he is going to have a stroke.

DR. J. COLLINS: No, no. I will last for another month or so I guess.

MR. S. NEARY: I doubt if he will make it to Budget day. But about the financial shape.

DR. J. COLLINS: Well, when the Budget comes down certainly there will be an exposition of what our status is.

MR. S. NEARY: Well, we are giving the government \$300 million; we have a right to know if we are in good shape or not.

DR. J. COLLINS: Now the hon. member also asked about a new accounting system in the Department of Finance. I am not aware of any new major adjustment to our accounting system -

MR. S. NEARY: No, you were down practicing badminton when that came in.

DR. J. COLLINS: - but I will say this, that there are changes in our accounting system going on all the time. And I might mention, Mr. Chairman, that there was a report done by the Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants

DR. J. COLLINS: recently where they did an in-depth study of the accounts systems used by all provinces in Canada and the federal government, and they found that no two provinces had the same accounting system. This was a much awaited report and there will be a lot of attention given to the report because there are some very good suggestions that will apply to all provinces, that we should all make some changes in our methods and try to get more uniformity and I feel that over the next or so there will be a lot of attention paid in that area.

The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) also asked was the Hydro debt included in our public sector debt, and it is. It amounts to some \$600 million of that total public sector debt amount. Similarly, the NFMC, the Newfoundland and Labrador Municipal Finance Corporation that is also in the public sector debt, that amounts for something a little over \$200 million to the public sector debt. School boards they are in the public sector debt also. They account for something just over \$110 million. And then I do not have the figures for certain guarantees we have given to the fishing companies and so on but they are in there also.

MR. S. NEARY: We will get that in due course -

DR. J. COLLINS: Right. Now I might say that the hon. member referred to the hon. Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) and he called her innocent and simply. I think I should comment on that. I am sure the hon. minister is perfectly innocent of all blame that could attach to her but she is by no means simple in intellect or in her ability to carry on her duties, I will say that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), also wondered about how are we managing our debt, how much of a load is it on us? There is no doubt about it, the load on this Province in terms of its public sector debt is heavy, but it is not unique. There are a number of provinces in Canada now which are not too far off us in terms of per capita public sector debt.

MR. FLIGHT: There is more than one (inaudible) us.

MR. NEARY: The **President** of the Council (Mr. Marshall) said we were bankrupt in 1971.

DR. COLLINS: Well, as I say, we are not the only province in the ballpark that this Province is in, there are a few other provinces also in there. Now, on the other hand, there is one province that has little or any public sector debt and, of course, I refer to Alberta.

I might mention, Mr. Chairman, that the federal debt, the federal per capita debt is, if I remember correctly, now in excess of the Newfoundland provincial per capita debt. The federal debt is a very **onerous** debt.

MR. NEARY: She must be in bad shape up there then. We will get nar a dollar at all this year.

DR. COLLINS: There are a couple of measures that one uses, or a couple of criteria one uses to check on the debt load, and I might mention **them** to the hon. House, **One** that is very much in vogue and is found to be useful, and that is the debt service ratio. That is the interest expenses as a ratio of current account revenue. In other words, you take the revenues that come in for ordinary running expenses, what

DR. COLLINS: proportion of that goes to service your debt in terms of interest expenses. In our case it is approximately 16 per cent.

MR. NEARY: How many million (inaudible) \$200 million or \$300 million?

DR. COLLINS: In interest?

MR. NEARY: \$170 million?

DR. COLLINS: Our total current account revenues will approximate, and do not hold me to this figure, about \$1.2 billion, so 16 per cent of \$1.2 billion, whatever that is.

MR. NEARY: So it is \$175 million to service the public debt - \$170 million to \$175 million.

DR. COLLINS: Yes, it is approximately one-sixth, around \$200 million.

MR. NEARY: \$200 million to service the public debt.

DR. COLLINS: Yes, that is right, the public sector debt.

Now, I think those were most of the points that the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) brought up.

MR. NEARY: Carried.

DR. COLLINS: The hon. the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) asked what was in it for his district. Well, in this Interim Supply Bill we are asking the House to allocate a large amount of money to carry on education for the next several months and I am sure there are schools in the hon. member's district. We are asking for a hefty allocation for Health to carry on the health services in this Province. I am sure that health services are applicable to his district. Similarly with Fisheries, and similarly with Transportation and Communications. So there may not be any specific

DR. COLLINS: item in the bill there but, nevertheless, the hon. member's district will benefit from these allocations.

