

VOL. 2

NO. 46

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 P.M. - 6:00 P.M.
TUESDAY, MAY 24, 1983.

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and, failing that, the Premier. Neither of these gentlemen seems to be in his seat so I guess I will ask the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall). The question concerns the lobster fishery, the salmon fishery and so on and the interference of Arctic ice with those fisheries along the Northeast Coast. I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that this year's fishery at least promised to be one of the best on record. Now, unfortunately, that has been interrupted by ice conditions along the coast. I know, for example, that in Musgrave Harbour, Ladle Cove, Aspen Cove, Carmanville, Frederickton and Fogo Island, a great deal of lobster, lump roe, salmon fishing gear and herring fishing gear have been lost. I am wondering if the minister is aware of and could inform the House what the extent of that loss is? If that is not certain, would he now give a commitment to have officials of the Department of Fisheries run a thorough inventory of what has been lost as soon as it is possible to do so?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, we are certainly aware of the situation but the extent of it is not immediately known. All I can tell the hon. gentleman is that the officials of the Department of Fisheries are on top of it and will, in fact, be monitoring it.

MR. TULK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I have reason to believe, out of the checks that I have done myself, that perhaps the loss is extensive. If it is, once, as the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) says, the government finds out how extensive the damage is, I am wondering what form of emergency assistance or aid is the government prepared to make available to these fishermen so that this year's fishery, which was a very promising one, I would point out again, will not be a total loss for them? What type of assistance or aid can they expect from government?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the situation, as I said, is being assessed, so obviously one could not make any specific response to the question the hon. gentleman has given. I can only tell him that we have to see what the situation is first. We have to operate within budgetary constraints that affect us all, affect the fishing industry and affect everyone else, and that is all that I can say at the present time.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK: I am wondering if the Government House Leader is aware that there are indeed some fishermen with 400 to 600 pots who have just salvaged something like fifty of them? I understand the government operates what is called a lobster pot bank and the cost of those lobster pots, I understand, without including the cost of rope and ballast and so on, is \$7. I understand that at a meeting

MR. TULK:

last night in Fogo district it was decided to ask the government to reduce the cost to approximately \$2 per trap. I wonder how the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) feels about that proposition and is he prepared to implement that measure once the inventory of damage has been carried out? I might point out that with the government's lobster pot programme, a lobster pot costs the fishermen more than it would if he had made it himself, so I am wondering if he is willing to go along with some form of subsidization? Surely he can answer that now even without knowing what the loss is, how great the loss is, I can tell him that in some cases it means, as I said before, where a person had 500 or 600 pots he is now down to fifty right in the middle of the fishing season, so I am wondering if he can tell us if he is willing to subsize the cost of those lobster pots that are found in his lobster pot bank and indeed for how much?

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I can only repeat the answer that I gave the hon. gentleman a moment ago. I mean, this is a matter that has to be, in the first instance, assessed. He has given certain figures. I do not disagree with his assessment of certain individual damage, which appears to be very great and very grave, but, in relation to all of these matters, I am sure the hon. gentleman will appreciate that whether or not there is in fact any assistance, whether it is possible to give any assistance is going to depend first of all upon the situation itself and the gravity of it and, secondly, equally important, as to the amount of funds that are available for that purpose. So, I cannot at this particular

MR. MARSHALL: time - I think it would be very wrong for me - by way of answering and trying to appease the hon. gentleman to give any impression whatsoever that there would be recompense in this particular case until we are fully apprised of the situation.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I recognize full well that you have to wait until the ice has moved off the coast before you can assess what the damage is, but I would like to ask the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) how many people is he prepared to put into the area and how long does he contemplate that it will take him after the ice moves off to give us a general commitment - perhaps he can give us a general commitment now - as to what the government's policy or philosophy is towards that kind of disaster? In other words, what I am asking, Mr. Speaker, is is there any ray of hope for those fishermen from Green Bay to Cape Freels who have lost an extensive amount of gear?

MR. TULK:

Is there any ray of hope for them at all? How long will it take him, after the ice moves off the coast, to give them a specific commitment?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, that is going to depend upon the answers that we get to the questions and the findings that the officials make. I can only say that this government sympathizes with any loss of the magnitude that the hon. gentleman describes. Certainly there have been losses in the areas. We are familiar, in the fishing industry particularly, with losses of this nature on a seasonal basis by way of gear and what have you, and it is very costly to the fishermen concerned. Certainly the government is very sympathetic to these losses, but as to holding out a ray of hope, look, that depends upon the amount of the money involved, the extent of the loss, and the nature of the overall policy implications that would be involved to responding to a specific situation. I can only tell the hon. gentleman that this government is very sympathetic to the problem, but what exactly it is able to do and how far it is able to address itself to the problem is something that we will have to determine after we address it in its full implications.

MR. TULK: Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Final supplementary, the hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out to the minister earlier, I understand that part of the loss, and perhaps a great deal of the loss is in the herring net fishery and the salmon fishery and the lump roe fishery. Let me ask the minister one final question. Since he refuses to hold out the ray of hope that I had asked him for for these fishermen, since he says that he cannot do it,

MR. TULK: would he now hold out this commitment to them, that as soon as that ice is off the coast he will send every possible fishery officer into the area to carry out the inventory of just what the loss is and assess the damage? Will that be done immediately, as soon as the ice moves off the coast?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I would not like this exchange to be framed in the context the hon. gentleman has in his question, saying that we refused to hold out a ray of hope. All I am doing, Mr. Speaker, is ascertaining what is real, which is the real world in reality. Now all I can say to the hon. gentleman is that within the measure of the resources of this government that it has by way of manpower in assessing the situation and by way of other areas, that we will address ourselves to it in its full implications as soon as we are able to have enough facts available in order to assess the situation in its entirety. But I do not wish this answer to be imputed in any way, on the one hand, of not holding out any ray of hope and, on the other hand, indicating that this government is going to implement a policy for compensation which, as much as we would like to do, is something we would have to determine, the extent of it and whether it can be afforded, as I say, and the implications on the long-term policies of the government in responding to this specific instance this year.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the minister responsible for parks, and the Premier, I would like to ask a question to the Government House Leader. In light of the events of the past weekend, when many law-abiding citizens at certain provincial parks in this Province were made very uncomfortable and were constrained to certain degrees in enjoying their life out in the provincial parks, would the minister care to tell this House if his government is planning to bring in any legislation banning the use of alcohol in provincial parks in this Province?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, as to the specifics, the hon. Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), in the absence of the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Simms), is seized of the situation, I think perhaps it would be better to refer the question to him.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, the reports from the weekend as it relates to activities in some of our provincial parks was certainly disappointing, to say the least. There are a number of things, I guess, from this past weekend's experience that will cause some changes to be made as it relates to additional enforcement and perhaps some innovative ways of making sure that the safety and in fact the enjoyment of legitimate campers is protected to the utmost. To the specific question of whether in fact alcohol beverages will be banned from the provincial parks, I am sure that that certainly will be considered along with a number of other suggestions on how to better protect the situation. Whether in fact that is in itself the only reason there were some problems, or whether in fact banning alcohol will indeed stop some of the activities that occurred is certainly

MR. DAWE: a debatable question and will be reviewed, I am sure, by the department and by government in general.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the acting minister. Would the minister tell this House if there are any words of assurance that he can offer to the parents of the children, and also to the elderly people who would like to use Butterpot Park, or some other parks in this Province on the various weekends throughout this Season that the people who are using those parks for the rest of the year and in the future will be protected better than they were this past weekend?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister for Transportation.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, from time to time for the past several years there have been isolated incidents of perhaps, not particularly sociable activities in the parks that have dampened the holiday activities of family campers and people who were taking the opportunity to enjoy our provincial parks, and from time to time additional measures have been taken. This seems to be a particularly unusual occurrence, this past 24th. of May weekend. It is not one that has been experienced before, at least not in this severity, and we would certainly hope that it will not be experienced again.

However, as I indicated, a number of additional measures will be put in place that will try and try this kind of activity from occurring as much as possible. It is very difficult to know beforehand exactly what will happen at the park sites and just what activities will take place, but certainly a complete review of security measures, of the involvement of the RCMP and other police officers, and, in fact, park staff will be reviewed in some detail over the next number of days to try and make sure that we can prevent might as much as possible the kinds of activities that occurred this weekend.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. It is surprising that I think the same minister was responsible for the parks a couple of years ago when we had a similar incident at Butter Pot Park. The minister may say that it might be a more major occurrence this time, but the minister was responsible about two years ago when we had a similar occurrence, and it usually happens the first week the parks are opened. Now could the minister advise this hon. House, in the capacity he is filling today, was the problem that there was not sufficient staff at the park to alleviate this problem? Or was the park warden in charge

MR. WARREN: of Butter Pot Park exaggerating when he said that he lost control of the problem in the park? Which does the minister believe? Does the minister believe that control was lost by lack of staff in the park or does the minister believe that it is just an occurrence that has been happening for the last three years and it is going to continue?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the member for Torngat (Mr. Warren) was not indicating that I was responsible for the disturbance in Butter Pot Park two years ago.

MR. WARREN: No way, No! No!

MR. DAWE: That was sort of suggested to me in his line of questioning.

The questions that he asks are really

MR. DAWE:

hypothetical ones. I have no control, nor does the minister who is responsible for the department, over some statements that particular officials may or may not have made. I am sure, as I indicated in previous supplementaries, that we as a government, and particularly, I am sure, my colleague the minister responsible will be going over with his staff, the situation in each of the parks, not only in Butter Pot Park but the other parks that were opened and try and do an assessment as to whether there was anything that could have been done to prevent this activity, whether it was the kind of situation that you could have expected and perhaps more could have been done, about or whether in fact it was something that perhaps could not have been controlled to the extent that we would like to see. But I am sure the department will be assessing that and will be making the necessary adjustments to prevent the situation from occurring again.