The hon. member also, I think, made comment on unemployment, that this government should be paying attention to the unemployment rate. Well, we are. We daily pay attention to it. I might point out that in the past year there was a significant drop in unemployment in the Province and not least of which occurred from the 750 high paid, although not necessarily full-time jobs, but nevertheless high paid jobs that were available through the oil and gas exploration off our coasts. I think the hon. member queried whether there was much use in our looking to oil exploration with a possibility of oil exploitation. I think it is well worth looking for oil exploitation off our coasts.

Also, the hon. member, I think, commented on education, whether this government was doing enough for education. I would point out that last year - I am not going to anticipate what is in the budget on Friday, but I would point out that last year there was an extra \$12 million given for capital construction in regard to education, that was in addition to the \$17.5 million for which we were also responsible. We were allowing another \$12 million of construction to go ahead, we were putting in sufficient monies to allow the DEC's to get into another \$12 million of school construction last year. I think those are the only points that I have at the moment,

DR. J. COLLINS:
that will come up.

Mr. Chairman, There may be others

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Baird)

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. D. JAMIESON:
Mr. Chairman, I am going to resist the temptation to become involved in an exchange with the hon. President of the Privy Council (Mr. Marshall) on his remarks, although I must say when I read them I dare say that I would be able to submit them to somebody as pure fiction and they might even make the Book of the Month Club in that category. The arguments were so circuitous and, you know, it is classic. Depending upon which particular argument hon. members opposite want to make,, they can either state that we have enormous unemployment - we have the Premier heading out across the country now talking about the dire straits and the desperate situation and the high rates of unemployment. When it suits the Minister of Manpower (Mr. Dinn), who was very accurate, I happened to have heard him yesterday morning, is that the unemployment situation is horrendous and so forth, yet when it suits the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) to say that the situation in Newfoundland is improving, he says the rate is going down.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is true.

MR. D. JAMIESON:
That is true, but the hon. the Minister of Manpower gave the actual statistics, and he has given them before and he is absolutely right, that the problem is you can look at it going down and say 'well, there is some improvement there', when in fact it is actually a reversal of that situation depending upon a couple of things, like he mentioned himself, namely, the participation rate and the very low level of participation, I believe, both on the male but particularly on the female workers side. But that is not what I got to my feet to ask, and if I could have the attention of the Minister of Finance - I do not mind waiting.

MR. D. JAMIESON: The proposition he put forward a few moments ago with regard to the ratio, if you like, of the servicing costs on the debt, viz-a-viz the general revenues, and the like, of the Province, could I just ask him, as a preamble to what I would like to say afterwards, is that one of the key elements that the bond houses or the lenders, other than the Heritage Fund in Alberta, is that one of the tests that they apply? And if it is, how does Newfoundland rate with that 16 per cent, I believe he said, compared to other borrowers in like circumstances? Has he any idea, in a sense, what the national average is provincially?

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

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, that is just one of the criteria but it is useful. Another one is the per capita debt, just the total amount on the basis of population.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is the per capita debt now?

DR. J. COLLINS: The per capita debt in the Province is approximately \$4,500 per capita, something of that order.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is the highest in Canada, right?

DR. J. COLLINS: Well, I cannot answer that, but if so it is not very far off at least two or three other provinces that I can recall to mind. We are high, we may be the highest, but we are not unique; in other words there are several provinces that are very close to us. The hon. Leader of the Opposition asked was this one of the things that the rating agencies pay attention to and I would have to say "Yes", they do. Again the same answer applies, I think, that it is a high ratio but it is not out of keeping with several other provinces. There are some provinces that have a much much lower ratio but there are several provinces that are close to our sixteen, I am not certain whether we are a bit ahead of them or they are ahead of us, but there are several close to us in that range.

MR. D. JAMIESON: I thank the hon. Minister of Finance. The reason for asking the question really relates to the enormous number of petitions from both sides of the House which make it clear that, I suppose, next to education and health, which are such absolute necessities, that the

MR. D. JAMIESON: crying need throughout many regions of Newfoundland today is for improved transportation. And I wonder if the experts, if you like, in the minister's department have at any time worked out what I might describe as a sort of ratio of cost benefit with regard to highways in particular. I will put this in the form of an observation or question, whichever it would help the minister best to answer, that I have been told, and I believe .