MR. WARREN: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: I understand that the purpose of the overflow at the various parks is to accommodate overnight people who are waiting to get in the park and they get into the park the following day. Is it the policy of this government for campers to use the overflow in the various parks the same as they would use the campsites? because I understand even last year, and again this past weekend, that the overflows were used for the same purpose by the campers as a regular campsites. Could the minister take it upon himself to see that the overflow will be used for the purpose for which it was intended?

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Minister of
Transportation.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, I
will have a word with my colleague responsible and I am
sure that, as always, he will do whatever is right and
proper in this situation as well as others.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question
for the Minister of Mines (Mr. Dawe). Mr. Speaker, on
May 16 the hon. gentleman told this House, in connection with
the barite operation at Buchan's site this year, 'I
have at the present time indications that there will be
limited barite operation at the Buchan's site this year.' Now,
in view of the fact that Magcoobar just opened an operation
here in St. John's, and there is one other operation that
supplies barite for the offshore drilling, could the hon.
gentleman tell us if he still stands by that

MR. NEARY:

statement he made the Monday before last, eight days ago, that there would be barite produced in Buchans this year?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Minister of Mines.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, I indicated at that time that the available information that we had - and that was from discussions with the operators of the barite operation in Buchans - that they were anticipating some limited production this coming season, and that still stands. What is important to realize, as it relates to that particular operation and as it relates to the Magnobar operation in co-operation with Standard Manufacturing Company, is that the extent of production at both operations will depend upon the extent of contracts that they are able to get from the companies that are doing the drilling.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could the hon. gentleman tell the House where the local preference policy comes into play? My understanding is that the federal government pumped \$400,000 into the barite operation in Buchans to get it going, and there is an unlimited supply out there. These other two companies mainly are owned by outsiders and they have to import barite from as far away as Ireland in order to sweeten the barite that they mine here on the Avalon Peninsula and in Trinity Bay. Now, where does local preference come into play as far as Buchans is concerned? Because hon. gentlemen will remember that when the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) was Minister of Mines and Energy, he went to Buchans and told them that everything was sweetness and light, would come up smelling of roses, that this was an example of what the offshore would do for

MR. NEARY: communities in Newfoundland, such as Buchans, that were hard hit with unemployment because of the closing of the mine. Would the hon. gentleman tell us now if the government feels the same way about the Buchans barite operation? And could he tell us where local preference comes in?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Minister of Mines.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, of course this government is very interested, and as a matter of fact, the policies that we have put forward indicate continuing of the local preference policy as it relates to all our resource activities. In the interest of perhaps clarifying the matter more precisely than I could, I wonder if the hon. member would mind if I refer the question to the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor), who has been involved in the development of the local preference policy and, in fact, has some background information on these two operations?

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

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to recognize how local preference works. In this particular case, what we now have are two companies, in effect, that qualify for local preference. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) may recall that about a year or so ago, there was a tender called by the offshore companies, which was awarded to the Maggobar company, and it was awarded to them based on the fact that they were operating with some barite that was being mined at Colliers Point in Trinity Bay and that was being ground by

MR. WINDSOR:

Standard Manufacturing Company here on a joint venture. Subsequently, after the contract was awarded and every effort made to fulfill the terms and conditions of the contract and the local preference requirements, unfortunately the company was not able to do that. The House may recall there was some question about it at the time. Having thoroughly reviewed that, we were convinced that the company had done everything that they possibly could have done under the circumstances and it was through conditions beyond their control that they were not able to fulfill the local preference requirements that they had previously implied they would. We made it very clear to them at the time, in speaking to the principles of the company, that they would not be given any further local preference unless they could clearly establish themselves here again as a local company. In order to do that, they would need a new milling operation. The main problem they had was that the equipment in the old mill was previously used by Standard Manufacturing primarily to grind pigments of paint. To use that equipment and apply it to barite, that there would need to be some new equipment. They undertook at that time to do that and they knew quite well that they would not get any local preference, that the Buchans operation obviously in future tenders would be given preference unless they brought their local component up to scratch. They have done that now with the opening of the new mill. I understand it is something like \$500,000 in investment in new equipment in co-operation with Standard Manufacturing Company.

Local preference comes into it, Mr. Speaker, very clearly, that without our offshore regulations, without local preference, Magco-bar would have no incentive whatsoever to spend that money in Newfoundland,

MR. WINDSOR: they would have no incentive to become involved in the operation at Collier's Point or elsewhere, and they are investigating other deposits of barite because there are several in the Province. And so local preference very clearly has resulted in a new operation being established here in Newfoundland. It has never been this government's policy to play one local operation against another. There are now effectively two local operations, they will be bidding and, obviously, the one that can provide the best level of service at the lowest cost will be the successful tenderer.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, either one of the hon. gentlemen can answer the supplementary question. The barite operation in Buchans was held out as the last hope that Buchans had left. The provincial government got behind it, the minister at the time went out for the opening, there was \$400,000 of Canadian taxpayer money put into that operation to get it going. Now is the hon. gentleman aware that as

MR. NEARY:

a result of this new company winning the contracts, the tender, that it has been announced that Buchans barite operation will not open this year, that no barite will be produced in Buchans this year? Is the hon. gentleman aware of that, that a public announcement has been made by the company, made last Thursday I think it was, that there would be no barite produced in Buchans this year?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Development.

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, you know, I think in my previous answer I indicated that really what you are talking about now are two local companies, one must compete against the other. And obviously the company that can produce the quality product, with proper delivery times and at the lowest rate, will be given the job. There was never any question from the people in Buchans, in the discussions I had with them a year ago when I visited that plant, by the way, and went right through the operation, there was never any question of them providing the barite to the total exclusion of Magcobar or any other company that wished to establish here. The people of Buchans are not asking for special preference, all they wanted to ensure was that they were competing with local companies and, if they were not, that they were given local preference. We have ensured that they would get local preference. The other company now has complied with the requirements of our offshore regulations and our local preference policy, and they have every right to do business here in this Province. It has been a policy of this government in fact to encourage joint ventures and to get new companies, particularly companies with the expertise and the background of a company such as Magcobar in here doing joint ventures with companies, such as Standard Manufacturing, that have been here for many, many years.

MR. WINDSOR: So both companies have a right to apply for the business with the offshore companies.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman did not answer the question I put to him. I know I cannot compel him to answer the question. The question was was either hon. gentlemen aware that the company that owns the barite operation in Buchans announced last week that they would not be producing a single pound of barite in Buchans this year? Is the hon. gentleman aware of that? The hon. gentleman probably did not understand the question, Mr. Speaker, Can the hon. gentleman also tell the House if under local preference, what the hon. gentleman interprets as local preference, will any company supplying mud, supplying barite for the offshore drilling, will they be permitted to import barite into the Province? For instance, I understand that the grade of the ore at Colliers is a very high grade and it has to be downgraded a bit and they have to import barite from outside of Newfoundland, from Ireland, to mix with the barite. Now could the hon. gentleman tell the House if that is permissible under the local preference policy?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Development.

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that it is not I who does not understand the local preference, it is the hon. gentleman opposite. The local preference policy applies to the value added within the Province. Now whether or not a portion of that ore is being imported from Ireland or anywhere else is totally irrelevant. What is important is the bottom line in applying the local preference formula, and the factors are well known to industry in this Province, that the company then, if the factor is

MR. WINDSOR:

sufficient to give them local preference, they will get local preference. If they import ore from Ireland, and if that reduces their local content to a point where they no longer qualify for local preference, then they indeed will not get local preference. Whether or not they do import part of it from Ireland it is irrelevant. They may well have to import some more from Ireland for blending, although the intent is, hopefully, in the end analysis, to operate as much as possible with local ore and of course with local milling and local labour.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: It looks to me, Mr. Speaker, like the 2,500 or 3,000 people who live in Buchans were bluffed by this administration in connection with this barite production. Could the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Dawe) tell the House if he has any information now about the future of the Buchans mines?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Mines.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, 'the Buchans mines,' I am assuming from that that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is asking really two questions, one as it relates to the base metal operation, the other one as it relates to the barite operation. I indicated to this House a few days ago that the base metal activity at the Buchans operation of ASARCO will depend on a number of things, The primary thing being whether the markets world wide for base metals improve sufficiently to allow the operation to continue with the minor reserves that are still available or whether in fact the new discoveries at Tally Pond are significant enough to cause the industry to move in and develop that site. And

MR. DAWE: that, of course, itself depends upon the market. If those things happen, then there is a distinct possibility that the whole base metal operation will be revitalized, but there are a number of things in there that are on beyond our control.

As it relates to the barite, the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) I think adequately explained the situation, in that it is a very competitive field that those particular operations are in. They have to compete on quality and on cost and on being successful in their bids to the companies which are looking for the barite for their drilling operations.

Now depending upon which one, I guess, gets its act together best will depend who gets the contracts, and that will be the same for the continuation of the contracts that will be offered this Summer from the various companies and for the years down the road.

MR. NEARY:

A supplementary to the minister,

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY:

In his answer about the future of the Buchans mines, could the hon. gentleman tell the House if the mine will be held intact to determine whether or not there is a good seam of ore there, the one they are looking now, or markets improve, whichever comes first? Could the hon. gentleman tell the House if the Buchans mine will remain intact ready for operation, or will the company be allowed to flood the mine?

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, the options available as they relate to that particular operation are assessed, there is an ongoing process of consultation between the officials of the department and the mine interests at Buchans. Their development plans and what is projected for the future are continuously updated and assessed and this government will do whatever it has to do within the acceptable regulations to insure that that operation, if things improve, becomes again a viable and worthwhile area of mining activity in the Province.

MR. SPEAKER:

The time for the Question Period has expired.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. MARSHALL:

Order 35, Bill No. 41.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order 35, Bill No. 41, second reading.

I understand that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) adjourned the debate on

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): this bill.

MR. NEARY: Oh, yes, Mr. Speaker, I was making a few general comments about the Newfoundland Constabulary. I believe I asked the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) if he could explain for the House whether the policy of early retirement for constables in the Newfoundland Constabulary was still in effect? I believe I pointed out on Friday that constables who enter the uniformed services of the Newfoundland Constabulary and the fire department could at age forty-three retire after twenty-five years of service.

MR. ROBERTS: That is as good as the House -

MR. NEARY: Well, that is better than the House.

MR. ROBERTS: -and they do not have to get re-elected either, do they?

MR. NEARY: They do not have to get re-elected, that is right.

Could the hon. gentleman tell the House if that policy is still in effect? If so, is there any intention on the part of the administration and the minister to change that policy? We could never understand the reason behind it, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps this would be a good time, now that we are dealing with "An Act To Amend The Uniformed Services Pensions Act," to clear up that matter. It seems to me it would be a bit much that people can retire at age forty-three, that is if they come into the constabulary at age eighteen and they are coming in today, Mr. Speaker, at a very early age, eighteen, nineteen and twenty years of age, and then they perform their service for twenty-five years and then they can go out on retirement and get another job. That is what has been

MR. NEARY: carrying out their jobs,
but it seems to me that the members of the Newfoundland
Constabulary - the principles behind law enforcement is
to protect people not to go out and let people get in
trouble or intimidate people, coerce them and abuse them,
try and get them into trouble; the whole idea of law
enforcement is to protect people and to stop them from
getting into trouble. But when you see squad cars hidden
away in the bushes and around corners and under the
brow of hills and so forth ready to pounce on people,
Mr. Speaker, that seems to me to be very demeaning and
lowering the prestige and the image of the Newfoundland
Constabulary.

MR. NEARY: I do not think you see that as much with the RCMP but you certainly see it practically every second with the Newfoundland Constabulary. A lot of people have remarked to me that maybe the minister has to recover some of the expenses of the expansion and this is how the hon. gentleman intends to do it, that they have a quota system, that they have to collect so much revenue to put towards the expansion of the Newfoundland Constabulary in the areas that they have taken in. Well, Mr. Speaker, that raises the question then of the wisdom of going ahead with the expansion at this time. Here, you have a government strapped for money, a deficit this year of \$27.4 million -

MR. ROBERTS: That they admit.

MR. NEARY: - that they admit, and will probably go higher, probably go to \$100 million. But what is happening, Mr. Speaker, is they have to provide squad cars now, they have to provide personnel, they have to provide radios, they have to provide all the services that ordinarily were provided by the RCMP. The RCMP just fade out of the picture, they take their squad cars with them, they take their radios, they take all the paraphernalia that they need for law enforcement in these areas and the burden of the cost rests on the shoulders of the Newfoundland taxpayers. So, Mr. Speaker, I question the wisdom of the expansion at this particular point in time. But I hope that these people who have come to us are wrong, that the minister is not merely trying to collect revenue to help pay for the expansion. I hope that is not correct, Mr. Speaker, because my idea of a policeman is to protect people, not to try to get people in trouble. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that this harassment, if it is indeed happening, should be stopped. I think that most Newfoundlanders are law-abiding citizens and now they are given a ticket for

MR. NEARY: everything. Some people have been stopped as high as ten and fifteen times and they are guaranteed to get a ticket for something, poor tires or your hand brake is not working. They have not done that for years. That is something we have not seen done in this Province for years and years, Mr. Speaker. They do not even measure the tires now, just get out and look at them and say 'Your tires are not up to scratch, not up to standard, here is a ticket.' It really looks like they are pushing for revenue to help offset the cost of expansion, and if that is so, Mr. Speaker, then I do not blame people for complaining and criticizing the present policies of the administration and the Newfoundland Constabulary. Mr. Speaker, personally, I do not like this idea of cars being parked, hidden away. I do not mind, I do not think anybody minds getting a ticket man-fashion or any woman getting a ticket woman-fashion, Mr. Speaker, if they are breaking the law. But when you are coming down a grade and here is a car hidden away and by and by the radar beeps in the car and the next thing you know the squad car is after you and you get a ticket for \$50 for speeding because you did not apply your brakes coming down a grade and a car is hidden away - Mr. Speaker, I do not think the hon. gentleman can justify that sort of action. I do not think he can. I do not think the hon. gentleman is aware of what is happening. People are getting tickets right, left and center, Mr. Speaker. And I am not just

MR. NEARY:

raising it, I have the highest regard for law enforcement in this Province. I have the highest regard for the RCMP and for the Newfoundland Constabulary but I do not like some of the things that I am hearing and some of the things that I am seeing. Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is right. I think that people are finding it difficult enough without having cars hidden in the bush, hidden under the brow of a hill, with these little gimmicks and the latest technology they have, that they can get a little beep in their car and the next thing you know you got a ticket, Mr. Speaker. I am sure all hon. members on both sides of the House have had these complaints. We have been swamped with these complaints since the expansion took place. And I am not saying anything detrimental about the Newfoundland Constabulary or the law enforcement. Their job is very difficult, Mr. Speaker. They have a very difficult job to do, especially in these trying times when the economy of this Province is in such bad shape thanks to the mismanagement and incompetence of this administration. People are being harrassed enough by bill collectors and people are being harrassed enough by government agencies who control your life. They run your life, Mr. Speaker. It is bad enough to have all of that, but then to turn the Province into a police state, I think that is going too far, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): A point of order, the hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, we are now discussing a bill with respect to The Uniformed Services Pensions Act; included in it, it is true, is a schedule relating to the Newfoundland Constabulary pensions. But I suggest that the hon. gentleman is getting now into the area of paying for

MR. MARSHALL: the Constabulary by the issuance of tickets, talking about bill collectors not connected with the Constabulary, that he is wandering further afield from the act. I wonder does the hon. gentleman know, after the weekend, what we are discussing. We are discussing the Uniformed Services Pensions Act, we are not in the Address and Reply and neither are we in the Budget Speech.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): To that point of order, I rule there is no point of order. There is a section in that act dealing with the Constabulary and the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is talking about the Constabulary.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thought the hon. gentleman was going to get up and call a quorum. At Question Period today ten ministers were absent from their seats, and the Premier was not here during Question Period today. I thought they all might be bored.

MR. MARSHALL: All on government business.

MR. NEARY: All on government business.

MR. ROBERTS: All at government expense.

MR. NEARY: All at government expense, I thought they might be bored, Mr. Speaker. I think it is outrageous, ten ministers missing when Question Period started today. But I thank, Your Honour, I think that was a very fair ruling.

I do not wish to belabour this point, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL: I tried to break your trend of thought.

MR. NEARY: Yes, the hon. gentleman tried to break my trend of thought and he will have to try again.

MR. ROBERTS: At least the hon. Leader of the Opposition has one, unlike the President of the Council.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. NEARY: And they can circulate all they like these little xeroxed thing they put on their desks today they can take some comfort in that if they want to, but there is no way -

MR. ROBERTS: If they had read The Daily News this morning they would have been shocked.

MR. NEARY: Yes. They can take comfort in that. No doubt before the afternoon is over some hon. gentlemen on the other side will be up waving this bit of paper. Mr. Speaker, how far I got on my face - I could not get very far on my name so I had to get there on my face.

MR. TOBIN: Or your brains.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, so no doubt they will take some comfort in that. But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that this is a bit of a problem and it is something that I think the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) should address himself to. It is not a condemnation, I am not condemning the Newfoundland Constabulary, as I said, I think they have a very tough job to do. We saw that on the weekend in the parks, Mr. Speaker, where these hon. gentlemen could not control the activities in Butterpot Park. But that is another subject, I know I cannot discuss this under this bill, Mr. Speaker. But there is a real problem there

MR. NEARY: and I believe the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) should address himself to it. And, Mr. Speaker, hon. gentlemen now will say, well, the Leader of the Opposition has some nerve to raise this because the next thing he will be watched, he will get all kinds of tickets. Mr. Speaker, I hope that is not the case, because I raised this matter in all sincerity. We have had a large number of complaints from ordinary people who think they are being unjustly dealt with. No doubt, Mr. Speaker, in some instances they may have been speeding, in some instances they may have violated some provision of the Highway Traffic Act, but the fact of the matter is that we have to remember that the principle for law enforcement is to protect people not to go after them tooth and nail. That is not the idea of law enforcement, Mr. Speaker, to go after people and give them a ticket for something or other.

The police are there to protect us. They are being paid to protect us, not to get us in trouble, not to hide away and try to catch hon. gentlemen speeding. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that is the purpose of the establishment of law enforcement in this Province. And I believe the hon. gentleman should address himself to it.

MR. ROBERTS: Man-fashion!

MR. NEARY: Man-fashion, yes. If they are out in the open and you know they are patrolling, nobody questions that. They have to patrol the highways, we recognize that. No question about that at all. I am not questioning that. If they are there you should know they are there. As a matter of fact, I think there should be signs put up. I have seen signs on the highway 'patrolled from the air'.

MR. ROBERTS: You have never seen the air patrols though.

MR. NEARY: I have never seen the air patrol, it is probably just to put a scare in people. But the signs are there. I think there should be signs put up, 'this area is patrolled by the Newfoundland Constabulary', they should not hide away. Does the hon. gentleman really think that it is right to hide in the bush, to hide down here by Bally Haly, two people sitting in a car waiting for some little innocent fellow to come along who never broke the law in his life, never had a speeding ticket, never had a ticket in his life, to wait for him to come along and by and by on goes the red lights and the siren? The poor fellow nearly gets frightened to death. /

MR. RIDEOUT: Did you ever see the RCMP do that to people?

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

MR. RIDEOUT: Did you ever see the RCMP do that to people?

MR. NEARY: Yes, I have, I saw it happen in Port aux Basques a few years ago, when they almost turned Port aux Basques into a police state, and I had to come out publicly and condemn them for it. And they stopped it. They were stopping every car after eleven o'clock. Every car in Port aux Basques was stopped after eleven o'clock at night, and I did not agree with it. They turned the place into a police state.

Well, that is what is

MR. NEARY: happening now in the greater St. John's area, the same thing as Port aux Basques. Mr. Speaker, I commend the Newfoundland Constabulary for the fine job they are doing. I think they are doing a great job under difficult circumstances, but I think they should stop this harrassment and stop this policy of hiding in the bushes waiting to pounce on innocent drivers. They are there to protect us, not to intimidate us, not to provoke us, not to get us in trouble.