MR. JAMIESON: it is true that to maintain poor roads - the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett) is not here but he spoke the other day of a figure of, I think it was, \$50 million, something of that order, that he used, and he said this is what we are spending and this, nevertheless, is not enough to maintain these poor roads in even passable condition. Now, the point I am getting at here with regard to cost benefit is that I suggest that it might be worthwhile - in fact, it ought to have been done if it is not done already - to take the annual expenditure which goes literally and figuratively down the drain. It goes down the drain every Spring. Whatever is done or 90 per cent of what is done on secondary roads that are not paved or not in good condition disappears. So, it is a recurring, annual amount which does not result in any significant amount of improvement. Now what I am driving at here is that it certainly seems to me worth asking whether a comprehensive commitment over a period of whatever is the logical number of years - let us take five as the logical figure because the government is always talking about five-year planning - and say, on a calculated basis and a planned basis, that within a period of five years the road system in this Province we are going to get rid of, except for little bits and pieces here, there and the other place; we are going to upgrade and pave all of the roads in the Province that are left, do it on a consistent basis of that sort. If that were done, and here is where the question comes in, this annual expenditure, which gains us nothing in the long run - the first week of bad weather we get and all of that grading, all of that stuff that went on during the year on a gravel road, is all finished and done with - would it not make some sense to think in terms of a clear-cut commitment? Incidentally, it was done in terms of federal-provincial agreements, because we laid out a five-year program, as I recall it, with the government in Ottawa, which said that over that period the Loop Road was going to be done, the Great Northern Peninsula, the Burin Peninsula. It was done in a sensible way because the people - and I have personal knowledge of this - who were doing the work on the federal side concluded that it

MR. JAMIESON: was simply wasteful to merely carry the upgrading to the point where you did not put the hardtop on. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) if he has given any thought, and perhaps he can answer on behalf of the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett) who I would give you ten to one would say this was a splendid idea, whether anything could be done, because in those terms - and I relate it back to borrowing - it may very well be that it might make some sense for the government to earmark a particular portion of its borrowing annually for highways improvements. The other and final advantage that I see in a program of this sort is that it would get rid of this continuing uncertainty which Spring after Spring sees my hon. friend, the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Bennett), and Bonavista North (Mr. Stirling) and Bellevue and the gentleman from - I have forgotten - the South Coast, from Hermitage (Mr. Stewart) - all of these things come in year after year after year, and it is always the same ones. I am told - this is my first year representing the people in the Southwest Arm area, but that one has been on the go for years and years and years. So I hope the Minister of Finance got the gist of what was a complex or a complicated kind of question, but has the department, and he as Minister of Finance, given any thought to this, and is it the kind of expenditure that would justify even, despite the high debt, that it might make some sense in the long run to borrow in order to end, once and for all, what continues to be probably the worst single continuing problem that we have in the Province, next, I repeat, to Health and Education?

MR. NEARY: Before the minister gets up -

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

MR. NEARY: - I have another question I want to ask him, and perhaps we can get off of this subhead and get on to something else, but I want to ask -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) I got one.

MR. NEARY: No? Under this subhead? Well, first of all, I want to confirm what the minister just said, that the per

MR. NEARY: capita personal debt in this Province
right now is \$4,500 per capita. Every man, woman and child in this
Province now has a debt of \$4,500 hanging over his or her head.
Every baby that is born today, tomorrow, next week, has a debt of

MR. NEARY:

\$4,500 hanging over its head.

MR. JAMIESON:

Welcome Wagon (inaudible).

MR. NEARY:

You talk about your Welcome Wagon.

The government has its own welcome wagon, \$4,500 debt.

MR. CARTER:

Joe Smallwood's fault.

MR. WHITE:

Oh sure it is, sure.

MR. NEARY:

Well, if it is not his fault, it is

Mr. Doyle's fault. If it is not Mr. Doyle's fault it is Ottawa's fault.

MR. STIRLING:

For bringing us into Confederation.

MR. NEARY:

So let the word go out, Mr.

Chairman. And to my way of thinking, Mr. Chairman, that is a very, very serious situation, very serious indeed. It is the highest in Canada and probably higher than most of the states in the United States, a per capita debt of \$4,500. Every man, woman and child and every child that is born today or from now on owes \$4,500.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have been hearing an awful lot here lately about oil, and the government has created an oil boom syndrome. There is no boom but the government tries to leave the impression there is a boom and as a result of government creating that oil boom syndrome the cost of everything, especially on the Avalon Peninsula, has started to go up. As I said in this House before the scavengers are in here, the land grabbers are in here, the four wheel drives are out in the countryside, the Lincoln Continentals and the Cadillacs are all over the place and the land grabbers and the scavengers, not from Newfoundland, some of them are from Newfoundland, are out there in the countryside like maggots buying up industrial property and real estate. And they have driven up -

MR. CARTER:

Name some.

MR. NEARY:

Yes. I could name some. They have driven up, they have inflated the cost of real estate. There is not one square inch of industrial land left on the Avalon Peninsula. What

MR. NEARY:

buddies of the government and the government themselves, some of the ministers, have not grabbed up the land grabbers from the mainland, Mr. Chairman, the land grabbers from the mainland -

MR. CARTER: There are other (inaudible) grabbing it.

MR. NEARY: Do you want to put your salary for the next ten years up against mine?

MR. CARTER: Name names.

MR. NEARY: No, I do not have to name names Mr. Chairman. When my research is complete the hon. gentleman will have the benefit of my report. But, Mr. Chairman -

MR. MORGAN: You will bring it into the House, I suppose, will you?

MR. NEARY: Yes, I will bring it to the House. The real estate has gone up considerably. Young people, well, anybody who wants to buy a house, not only young people, anybody who wants to buy a bit of property today, a bit of land to build a House today is completely frustrated.

MR. J. CARTER: To a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN (BUTT): A point of order. The hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, to a point of order. I suggest that a slimy innuendo has been made against the ministers of this government and if any of them have been guilty of dabbling, using prior knowledge to dabble in real estate, then the hon. gentleman should either name names or he should be named. Could we have a ruling on that?

MR. JAMIESON: Mr. Chairman, I -

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the point of order. The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. JAMIESON: Yes to the point of order. As far as I am concerned I have been listening, for the last three or four days, to the hon. gentleman for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) with asides and offhanded remarks and interruptions which I suggest are completely unparliamentary. And on the point of order I distinctly heard my hon. friend and he made no aspersions

MR. D. JAMIESON: insofar as any member of the ministry was concerned. And I do not believe that a check of Hansard will show it and I suggest there is no point of order.

MR. S. NEARY: Right on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. J. MORGAN: To the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): To the point of order, the hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, I was sitting here doing some work and listening but I got the clear interpretation - that the statements made by the hon. gentleman for LaPoile (Mr. S. Neary), that the insinuation was clearly left that there were ministers of the Crown who were dabbling in real estate and involved with some people from the mainland involving real estate matters which is a very serious charge. And he went on to say, when questioned by someone from this side of the House, that he would bring the information forward to the House when his investigation was complete. Well, that is fine but at the same time the insinuation, the innuendo, is left that certain ministers of the Crown are involved in wrongdoings in connection with real estate in the Province. And therefore, Mr. Chairman, that remark should be withdrawn - remarks casting aspersions on ministers of the Crown.

MR. J. CARTER: Further to that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the point of order, the hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER: Any member of this House may make an accusation against any other member provided he names the name and brings in documentation; then the matter can be debated and the matter can be disposed of. But just to make blanket accusations that some minister of the Crown has dabbled improperly in real estate is a very, very serious charge. And I think he should either withdraw it unequivocally or else be asked to back it up.

MR. S. NEARY: Curiosity killed the cat.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): To the point of order, as I understand it, the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. S. Neary) did not name any specific ministers and I would rule that there is no point of order.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Now, Mr. Chairman, I was talking about these land grabbers who have come in here from the mainland who are out in the countryside inflating the cost of real estate to people in this Province who are interested in establishing in business, who are interested in building homes and buying homes. I do not think there is any doubt about that, Mr. Chairman. And government has created this situation by portraying the impression that there is an oil boom. Now, the question I want to ask, if the government have such faith in the offshore resources, if the government have put all their eggs in one basket and are prepared to neglect everything else, let services deteriorate in this Province, put all their eggs in one basket and can think of nothing else only oil, oil is going to be the salvation of this Province, then will the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) tell the House if they are so optimistic about the future of oil and about what it is going to do for Newfoundland, how long will it take? if the oil started to come ashore, say, next year, on January 1st of next year, if the oil stated to come ashore next January, how many years from that date will it take to wipe out our public debt, to eliminate that \$4,500 dark cloud that is hanging over the head of every man, woman and child in Newfoundland? How long would it take? And will the minister, while he is answering that question, also tell the House, if they are so optimistic about oil, if oil is going to be the salvation of Newfoundland, if everybody is going to become rich because of oil, if the Public Treasury is going to start bursting at the seams because of oil, will the hon. gentleman tell us if it is possible for government to borrow more money - if they are optimistic about the oil, to borrow more money to look after the road conditions, to build new roads, to build new