I remember there some time ago I was stopped by the Newfoundland Constabulary, I was coming down Portugal Cove Road, and I was told by the constable that my licence had expired and that he would have to give me a ticket. I said, 'I am sorry, but my licence has not expired'. At that particular point in time, Mr. Speaker, I had information that 20,000 Newfoundlanders, their licences had expired unknown to the people who had the licences, unknown to them. Probably other hon. members of the House were in the same predicament. I happened to catch mine.

MR. ANDREWS: I was one.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman was one. Well, I happened to catch mine and I had my secretary call Motor Registration and they sent me out a piece of paper, a temporary licence. But Motor Registration forgot to tell the Newfoundland Constabulary, so on their wheel over there, when they called in on the radio that night, 'the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Neary, is driving without a licence', everybody on the Avalon Peninsula who had a police band radio heard that. I could visualize in my mind people listening to their police bands saying, 'There you go, there is the crowd who are up making laws, breaking them. Here is the Leader of the Opposition driving without a licence.' So what I did, Mr. Speaker, I went straight to Fort Townshend, I walked in and I asked for the gentleman in charge and I said to the gentleman, 'would you mind checking to see if I have

MR. NEARY: a driver's licence?" So he went and checked the wheel or whatever it is they have over there, and he came back to me and he said, "I am sorry, Sir, but your licence has expired." So I put my hand in my wallet and I took out this piece of paper and I said, 'Well, what would you call that?' 'Oh,' he said, 'that is a driver's licence.' 'Well', I said, 'how long is it good for?' He said, 'Three years.' 'Well', I said, 'do you not think you should update your wheel?' And then I insisted that somebody get on the radio and call that constable and tell him that I did have a driver's licence, because all these people who listened to the police bands had heard that I did not have a driver's licence. I do not know whether they did it or not, but I asked them to do it, to call back so that all of the people who heard that I did not have a driver's licence would now hear that I had one.

MR. WINDSOR: Have you got one?

MR. NEARY: I certainly have got one. I happened to catch it. And the Minister responsible for the Environment (Mr. Andrews) says he was in the same predicament. I do not know whether he caught his.

MR. ADREWS: I caught it.

MR. NEARY: He caught it on time. But there were 20,000 Newfoundlanders in the same boat that the hon. gentleman and myself were in.

There was confusion about the application that had to be sent back for your driver's licence and there were 20,000 in the same boat. And no doubt an awful lot of these people got tickets. I know some did. An awful lot of them got tickets when they should not have gotten tickets, because the fault was with Motor Registration, But yet the police in the carrying out of their duties and their responsibilities had to issue a reprimand or a ticket because it was not shown on the wheel over at Fort

MR. NEARY: Townshend, in the police headquarters,
that these people had a temporary licence, or indeed had renewed
their licences.

 I think it is too bad that the police
have to get that kind of name, Mr. Speaker, they have to get
that kind of reputation. I do not like it

MR. NEARY:

because I, as a member of this House, have an oath to pledge allegiance to Her Majesty the Queen and to uphold law and order and so, therefore, I am all behind the Newfoundland Constabulary, I support them in their endeavours. I must say, they are doing a magnificent job on protection - what is they call that, these constables that have been seconded to -

AN HON. MEMBER: Your time is up.

MR. NEARY: No, my time is not up yet.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, yes it is.

MR. NEARY: - they work on the principle of protecting people rather than allowing people to get in trouble, Mr. Speaker. I know these are young rookies, they are eager. We are told they are operating on a quota. The hon. gentleman denied that a couple of years ago when the former member for Grand Bank asked the hon. gentleman, now I would like to ask the hon. gentleman again, do they have a quota system? Are they expected to produce so much revenue to help pay for the expansion in the greater St. John's area? If they are, then I would say that it is a pity, it is a shame, indeed, that the members of the Newfoundland Constabulary, who would be doing something more useful, should be spending their time harrassing people for minor traffic offenses. You know, Mr. Speaker, a five dollar bill, or a ten dollar bill, or fifty dollars for a speeding ticket may not sound like much to hon. gentlemen there opposite, but it means a great deal to people who are on unemployment insurance and people in the low income bracket. Can you imagine getting hit with a fifty dollar speeding ticket? And that is happening to a lot of people, Mr. Speaker, especially in the newer areas, where the Newfoundland Constabulary are now patrolling for the first time. I must say, Mr. Speaker, in all my experience on the Portugal Cove Road and the Torbay Road

MR. NEARY: and the Kenmount Road, in that general vicinity, that I have never seen as many squad cars, prtrol cars, patrolling that area as I see today. And, as I say, I do not mind a bit -

MR. WARREN: And Brookfield Road.

MR. NEARY: - Brookfield Road the same way. I do not mind a bit the patrol cars driving up the road, back and forth, going behind people, watching traffic, protecting the children when they are crossing the street, that is all fine and dandy, Mr. Speaker, but what irritates me is when they hide away. I do not think that is right. Maybe I am wrong, I could be wrong, perhaps the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) now when he stands in his place can convince me that I am wrong in saying that. The hon. gentleman might get up and say well, it does not make any difference how you catch a crook, how you catch somebody who breaks the law as long as you catch them. But there is something very demeaning about that, hiding in the bush or hiding in a gravel pit.

MR. WARREN: In the ghost cars.

MR. NEARY: And these ghost cars, that is another thing, Mr. Speaker. I mean, you know, they have to be something else.

MR. RIDEOUT: You cannot see them.

MR. NEARY: No, that is right. All they have is a little gadget on their dash board that lights up, and the red light starts spinning around, the siren goes.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, you know -
MR. CALLAN: Everyone should have one.
MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you what is happening in this Province, that an awful lot of people who can afford it are getting these gadgets that will tell you if radar is down the road. There is a little gadget you can get now, they they me they are illegal, but you can put it in your car and it will tell you if the police are parked or coming towards you with their radar. My hon. friend, the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry), should talk to some of his constituents about the number of tickets that are issued down there right in the hon. gentleman's - I happen to be one of the hon. gentleman's constituents.

AN HON. MEMBER: Did you vote for him?

MR. NEARY: Fortunately, I only got one ticket. Mr. Speaker, I am not complaining about that.

AN HON. MEMBER: I will have you barred from the South Coast.

MR. NEARY: Well, the hon. gentleman might be surprised. At least when the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) represented that area - we complained one day to the hon. gentleman about snow clearing and I will tell you within the matter of a couple of hours -

MR. CARTER: Minutes.

MR. NEARY: No, not minutes, within the matter of an hour, I would say, an hour and a half, the hill was cleared. We have not had occasion to test the member for Mount Scio but if the occasion arises, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, some of the people in the area who are very close to me will not hesitate to call the hon. gentleman. I hear an awful lot of complaints from the hon. gentleman's constituents.

MR. BARRY: I have not had any.

MR. NEARY: No, the hon. gentleman has not had any.

MR. BARRY: They are very few.

MR. NEARY: Very few. Well he has had a few no doubt, Mr. Speaker, because this area is very heavily patrolled. And, as I say, I am not knocking the Newfoundland constabulary. The hon. gentleman may say I am being contradictory right now, I am not. There are just certain policies that are being followed, procedures that are being followed by the Newfoundland Constabulary that I do not like. I do not like these unmarked cars and, Mr. Speaker, I do not like cars hiding in gravel pits and hiding in the bush. I think that is demeaning, I think it downgrades, I think it lowers the image of the Newfoundland Constabulary and I believe it should be stopped. Let them go out and patrol man fashion, let them be visible, let everybody see them, because that is what they are there for, to protect us, are they not?

MR. WARREN: Let people see them.

MR. NEARY: Let people see them. Maybe if people could see them they would not speed as much. Maybe they would keep their cars in better condition if they could see them. This idea of getting caught, all it does is make people want to get revenge, to hit back at the Newfoundland Constabulary. I do not think they deserve that, Mr. Speaker, so I hope my remarks will not be misunderstood or misinterpreted by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer).

I remember once, the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) came into the House and told us how he was being harrassed, he was very adamant about it, and I do not think the fact that he raised it in the House helped his cause any. Maybe because I am

May 24, 1983

Tape No. 2465

JV - 3

MR. NEARY: raising it now, it will not help
my cause any, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Be careful driving home.

MR. NEARY: I will, do not worry, I am always
careful, Mr. Speaker. Once burnt twice shy that is the
way I feel about it. The only thing is that if they are
going to ticket me then they had better be on safe grounds.

MR. NEARY: That is the only thing I can say. Mr. Speaker, nobody likes to get a ticket, I suppose, but there are times when we deserve to be ticketed. I would like to hear the minister's views on this matter of early retirement and whether police should be hidden away, whether they should have unmarked cars and this sort of thing. I think that is a wrong procedure.

MR. WARREN: And the portable breathalyzer.

MR. NEARY: The portable breathalyzer - I do not know, I could take that too, I think. I really have no objections about the portable breathalyzer.

But these two items - hiding away, sneaking around, two people sitting in a car. Mr. Speaker, you know, people who have come to me say, 'Well, you could rob a bank and there would not be a policeman in sight but go down on the Cove Road or Kenmount Road or down on Brookfield Road and you will find them hidden in the gravel pits and in the bushes.' That is a criticism I have heard. Maybe it is not justified, maybe it is an unjustified criticism, but I hear it every day. And I believe it is something that the hon. gentleman should address himself to and recognize as being a real problem. It does nothing for the image of the Newfoundland Constabulary. As a matter of fact, if anything, it damages the image of the law enforcement officers and I do not think they deserve that, Mr. Speaker, I think their job is difficult enough as it is. But let them come out man-fashion and woman-fashion, now that we have a lot of women in the patrol cars. Let them be visible so that people can see them and let them be friendly and courteous and not, Mr. Speaker, step up to the window of your car as if you were living in Nazi Germany. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that that day will not come. I hope they are better trained than that,

MR. NEARY: that they will not be snarky with you, that they will be ladies and gentlemen when they do approach you to inform you that you may have violated some provision of -

MR. WARREN: Most of them are.