March 26, 1980

Tape No. 673

SD - 3

MR. S. NEARY: hospitals, to build new schools,
to provide the services, to reduce taxes, will the government,
because they are so oil conscious and because they have so much
faith in oil and they are so optimistic about the future because
of oil can they now go out this year and

MR. S. NEARY: because of oil, can they now go out this year and borrow more money?

MR. W. MARSHALL: In forty-eight hours the hon. gentleman can see exactly how much is going to be borrowed.

MR. S. NEARY: No, but I am asking the hon. gentleman is this possible? Because the government has so much faith in the oil and they are placing the whole future of Newfoundland in the hands of the oil barons of the world, can we borrow the money to repair the roads, to build new roads and pave roads and build new hospitals and new schools and provide the services that are needed in this Province. Can we do that? If the government does not do that then I would say they do not have as much faith in oil as they are telling us.

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

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Leader of the Opposition put forward a proposition which is, I think, a very reasonable proposition - I should say valid, perhaps reasonable is not the right word - certainly a very valid proposition because if it was not a valid one I suppose we should have gravel streets in every town in this Province and so on and so forth. So there is certainly value to paving and I think, not only from the point of view of convenience and cleanliness and all the rest of it but very likely from the point of view of maintenance. And I wonder if the hon. Leader of the Opposition, and he alluded to this, that he has a special feel for this because I think in his own district he probably pursued that course of action when he was in Ottawa and fortunately for that district, and in many respects for the Province, he was in a position to put forward a proposition like that and make it stick a bit. And I think that everyone will agree that in his district there is a lot of paving there and I am sure -

MR. D. JAMIESON: We would have agreed to pave every trunk road in Newfoundland under the DREE agreement, every one.

DR. J. COLLINS: Right. So I would say it is a valid proposition. Now, of course, the next question is should we get into it? And this is where the difficulty comes because there is no doubt about it if one wanted to do that you would have to go into quite a heavy borrowing programme for that specific purpose. I find it a little difficult to reconcile that thought with the thought that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) then brought up where he complains about the amount of per capita debt here -

MR. JAMIESON: I qualified it too.

DR. J. COLLINS: Yes. I am not saying that the hon. Leader of the Opposition was inconsistent, I am just saying that there was an inconsistency between the approach taken by the two members opposite, that we can hardly get into a large borrowing programme to do all this paving, which may well be a valid thought, and then at the same time complain about taking on a big debt burden, one just cannot do both together. When the means are available, or in prospect, I think that a study like that might well be most enlightening and might well give the way to go.

I might add at this point, Mr. Chairman, that when the five year development plan does come down that the Department of Transportation and Communications will have their input into that; they already have and their five year perception of things will be laid before this hon. House and hon. members will be able to judge how it approaches that concept that the hon. Leader of the Opposition brought up.

The hon. member for LaPoile mentioned speculators, and he has knowledge that there is undue speculation going on and that it is having an effect on the

DR. J. COLLINS: cost of living index. In this regard I would just point out, and hon. members will recall that the Premier of this Province gave a commitment that in terms-and the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) was referring, I believe, specifically to industrial land - he did make the statement in this House that if speculators do buy up land that is ultimately needed for the prosecution of our expectations offshore, that that land will indeed be expropriated and the price paid for that land would be

DR. COLLINS:

a price that was in effect before a speculative look was taken at it. That statement was made in this House and that commitment was given, and I have no doubt that that commitment will be kept. In other words, if someone now thinks they see an area of land that is likely to be used for the operations offshore and they buy that up at a low price now and hope that that price will escalate and if indeed that land does become necessary, if need be the Province will expropriate that land and will pay them the price that they paid for the land, if that is a reasonable price, and will not pay them a high speculative price.

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

DR. COLLINS: Yes.

MR. STIRLING: I cannot quite believe what I am hearing because when I was involved with the City of St. John's we did have to acquire a fair amount of land and I would be interested in having the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) who is a lawyer confirm what you just said. Because my understanding is the Crown has the right to expropriate but they do not have the right to set the value, the value is set by the market value. And if it is established that the market value is the now, what you would call, inflated value, as long as somebody is willing to pay that then what you are saying - I would be interested in hearing whether the President of the Council agrees that you can legally do that.

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, what I said was this was an undertaking, a statement, a commitment given by the Premier in this House and if it is required to carry out that commitment, that statement that there will be changes in the law, Presumably the law will be changed and this House has it in its power to bring in, to make adjustments, to make amendments to the Expropriation Law. That was a clear understanding given by the Premier in this House and it was designed for that very

DR. COLLINS:

purpose, to sound a warning if there are people who wish to speculate that they do so at their peril and they will not do so to their ultimate gain if the land in question is required for the public interest in terms of exploiting our offshore resources.

The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) asked, I believe, when can we expect to get benefits from the offshore. There will be something when we do the sector review in the Budget document, there will be information, to the degree that it is available, brought forward at that time and I would propose to leave the question until then. He also asked whether we could in natural fact borrow more on our expectations, and I would say the answer is yes. There is no problem in borrowing. I think we could probably, if we put our minds to it, go out and borrow a billion dollars tomorrow. The problem is paying for your borrowings. If you pay enough you can borrow but if we are to be responsible about things we can only borrow to the limits that we feel can be adequately handled in our current account budget. And we will only borrow in prospect when that prospect is very near. I think hon. members will be aware that in Norway they got into trouble that way. There they had very reasonable expectations for large inflows of revenue from their offshore resources and they actually borrowed on that prospect. Unfortunately, there was a year or more delay in the actual flows coming ashore and for a while - and I believe they are still just digging themselves out of the hole - for a while the Norwegian economy was in a rather shabby state.

MR. CHAIRMAN (BUTT):

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. JAMIESON:

I would like to pursue, and perhaps my hon. friend from Bonavista North (Mr. Stirling) might also, this question with regard to land speculation and the ability of the government to introduce new legislation which would prohibit, what

MR. JAMIESON: I will call, for want of a better word, gouging, that if people are picking up land or properties with the idea that they may escalate in value, if I understood the hon. minister correctly, what he said was that the law could be altered in such a way to ensure that it would not be resold at an exorbitant or even at a market price if that was seen to be inflationary. Now the question is, and I put it by way of an observation, I suspect that that could only be done if the Crown itself, even if it could be done at all, it could only be done if the Crown itself were going to acquire the property. Let us say, and I will put forward this hypothesis because I think it is a very, very important point now and I hope that it can be clarified, if not this afternoon then in coming weeks, because we all know, as the hon. member for Lapoile (Mr. Neary) said, what is happening, there is no question about that, but let us say that a non oil associated company were now to speculate and buy land, and then a private company, a private company, were to become involved in oil and gas related activity, would the government be able or would this House be able to, by legislation or otherwise, set limits on what one private person can get from another private person, and I am using the word 'persons' here in the corporate sense. I can understand how, if the government wanted for its own purposes and a Crown corporation or something like that, I can understand how, in the right of the Queen, in the right of the Province, that could be done, but could, in fact, any legislation in this House determine and protect a private company from someone who had bought property? Is that the concept that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is advancing?

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Butt) The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, my purpose in responding the way I did was just to remind the House of the commitment given by the hon. the Premier, and I would not wish actually, without further study, to go into this in any great detail, but my understanding at this point in time was, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition's is, that clearly it would be difficult to support government's doing

DR. COLLINS: something for a citizen or a private company against the best interests, as they were seen by some other citizens or some other private companies, I think that would be difficult to support. I think when the hon. the Premier made his commitment it was for the purpose of protecting in the public domain or if the public good was compromised, that this speculation would not be allowed to stand in the way of development. I think, specifically, we will have to have what might be called, shall we say, a terminal of whatever means. However offshore hydrocarbons do come ashore, whether it is in tankers or whether it is in pipelines of however it is, there will have to be a terminal of some description in the Province, clearly, to accept it. Well, if there is speculation, buying up land around the terminal that will ultimately be decided, that speculation will not prevail. That is the essence of the Premier's commitment, I think, and that would mean, of course, that that terminal would become essentially the property, either directly or whatever, of the government of the Province.