MR. NEARY: - and most of them are; but you get the odd one who is having a bad day, in a cranky mood, Mr. Speaker, got out on the wrong side of the bed,

MR. NEARY: things are not going well, he does not like his job and he will come up to the window and be snarky and pompous and arrogant.

MR. CARTER: They are all afraid of you.

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

MR. CARTER: They are all afraid of you.

MR. NEARY: No, they are not, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CARTER: They are afraid of what you will say about them.

MR. NEARY: If they have a friend, if the Newfoundland Constabulary and the RCMP have a friend, it is certainly in me, Mr. Speaker..

MR. CARTER: You claimed that you are being -

MR. NEARY: I thought the sun was going to shine today and the hon. gentleman would be out in his savoury patch, Mr. Speaker. He must have it all in for the year.

But I just thought I would make these few points, Mr. Speaker. This is a matter that has been bugging people in the new areas, since the expansion was announced by the hon. gentleman. Now I will be glad to take my seat, and if nobody else has any comments to make, I am sure that the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) would care to clear up some of these matters that I have raised. And I hope the hon. gentleman will accept my criticism in the spirit in which it was given. It is not a condemnation of the law enforcement people, the law enforcement agencies, it is merely a criticism of some of the policies and procedures that they follow, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CARTER: Who are you terrorizing now?

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman should know all about terrorizing from when he was in the Department of Education, the way he terrorized the staff in that department,

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker. Why does not the hon. gentleman get out that Xeroxed clipping from the morning news that he has there in front of him and wave that around now. I am waiting for some hon. gentleman over there to pick it up. So I eagerly look forward, Mr. Speaker, to hearing what the hon. gentleman has to say about this matter of early retirement and these policies and procedures that I have talked about.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. CARTER: Now we will hear it, the truth and nothing but the truth.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on the bill in response to my helpmate, to the gentleman for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) let me say, of course, it will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, and I apologize to him in advance if he is unable to recognize it or appreciate it. You know, I do not if people in the House realize that he and I do this dog and pony show by arrangement. I will leave it to Your Honour to decide which half of the pony he represents, but life would not be the same without him. And I want my hon. friend from St. John's North to know that, that life would not be the same without him.

MR. CARTER: Very boring.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, I agree a tribute to the hon. member for St. John's North is very boring and I am the very first to say that, but I felt that the hon. gentleman for St. John's North gets so little attention in the House and is so badly in need of a tribute that I should say these few modest words about him.

MR. ROBERTS: And I want him to know I am deeply grateful because whenever I lack the inspiration to carry on, I simply look at him and that tells me why I am opposed to the administration that he supports.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before the House is one which is concerned with the Constabulary, as Your Honour established in a ruling. It deals specifically with a relatively narrow aspect of the Constabulary's activities and affairs. I do not want to get too deeply into that narrow aspect but I do want to raise a point or two in connection with the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary generally. And I believe this is the only opportunity we are likely to have in this session of the House to raise, in this way, matters connected with the Constabulary, all the moreso since the infamous 'reform' put through by this government some years ago in which they took the debate on the estimates out of the House of Assembly and moved it into committees.

Mr. Speaker, the Constabulary these last few years - and I think it probably goes back in its genesis, these reforms of which I speak to the halcyon days when Les Curtis was the Attorney General and then carrying on through the halcyon days when Alex Hickman, who is now, of course, Chief Justice Hickman, was the Attorney General, and I have no doubt that all of us will be rewarded with our hopes that under the present Attorney General, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) equally halcyon days will continue to bless the Constabulary.

But over the last period of years, the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary has undergone a transformation and, in my view, has gone from being a force constructed on a very out-dated and outmoded philosophy to one which now is a modern police force and, I think it

MR. ROBERTS: is fair to say, compares favourably with any force in any area - I was going to say in any city of the size of St. John's but in any area of the size which the Constabulary now serves. I do not know how many people are within its present coverage area, it is probably of the order of 200,000 or maybe a little more; add on Corner Brook and add on Labrador West a little bit down the road and the Constabulary will be directly policing about 250,000 people, which is getting close on to one-half of the people who live in this Province of ours. So, as I say, I think they have gone a very long way from being a force which was efficient in its time - and I would not want to say the Constabulary in the 1930s and the 1940s or 1920s or 1950s, for that matter, was not an effective and efficient police force for its time, but in the 1960s and 1970s and now on into the 1980s, the Constabulary either had to change or to wither on the vine and die. Fortunately, it has changed,

MR. ROBERTS: and the change has been far more rapid than most of us realize. It was not so many years ago that the Constabulary had an internal rule that a policeman's private affairs are really the subject of disciplinary action by the force. And that, of course, led to some notable and memorable conniptions back in the late '60s. But all that day is behind us, now we are running a professional and political force. And I think that is very much to the credit of the Ministers of Justice who have had the wit to provide the funds necessary for that and the brains to do little else with the force except ensure that competent officers were appointed and let them get on with the running of the show. Because, of course, the whole point of a police force is that within the bounds set down by the law and by legislation, it must be left free to do its job without interference from politicians. And I have no evidence, in fact all the evidence I have is the other way, I have no evidence at all to indicate that any minister, including the present minister, has done anything other than let the police force do what it ought to do and do it properly within its own terms of reference.

Mr. Speaker, though, there is one feature of modern police administration that we have not as yet adopted in this Province. And I want to take just a very few minutes this afternoon and raise it again with the Minister of Justice, it has been raised before. Unfortunately, he has not seen his way through to sponsor this kind of change. I hope now that he will give it further consideration and if he will not agree now to do this, I hope that he will in the next year or so. I am speaking, of course, as the hon. the minister has no doubt divined, I am speaking of a Police Commission. And I do not much care what name is put on it, a rose is a rose is a rose, but I do think there is much to be said in favour

MR. ROBERTS: of setting up an impartial, non-partisan and responsible body - three, five, maybe even seven, but three or five people, I think, should be adequate - that would be charged with a dual combination really not charged with running the police force day to day. The Chief of Police and his Lieutenants or whatever they are now called - I cannot keep track of the nomenclature of rank, but his subordinate officers are the men and women to run the police force day to day. But charged with the supervision of it, and, of course, that leads to the second point that a Police Commission would do, and that is to be both a check upon the police and a defence for the police. And both of those, I would say, Mr. Speaker, are of equal importance. The Police Commission if it is a sword is a two-edge sword, it is one that cuts in favour of the way in which the police carry out their duties as well as cutting against the way they carry out their duties. I would not want anybody for a moment to be under the impression that a Police Commission would be solely and only designed to provide yet another means of disciplining police or of investigating complaints against the police, it is also a matter of enabling the police to defend themselves in a way they cannot do now. We have a professional force here. They are providing a very good service, the calibre of their training has increased by - what? - a quantum of ten in the last fifteen or twenty years, I think it is fair to say fifteen or twenty years ago they had minimal training, now all of the senior officers and all of the new recruits these last five or six or seven years have had extensive training and I understand, as well, there is a lot of in-house or in-course training being given to the police officers on a regular and continuing basis. What we do not have, Sir, is some mechanism whereby a citizen who feels aggrieved by the treatment which he has received from the police force may take his complaint

MR. ROBERTS: to an impartial and knowledgeable body. I know we do have the courts. There have been several actions I believe in the courts this year, one or two criminal actions in which officers of the police force were defendants. If I recall correctly the charges were dismissed in the cases I am thinking of. I may not have remembered them all, but there were certainly one or two cases where members of the Constabulary were charged with criminal offences involving citizens with whom they dealt in the course of their police duties, I am not speaking of any member of the force who may have committed a criminal offence outside the scope of his police duties, and there certainly have been one or two civil actions where people have sued police officers for false arrest or some other offence under the civil law and sought compensation.

That is not an adequate remedy I would suggest to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer). It is not an adequate remedy because first of all it is expensive and time consuming for both the police officers involved and for the citizens involved. And, secondly, while I am a firm believer in the adversarial process put through our courts, I am not sure it is the way in the first instance to resolve this kind of dispute and I suspect, as well, there are many questions, complaints, disputes of a lesser nature which are not pressed under the present system but which nonetheless ought to be looked at. So I say to the minister that such a commission would work both to help the police in doing their duties, because if somebody attacks the police, and I do not mean attacks them physically, but if somebody complains about them or criticizes them, and the police are no more above criticism, or no more immune from complaint than any of us, there is a mechanism by which the police can

MR. ROBERTS: turn to a body and say, 'Here are the facts,' you know, 'hear it, decide upon it'. And similarly any citizen who feels aggrieved, either that he has been harrassed by the police or been treated improperly, is not put to the matter either of envoking the criminal process or alternately bringing a civil action against the policeman or the policemen, or policewomen, as the case may be, concerned.