MR. JAMIESON: So that I am correct -

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

DR. COLLINS: Yes, that would be my understanding.

MR. JAMIESON: - yes, and I do not want - obviously, indeed, in some respects it is a bit unfair to be asking for legal opinions from the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) in this matter. I do want to say as a final word on this that I think it is an extremely important point for clarification at some stage, given perfectly legitimate enterprises - and let me declare myself that I am not in the slightest bit involved - but

MR. JAMIESON: that it is a perfectly legitimate thing for someone to know, whether indeed if they see a potential business opportunity the risk, if that is the word, they are taking, and the conditions under which the marketplace would not be permitted to function but that government intervention would come into it. I do not want to give a facetious argument, but let us say someone has bought four or five houses, or even a house on the grounds that in five or six years they are going to be able to improve on it and now they are lashing out 15 per cent mortgage money and the like, I would assume that that kind of thing would come under control because if it is, then I think there should be some clarification given as to what the government's specific intentions are rather than in generalities. But I understand that the minister cannot go much beyond what he said now.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. STIRLING: Yes, it may be sufficient for me, because I know my colleague here has another question, sufficient for me to say that I certainly intend to open this question up tomorrow because it is a very significant departure from the normal process and it may explain, Mr. Chairman - and the lawyers who are present should certainly take note - it may explain why this government has not done anything about land assembly, for example, for housing. Because I do know something about what I am speaking about in this connection because I was involved with the City Council that with the help of the provincial and federal governments bought up land well in advance of speculation taking over. Because what the minister has just introduced, and he may believe it because the Premier said it, he may believe that that did it because the Premier said,

MR. STIRLING: 'If speculators think they are going to take advantage, we are going to bring in a law'. He may have accepted the Premier at face value and the Premier may really believe he can do that, but I do -

DR. COLLINS: You did not listen to much of what the hon.the Leader of the Opposition and I were just talking about.

MR. STIRLING: Oh I certainly did. I certainly did. I understood you to say, for example, if - let us use the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) as an example, just as a hypothetical case, who owns some land in this area. What I understood you to say is that if you decide that you want to expropriate his farm and that you want to put in a facility on that land, as I understand what you said, and that the member for St. John's North says -

MR. CARTER: Being hypothetical.

MR. STIRLING: Being hypothetical, of course - the member for St. John's North, I happen to use that example because it is in St. John's and because of my experience on these federal/provincial committees, of what used to happen up until this point. If the member for St. John's North says, 'No, you cannot take my land', the Crown has every right to expropriate the land as you expropriated Churchill Falls. You have every right to do that and say, 'Member for St. John's North, we have taken your land over as of this day'. And then you try to establish the value. And the member for St. John's North establishes as the value of his land a piece of land that was sold, to a private company, next door to it for \$100,000 an acre, and one next to that for \$100,000 an acre, and one next to that for \$100,000 an acre, and establishes the market value of his land as \$100,000 an acre. What I understood the minister to say,

MR. STIRLING: is that the Premier has given a commitment that the Province will introduce legislation to say, 'No, we are only going to pay you the value of the land when you bought it, or you inherited it, when it was used for farmland, and we are going to pay you \$2,500 an acre', an absolute, complete departure

MR. L. STIRLING:

from the normal process and one which may explain why the government in its ignorance is not going out acquiring land well in advance and it is a very fundamental principle. And I just want to - because I do want to give my colleague a chance to answer it - I want to give notice that tomorrow I do intend to bring this back because it may be that the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) misunderstood the Premier or it may be that the Premier does not understand what his authority is or he intends to take action which will be something that has not happened anywhere else in Canada, saying, that, for example, purely hypothetical, the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) can not get the market value for his land if he decided to sell it at a time when the government decided to expropriate it.

I realize that the Minister of Finance just introduced this and then I would say that we definitely have to get that clarified and I just give notice that I will bring it up tomorrow when we have more time and maybe the Minister of Finance will have a chance to talk to the Premier tonight.

On motion Head 1 carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Butt)

Shall Head 2 carry?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. Minister of Labour and

Manpower.

MR. J. DINN:

Mr. Chairman, today, you know, there has just been a few points brought up that maybe with a little clarification, some of the things that I know that are going on with respect to the Northeast/Avalon area, that may clarify for hon. members opposite what the situation is as it exists right now.

We have, passed by the government, a Northeast Avalon regional plan. All the land in that region is designated agricultural or forest land, industrial, commercial -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible)

MR. J. DINN:

Yes. And whereas some speculators may come in here and look at a nice piece of land and say, "Well, you

MR. J. DINN: know, we are going to have some offshore oil development here and I will buy up that land. I can get it at a fairly cheap rate." And they are going to get a bit of a shock down the road when they find that that is zoned agricultural and no industrial park can go on there. It just simply can not go. I mean, they can pay whatever they want for that land, the fact of the matter is, if it is zoned agricultural all we have to do is say that it stays agricultural, we are not going to rezone it and it is as simple as that.

We have land right now designated as agricultural. We have land designated residential, we have land assemblies right now. We have the capability, I believe, if you include Cowan Heights and if you include the land assembly in at Newtown, the capability of some 2,000 lots. That is all controlled, that is zoned residential, that is zoned by the government. And it does not matter what amount of speculation goes on, what has happened up to this point in time is that government basically develops the land and sells it at cost. So you can have your speculation, you still have protection, especially in the Northeast Avalon area with respect to what can happen. If you have it zoned forestry, I mean, they can go and buy all the land they want unless they are getting into a forest operation it simply will not be rezoned. And if the government determines that they will not rezone it, they will not rezone it. And there is no amount of speculation that can affect that situation.

If the government wants land that is now zoned forest land and buys that land and expropriates that land, it does not matter what a person pays for it, it is still forest land and they can expropriate that land, it does not matter what they paid for it. A guy says, "I paid \$25,000 an acre or \$50,000 an acre." We will say, "Are you going to start a sawmill on there now." And if they are not going to start a sawmill or some type of forest operation that is it and they are not going to develop it. It is as simple as that.

March 26, 1980

Tape No. 678

SD - 3

MR. J. DINN:

Right now the Northeast Avalon, and it is a clearly defined area, has set out in it most of the land outside of what is in the city of St. John's, which they have total control over, has set out designations as to what that land can be used for. And it is only the government who can change that designation. So there are in effect right now quite a few controls and there are also

MR. DINN:

quite a few controls with respect to residential development. Now, speculators, as I say, can come in here and buy up all the farmland they want. And I do not know if we can prevent a farmer from selling his farmland, I mean, if he wanted to sell it. The fact of the matter is, unless the guy is going to start a farm that is it. I mean, there is no industrial park going to go there if the government decides that they do not want an industrial park there. So it is laid out fairly well now. The fact of the matter is, the Premier made a statement and I think that statement can be lived up to in many ways. You can rezone the land agricultural land, forest land and prevent development. It is as simple as that. You do not have to expropriate it. If you need land for a development you can expropriate land. I mean, there is nobody can question that in the Province. The government has the right to do certain things like that.

So what I am saying is that there is built in right now quite a bit of protection for the people, especially in the North East Avalon area and that protection is built in and whilst we have - and everybody knows, I do not think there is a member here in this House but knows that there are speculators in here buying up land and getting options on land and so on. I mean, their shock is going to come down the road when they try to build an industrial park there because the fact of the matter is, there is land set aside for industrial parks and if they want to build outside they have to get it rezoned and the government is the only one that can rezone the land. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

On motion Head 2 carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN (BUT):

Shall Head 3 carry?

MR. STIRLING:

Mr. Chairman -

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. STIRLING:

In the head, Executive Council, that is where the Action Group was last year and there was money left over from the Action Group. Is there any of the Action Group and then McConnells - and McConnells has now been brought out in the Auditor

MR. STIRLING:

General's Report and it is now a matter that is before this House and before the Public Accounts Committee - is there any money included in this vote, the \$980,000 in the Executive Council, to pay for any outstanding bills of the Action Group.

MR. CHAIRMAN (BUTT):

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

If the hon. member will just allow me to scan down through it.

MR. STIRLING:

You can keep it for tomorrow if you like and go on to another head.

DR. COLLINS:

I would be most surprised if there is and I can assure the hon. member that the notes I have here, and these are quite extensive I think, the notes I have here do not in any way allude to the Action Group one way or the other.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Do you want to call that one now and pass that one, number three?

MR. STIRLING:

Save it for tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL:

Let it stand. I move the Committee rise then, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS):

The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has considered the matters to it referred, has made progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. President of the Council.

March 26, 1980

Tape No. 679

IB-3

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I move the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Thursday at 3:00 P.M. and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday at three of the clock.