You know, Metropolitan Toronto has a most interesting setup brought in by the Government of Ontario. Now I am not suggesting it is appropriate here, Metropolitan Toronto has twice as many people as the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador as a whole and in the scope of criminal activity if they are a ten we are about point one. But nonetheless they have gone so far as to set up a separate office, an officer who has a staff, and his job is to investigate any complaints against the police and then to bring in recommendations which are then dealt with according to the process set down by Ontario legislation. That is how far some jurisdictions have gone. I do not think we need go that far. I think what we do need is a small body, three people would be ideal, they do not need to be full-time, they would presumably be paid only for the time they sit, much as would a board of directors or the Medicare Commission or twenty other groups we could name, the cost would be relatively minimal but a group to whom people could turn. I do not want to go over it again. I think the minister knows the point of what I am saying and has grasped it, whether he agrees with it or not remains to be seen, but I do want to say that I think it is of paramount importance, Mr. Speaker. The police are becoming more and more important, if that is the right phrase, in our daily lives. At least they are becoming more and more present. There are more and more police officers, there are more and more points at which the activities of the police, the duties of the police cross the paths of ordinary citizens, and this is going to continue to

MR. ROBERTS:

be so. You know, a few years ago if you were driving home there was really no reason for a policeman to stop you unless your car was weaving back and forth across the road. Now, of course, we are into the age of the breathalyzer and the policemen have to have, I believe - I do not do criminal law and I do not want to reveal my abysmal ignorance of it, but as I recall, the police must have some reason to ask you to take the breathalyzer. But if he stops you because your headlight is out and he smells liquor on your breath, then that is reason enough and he surely should do it. The breathalyzer has, in view, turned out to be a very valuable police tool, it has certainly cut the number of accidents in which alcohol was involved, reduced them, and it has obviously reduced the numbers of people who take a chance driving while they have got liquor aboard them. But there are more and more instances, Mr. Speaker, where the activities of the police, the normal, proper, routine and appropriate activities of the police intersect with the lives of ordinary citizens. There are going to be more and more instances of complaints. Now, I have no idea how many there are, I am not even sure to whom one complains now. I suppose you could go to the Chief of Police and I am sure that the Chief would deal with the complaint as best he could on its merits without any fear of favour, you could go to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) who I assume would have to refer the matter through the Chief of Police, or presumably you could go and start a criminal proceeding or a civil action. Neither of those is a very efficient and effective method. I have dealt with the civil action, I have dealt with the criminal process. Going to the minister, or going directly to the Chief is really open to question because it is a matter of people investigating themselves. I am not saying that the Chief of Police would be other than

MR. ROBERTS: fair and fearless in an investigation but nonetheless it is an old saw that justice must not only be done but must be seen to be done. So, I would say to the minister that I think there is a case for this, not simply - and I will leave it with this - not simply to investigate the police but to give the police a body, a group, to whom they can make reference, to whom appeals can be made. And I will say to the minister that we are going to see more and more complaints, for whatever reason, more and more questions being raised, comments being made whether they are justified or not. In my view, the police force here in St. John's, the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary, which will soon become a Newfoundland Constabulary as opposed to a St. John's Constabulary, which is what it has been really for - Well really since the Rangers came in early in Commission. Back in 1934, I guess it was, the Rangers were established in early 1934. The Royal Newfoundland Constabulary is going to be more and more part of life in this Province, and so it should be. It is a first-class police force and I think we have every reason to be grateful for the work that the men and the women in it do but even with all that nobody, not I and not the minister or anybody else, could ever say that no policeman or policewoman will ever do something wrong. We just cannot say that. It is obvious that over the path of a number of years some will stray from the straight and proven path just as members of the House do, members of the Bar and members of Your Honour's profession, the optometrists - I am sorry, Your Honour, begging Your Honour's reverence, the ophthalmologists. I am in the right church but the wrong pew there am I not? - and there are bound to be complaints, there is bound to be the odd bad apple. In fact, we have been very fortunate that there have been so very few here in Newfoundland. A lot of metropolitan police forces have whole squads and divisions that do nothing other than investigate the police. We do not need that but what

MR. ROBERTS: we do need I suggest is an independent commission made up of three, five, three would be enough, knowledgeable and impartial people who could serve as a forum where complaints could be dealt with, where they could be looked into and the appropriate recommendations be made. And I am not suggesting that this commission be given any power other than an advisory or a recommending power. I am not so sure for the minute we should give them executive power, I think that we should leave either to the police authorities who have quite an elaborate and well-developed internal discipline code which they administer or alternately to the courts, the regular courts of the Province which could deal with it in the normal way.

But I would say to the minister there is an in between area , there is an in between need to be met. It is not being met now and I think a commission of the sort I have described would meet the need. I commend it to him on that basis, Sir.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will attempt to respond to the points made by both hon. gentlemen opposite, the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) and the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts). First, on the pension matter. strictly speaking the policy now is that the three uniformed services are treated the same way in terms of pension, that is the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary, the Fire Department, and the Correctional Service, the Warder Service at the penitentiaries, and that is a matter of policy and indeed appears to be a valid one. So they are treated the same in terms of pensions.

And the pension provision is that for a non-commissioned person retirement is at age fifty-five or after twenty-five years of service, whichever comes

MR. OTTENHEIMER: first, for commissioned officers at sixty, and that sixty will be applicable to everybody after the present incumbents have retired. But with the present incumbents they may continue until sixty-five, that is the chiefs and deputy chiefs, superintendent, deputy superintendent, the person at the head and the deputies, whatever they might be called in various services. So for the incumbents who did not know about this change coming, obviously nobody did until it came, they may continue until sixty-five. When they are through, for all commissioned officers it will be sixty.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) asked, in many cases people are quite young when they retire because after age fifty-five, or twenty-five years of service, obviously a person could be forty-five or forty-four, forty-three, forty-six, why such an early retirement? The only answer I can give is that indeed this early retirement provision for organizations like the police force, or like a correctional service, are quite general across Canada, indeed across North America, very similar to the ones in the RCMP, very similar to ones in the federal correctional service, and indeed in other provincial correctional services. And the reasoning has been, and this has been discussed in the collective bargaining context as well as far as the non-commissioned people are concerned, who are covered by collective agreements, and I think it is valid that it must be a profession or a career with a great deal of tension, a great deal of pressure, certainly, if one thinks of a correctional warden spending just about all his working days in a prison himself, and police officers, and I am not thinking of the times they are giving out speeding tickets, but obviously in their other more difficult assignments, and it is a general practice across North America that there is early retirement for people in that kind of a stressful, if you wish, occupation. Indeed it is throughout the armed forces, throughout the RCMP, throughout the federal correctional services, it is in other provincial police forces, and provincial correctional services. So that is the reason for it.

Now, getting to the other matters of a more general nature the hon. Leader of the Opposition was bringing up the situation whereby traffic violators are at times apprehended through the use of unmarked cars, or through the mechanism of having police cars not visible by being off the road or parked. Both forces which do policing in Newfoundland,

MR. OTTENHEIMER: the RNC, and the RCMP, use both methods, one, the visibility method where the patrol car is visible, is parked on the side of a road or at an intersection, or is cruising, is visible; and they also use the other method whereby a car is not marked, or is not visible. And the argument the hon. gentleman was putting forth is that we should only use the former, the visible part. The only answer I can give to that is that the more enforcement of traffic violations there is, I am thinking in terms of speeding and that kind of thing, I do not mean parking meters,

MR. OTTENHEIMER: the more enforcement of moving violations there is, the statistics show, the less incidence of highway accidents and that means obviously, the less incidence of the results of highway accidents which are death or maiming or whatever and that it has been proven effective as a means of enforcing moving traffic violations to not rely only, although it is an important aspect, on the visible and the marked car, but to rely, to make certain recourse also, to either the unmarked car or the car, although marked, not being visible. And I suppose the reasoning behind it is that for those who have a tendency to speed, to drive carelessly - I think one of the worst offences that I see myself is passing where there is no visibility or inadequate visibility. People pass on double barred lines or pass on the highway where it is obvious they are not supposed to pass or where they do not have visibility. I think that is probably the most dangerous.

MR. NEARY: If you are hidden away, you will not see that.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Well, what I am suggesting is that it has been found that having both methods of enforcement will cut down on traffic violations, because if you only have the visible, that being the police car visible to the motorist, and if he knows the only police cars around or 'the only way I am going to be apprehended is by a car which I will see parked by the road, parked at an intersection or cruising, then when I do not see one I can go ahead without any worry.' But when the potentially dangerous driver knows that not only are there police cars visible that he can see but there might be one parked where he cannot see it or that there might be one behind him or in front of him but unmarked as a police car, this is an added deterrent for moving traffic violations. And it is the moving traffic violations which

MR. OTTENHEIMER: are the ones which cause death and cause maiming and cause hardship and it has been proven by statistics that the more rigorous the enforcement for moving violations - I am not talking about parking tickets - the more rigorous the enforcement of moving violations, the less highway and road traffic accidents there are, and that is the rationale for it. I know nobody likes it.

MR. NEARY: Drivers of cars coming toward you now will flick their lights on and off to let you know they are hidden.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Well, that is fair enough, I guess. Everybody is allowed to take what precautions he can.

MR. NEARY: Fair enough.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: But the point I want to make is this that we are talking about that small percentage of drivers who do drive dangerously; that is not only going over the speed limit but it is frequently passing where they are not supposed to pass or tailgating or doing all of these things. If that small percentage of, but

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

potentially hazardous users of the road were of the opinion - if I were to say here today, 'There will be no police cars except those that are marked and visible where the motorist can see them', then these fellows would have carte blanche to do what they can. But if I say to them 'There will be the ones that you can see, which will be marked and visible, but there may also be a car on the highway which is unmarked and which you will not know if it is a police car or not, or there may be a car parked off the road or somewhere where you cannot see it', then they will hopefully think twice before risking their and other people's lives by passing on the double lines or other hazardous practices. What I am giving is the reason for it.

I just want to comment briefly on one point the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) made and that was he said to the effect that he hoped by giving out traffic tickets the government was not making up for the cost of expansion of the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary and were there quotas. Number one, I can say there are no quotas. And number two, certainly there is no policy for making up, by additional tickets, for expansion of the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary. If every instance in which we expand the Constabulary - in effect, we save a certain amount of money because the RCMP are not here free. The RCMP in their provincial policing in all areas of the Province except Corner Brook, in all areas of the Province under a ten year contract, which runs from 1980 to 1990, the cost escalates from 56 per cent in 1980 up to 70 per cent in 1990. So over that ten year period the cost the Province pays of the entire provincial bill goes from 56 per cent to 70 per cent and for Corner Brook, as in any area where the population is in excess of 15,000, it goes from 80 per cent to 90 per cent. And these percentages

MR. OTTENHEIMER: the Province pays. Because some people think that in every area policed by the RCMP it is free. Now we have a vote of \$27 million or \$28 million or whatever it is in the Estimates for it, it is paid under a contract which is going up all the time. And that percentage is not only for salaries and, you know, the police cars used in the Province and the equipment used in the Province, but it takes in a percentage of the whole superstructure of that organization - its training, its headquarters at Regina, its pension plans, the entire superstructure of a very large organization. Indeed the posting, if a constable is going to be posted from Vancouver to Lewisporte, a percentage of that is paid by the Province. So there is no additional cost to the treasury, because when the Newfoundland Constabulary go in, let us say they go into an area where there were twenty RCMP policing, when the Newfoundland Constabulary go in

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

there are twenty less RCMP, they are not added on on top.
So certainly there is no justification there.

And just briefly to comment on some points made by the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) certainly the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary, and it is during the past three years that I am obviously most familiar with, has during that period of time made substantial progress, since 1980 has made substantial progress. Some of the main items in it are that now, of course, there are women as well as men, also, all vacancies are done through public recruitment, public advertisements - I guess hon. members have seen them - done through the Public Service Commission. There is no room for nepotism, there is no room for political interference. The same is true for the fire department and for the correctional service. It is all done through the Public Service Commission. Sometimes people phone me and say, 'You know, can you help so and so get in the fire department or get here or get in the police department.' And I say, 'I wish him well but all of this goes through the Public Service Commission,' and that is really the only way to do it. We had, I think, roughly forty positions for the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary advertised six, seven eight months ago whenever it was; I understand we had about 450 applications. So you can be very selective.

MR. NEARY: You would not object to a member writing a recommendation.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: No. If any member writes a recommendation and sends it to the Chief or the Public Service Commission fair enough, but these people, I am quite sure, will bring their individual assessments to it. So, there has been the public recruiting, the involvement of the Public Service Commission. We also, of course, have a training programme for every cadet, a five - five and a half months training programme at the Atlantic Police Academy in Prince Edward Island.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Now, with respect to the point being made by the hon. gentleman of a police commission: First of all, let me say that the last time the police commission concept was spoken about in the House, and that was the former hon. member for Grand Bank-- actually, I believe he had something quite different in mind than the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts). As I understood what he was saying then was a police commission as the agency to run the police, as an administrative agency. You know, you have the Department of Justice and the government would set up a police commission and then the Department of Justice would not have the responsibility, I suppose they must have some somewhere, but it would be the police commission which would run the police and certainly I did not agree with that. We only have two provincial forces in the Province, two forces doing provincial policing, the RCMP and the RNC, and to bring in an administrative structure seemed to me to be totally inappropriate. So, the last time - the hon. gentleman for the Strait of Belle Isle mentioned about the police commission, what I was pointing out was the last time it was spoken about, and that was the former hon. member for Grand Bank, it was in terms of an organization or a body which would administer the police force and my opposition to that, or the reason

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

I found it unacceptable was that we would be setting up an additional bureaucracy to run and manage the police force and that seemed to be unnecessary, especially in a Province where we have two police forces not a multiplicity. In Nova Scotia there are a eleven or twelve police forces, Halifax, Dartmouth, Antigonish, there are numerous police forces, and ten or twelve in New Brunswick as well. But what the hon. gentleman was referring to was not, as I understood it, an intermediary, a police commission to run the police, to manage the police, to be an administrative unit, but to be more of a body which could make review and recommendation upon citizen complaints. In general, I think that would be it. It would be an impartial body which would be in a position to hear and to make enquiries with respect to, and make recommendations with respect to complaints which might come from citizens in what they judge to be improper activities by the police.

I certainly agree that it is important to have an outside body. At times I get phone calls about an alleged instance where in somebody's opinion the police have not acted correctly and I have it followed through, I am sure the Chief does as well. But we did in 1982 amend The Parliamentary Commissioner Act, The Ombudsman Act with that in mind, and we did empower the Ombudsman to hear complaints with respect to the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary - well, I will read the two sections because they are quite self-explanatory. 'Without limiting the generality of this act, where a person has a complaint against any member of the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary that person may report the complaint to the Commissioner', the Commissioner there, the Parliamentary Commissioner (Ombudsman). And then, Subsection (2) 'Notwithstanding any provision of this Act, the Commissioner', in other words the Ombudsman, 'may investigate,

MR. OTTENHEIMER: review, recommend, and report
with respect to any complaint made under Subsection (1)
in accordance with the procedures set forth in this act.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: In other words, he would write the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) and make recommendations and indeed he would report to the House on any matter which he wished to report in respect thereof. So I just point out that the Parliamentary Commissioner, the Ombudsman, is empowered to hear any complaints with respect to the police force, the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary. Now it may be that the day will come when the Ombudsman would be too busy or this would be too onerous, and there may be too many complaints, or he might have too many other things on his plate, but before we -

MR. NEARY: Nobody pays any attention to the Ombudsman anyway.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Well, I cannot help that. You know, I mean, the hon. gentleman is there and he has certain statutory powers and he has been given the authority. As I say, the day might come when he would have too many other things on his plate whereby he could not do it, and if that were the case then obviously one could think of another person or body, whether it be a police commissioner or whatever you want to call it, to handle such complaints. But the mechanism is there now through the Ombudsman. But I just again want to make the distinction, because the same term has been used in two different instances. When Mr. Thoms was speaking about a police commission, he was talking of an administrative unit, as I recall, and that we will regard as an unnecessary additional level of bureaucracy.

The hon. gentleman for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) is speaking about it in terms of a board which could review police action as a result of citizens' complaints and make recommendations with respect thereof and really what I am saying is that that can now be done through the Ombudsman and if and when it appears that it is necessary to have another agency because the Ombudsman is too busy or for whatever other reason, then certainly another agency would be a

May 24, 1983

Tape No. 2478

NM - 2

MR. OTTENHEIMER: possibility. But the mechanism is there now through the Ombudsman.

I think I have covered the matters raised by hon. gentlemen.

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

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: I move second reading of the bill.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Uniformed Services Pensions Act," read a second time, ordered referred to Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No. 41).

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

MR. CHAIRMAN (Dr. McNicholas): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, before you proceed with business, perhaps I might suggest to the Committee that we adopt the same procedures we have in other years, that is be governed by Standing Order 118, subsection 5 of that Standing Order with respect to the money bills on the paper, and what really in effect that means is be governed by the same rules as pertain now with respect to Committee of Main Supply, that is, fifteen minutes and fifteen minutes and then ten and ten thereafter.

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, the Committee will be dealing with what has been called the loan bill. We have a resolution before us and the resolution will subsequently hopefully give rise to a bill. The resolution itself is explanatory of the bill, I think, and that is: "that it is expedient to bring in a measure to authorize the raising from time to time by way of loan on the credit of the Province the sum of \$220 million and such additional sum or sums of money as may be required to retire, repay, renew or refund securities issued under any act of the Province."

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, just a few words of explanation and there may be questions that need to be asked otherwise, but I would again point out that the loan bill does not include those monies that are required to roll over some of our previous borrowings. The loan bill is in addition to that. This loan bill today that hopefully the House will give assent to or give second reading to, is for the same amount as the loan bill of last year, 1982, where there was a similar amount requested, some \$220 million. Just an indication of how that sum is arrived at, Mr. Speaker. The budgetary requirements were for just over \$200.3 million and that amount included what we anticipate would be spent on capital account plus the relatively small amount of deficits that we are projecting this year on current account. Mr. Speaker, to that amount of the budgetary requirements, as I just mentioned, we have to add the amount that will be required for debt retirement and sinking fund requirements which do not have to be in the loan bill. So you have our budgetary requirements, the amount for debt retirement and sinking fund will be just over \$94.3 million. Our total borrowings there will add up therefore to \$294.6 million. Mr. Speaker, we already have authority to borrow from the Canada Pension Plan under another Act, and this is not impaired in any way when the 1982 Loan Act expires, that authority continues under the Canada Pension Act, we have authority to borrow just over \$52.7 million. So we have to take that \$52.7 million from that sum I just gave you a minute ago of \$294.6 million, and on that basis one would anticipate that the loan bill should be for \$147.6 million. So if you would do it on that sum it would

DR. COLLINS: come to \$147.6 million. The loan bill puts in an amount to give us flexibility, it puts in \$72.4 million to give us flexibility and that flexibility is required because we only have the authority to borrow, apart from the loan bill, in terms of debt retirement as those debts are retired. And, of course, the debts are not all retired at the beginning of the year, some of the debts will not be retired until very late in the year, and if we relied on that additional authority only we might find ourselves in a very tight position at some desirable point in the year when it would be a good idea from the Province's point of view, to borrow, so there is that amount put in for flexibility, of \$72.4 million. Now, Mr. Speaker, it does not necessarily mean that the government exercises the full extent of the authority given, The authority is there but it does not mean we always use the whole authority up; the House does not allow the authority to be exceeded, of course,

DR. COLLINS: but it does allow that flexibility. Last year, for instance, when the 1982 loan bill expires, and it will expire when the 1983 loan bill comes into effect, it expires immediately, there will be a residual amount of something between \$35 million and \$40 million left in the old loan bill -

MR. NEARY: How much is left?

DR. COLLINS: \$35 million to \$40 million. So we still have that authority to borrow at this point in time. But that will lapse when the new loan bill comes into effect.

Mr. Chairman, I am quite sure there may well be questions asked as to what were our borrowings last year in detail or perhaps what the public debt is and so on and so forth, but possibly the best way to have handled it would be not to anticipate such questions but to leave my remarks as they are now and I will be in the position to answer any questions as they arise.

I move the resolution.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman is quite right in anticipating a number of questions and probably a few comments from members on this side of the House about the government borrowing for last year and for this year.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let it be recorded that this is a record amount that is being borrowed by the administration. They are asking the House to approve borrowing to the extent of \$294.6 million of which the hon. gentleman tells us that \$72.4 million is for flexibility. In other words, the administration are asking for a cushion, they are asking the House to approve \$72.4 million in case of any emergency that may crop up. When the House is not sitting the hon. gentlemen will be able to go out and borrow the money if loans become due or they have to meet

MR. NEARY: their debt.

Now, the hon. gentleman also told us that last year there was an amount of \$35 million to \$40 million provided for in the loan bill which was around the \$220 million. There was an amount that they did not borrow. Now, could the hon. gentleman just make a note of this, one of the questions I want to ask the hon. gentleman, will this amount be indeed borrowed before the new loan bill comes into effect? Have the government completed their borrowing for the year? Will they be looking for this \$35 million to \$40 million? Have they made any arrangements to float that loan, to borrow that amount of money before the new loan bill comes into effect?

Now, Mr. Chairman, the administration over the last few months, and indeed in the last couple of years, have been boasting about the fact that the credit rating of this Province has not been affected in the last year or two. Well, our credit rating, Mr. Speaker, is so low, or so high I suppose is the right way to put it, our credit rating is so bad that if you tampered with it at all that it may just put the Province in a terrible financial bind.

MR. NEARY: It is very unlikely that the credit rating unless something drastic happens, something unforeseen happens that the credit rating will be tampered with, because there is no room to manoeuvre with Newfoundland's credit rating, Mr. Speaker. We have the worst credit rating in the whole of Canada. And to change the credit rating, I think, would mean bankruptcy for Newfoundland. That is what it would mean, it is so bad, our credit rating.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we also have the highest per capita debt in the whole nation. Our total debt at the moment is around \$3.5 billion or \$3,500 million, \$3.5 billion is our provincial debt. This is just about \$7,000 for every man, woman and child in this Province. A child who is born since the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) just spoke, any child born after that will be in debt almost \$7,000, the day it is born. That is the highest per capita debt in the whole nation.

MR. TULK: How much was it when that supposedly wasteful Liberal government -

MR. NEARY: When that wasteful Liberal government, that much maligned Liberal government was in power the personal per capita debt I believe was around \$1,200 or \$1,300.

MR. TULK: So in ten years we have had an increase of (inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Yes, in ten years the personal per capita debt -

MR. CALLAN: Eleven years.

MR. NEARY: In eleven years, the personal per capita debt has jumped from around \$1,200 or \$1,400 up to almost \$7,000 for every man, woman and child in this Province.

MR. TULK: That is an increase of 500 per cent.

MR. NEARY: That is an increase of 500 per cent in eleven years. And that is pretty heavy stuff, Mr. Chairman, pretty serious.

MR. TULK: And they are supposed to be developing the Province, what have they developed?

MR. NEARY: I would not mind, Mr. Chairman, if for that \$3.5 billion we had anything to show for it.

MR. TULK: They have nothing.

MR. NEARY: They have nothing to show for it, there are no new industries, no new mines opened. Mr. Chairman, I noticed over the weekend a certain -

MR. TULK: And the government cannot even give us a commitment to help some lobster fishermen.

MR. NEARY: That is right. A certain gentleman who writes editorial comments in one of the newspapers, who is a notorious Tory, writes a column in one of the daily newspapers in this Province was highly critical, very critical of the administration. Now, what was he critical of the administration for?

MR. TULK: Is that the one that came over the weekend?

MR. NEARY: That is the one that came over the weekend, yes.

MR. TULK: Even the Tories are aware of it.

MR. NEARY: As a matter of fact, there were three editorials in the newspapers over the weekend and, of course, there was one today - to count it to three there is one today which is a different topic.

AN HON. MEMBER: That one tells the truth.

MR. NEARY: Yes, that one tells the truth, the others do not tell the truth. Mr. Wick Collins does not tell the truth, the Editor of The Evening Telegram or The Daily News do not tell the truth. Mr. Rowe is the only

May 24, 1983

Tape No. 2482

SD - 3

MR. NEARY:

one who tells the truth, Mr.

Chairman.

MR. CALLAN:

What about Michael Harris?

MR. NEARY:

Michael Harris had a beaut

in too,

MR. NEARY: "Off colour humour just does not pay". We should have circulated that one and laid it on members' desks today, it was in Friday's Globe and Mail. I draw that one to the attention of hon. gentlemen there opposite.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it would not be so bad -

MR. TULK: Do you mean to say they wasted that Xerox paper to send that over, what Bill Rowe wrote?

MR. NEARY: Oh, yes. That was somebody on the opposite side.

MR. TULK: Whoever did that over on the other side should have it deducted from his salary.

MR. NEARY: Somebody whose mind is just as devious as the author of that article, just as devious.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BUTT: A former Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. NEARY: I knew before the afternoon was over, Mr. Chairman, that I would get a rise from gentlemen there opposite.

MR. WARREN: What happened to Mr. Greene I wonder?

MR. NEARY: Who?

MR. CALLAN: What about Frank Moores? What is he? How is he?

AN HON. MEMBER: He was elected too.

MR. CALLAN: Yes, is that right?

MR. TOBIN: Those sent from Burin-Placentia West, they were elected too.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I knew I would get a rise out of them before the afternoon was over. We may as well have it out now, because it will lay there -

MR. TULK: It is like throwing out bait.

MR. NEARY: That is right. You throw them out the bait and they take it down, they gobble it down hook, line and sinker, Mr. Chairman. Maybe I have gotten pretty far on my face, Mr. Chairman, but I know other people who have gotten pretty far on their name.

MR. TOBIN: "Steve is now a harmless, burnt-out case".

MR. CALLAN: That is the fellow who wastes taxpayer dollars. They are after you.

MR. TULK: The cub from Burin-Placentia West.

MR. CALLAN: I heard you on the radio telling lies, over the weekend.

MR. NEARY: But anyway, Mr. Chairman, now that they have taken the bait, they have gobbled it down, let them have their little say now and then we will get back to the public debt.

MR. TOBIN: I spoke the truth.

MR. WARREN: You did not even tell the truth in the House the other day.

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

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I was going to say that this -

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order, the hon. member for Burin-Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN: I think the hon. member for Torngat Mountains just made an accusation that was loudly heard in this House, that I lied to this hon. House and I think he should be asked to withdraw.

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

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

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, we do not have a member for Torngate Mountains in this House, that is one thing, and the other thing is, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that Your Honour consult with Hansard before ruling on that kind of a thing. The hon. gentleman was not even in his seat. He rushes back to his seat and he gets

MR. NEARY:

up on a point of order, something he is alleged to have heard somebody on this side of the House make a comment on, Mr. Chairman, So I would say there is no point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

To that point of order, I will look at Hansard to see what comments were made, and I will rule on it in time.

MR. NEARY: Anyway, I started to talk about this gentleman who wrote the column. Now, what was the criticism of the administration? The criticism of the administration was that they had mismanaged and neglected the Newfoundland and Labrador economy. The gentleman even went as far as to say that he was rather surprised at the impact, the consequences, the long-term consequences of the teachers dispute, that he more or less implied and agreed with the Premier that this matter would blow over, that the teachers would not remember. Well, now, Mr. Chairman, the only thing I can say to that is we will have to wait and see.

I remember another occasion in this Province when the teachers did not forget. As a matter of fact, the teachers claimed credit to a large degree, for rooting out the twenty-three year old Liberal administration in this Province, that was here from 1949 right up until 1972. The teachers claimed credit for that. And I have a feeling, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Collins may be wrong on that. I think the teachers will remember. But, anyway, that is neither here nor there, we will just have to wait and see, only time will prove whether he is right or whether he is wrong.

But on the state of the economy that seems to be the crucial point, that seems to be what everybody in Newfoundland and Labrador is talking about today, the state of the Newfoundland economy. And if there is one thing the administration can be condemned for and criticized for is their mismanaging the Newfoundland and Labrador economy

MR. NEARY: and mismanaging our natural resources. Our debt is \$3.5 billion or almost \$7,000 per every man, woman, and child in this Province and we do not have a single thing to show for it in the last eleven years. No new mines, no new industries started, no meaningful businesses started in this Province -

MR. CALLAN: No new minds, m-i-n-d-s.

MR. NEARY: - that can generate new dollars, Mr. Chairman. And therein lies the problem. The debt is going up. The administration have done nothing to curb the debt. They are burying their heads in the sand. They are just carrying on as if the money was going to roll in. They based all their hopes on offshore oil and gas. They went to the voters in this Province on April 6, 1982 in a one-issue election. There was only one issue. Now remember they had 33 seats in this House, 33 , and they went back to the voters to ask the voters to give them a mandate to negotiate an offshore agreement, Mr. Chairman. And the reason you have forty-four members sitting on that side of the House today is -

MR. HODDER: There are only twenty there now.

MR. NEARY: - because the people agreed to give the present Leader of the administration , the Premier, a mandate to negotiate an offshore agreement, and they have not even done that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, as Mr. Wick Collins said over the weekend, if there were an election today - now that gentleman is not known to be very complimentary towards the Liberals or the Opposition - he said if there were an election today, it would be a different story. The hon. gentleman thinks through his pork barrelling and his political patronage, the hon. gentleman thinks that by filling up the jobs in the Summer with people from his own district that that is going to get him re-elected. What the hon. gentleman does not realize is that for every person he puts in a job, he makes a hundred enemies. The hon. gentleman should realize that.

So here we are now, Mr. Chairman, into a situation where the government wants to borrow \$294.6 million, our debt is \$3.5 billion or \$7,000 for every man, woman and child in the Province, and in the last eleven years they cannot point a finger at one significant activity, they cannot point a finger at one major development in this Province, and that is the whole problem with this administration, Mr. Chairman. That is why they can be so severely criticized, they have not delivered, they have not produced. The state of the Newfoundland economy is in a horrible mess. We have record unemployment, especially among young people who cannot find jobs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. NEARY: Well, maybe I will get another crack at it, Mr. Chairman.

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

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) raised some points, I suppose I may as well answer them as we go along just very briefly.

The hon. member says we are borrowing - the loan bill is a record amount. As I indicated, it is not a record amount, it is the same amount as last year. He mentioned about the cushion, and he is quite right, you could look upon the extra amounts that we have added on as somewhat of a cushion, but as I explained, it is to give us the flexibility that we really do need and also, if circumstances were particularly good, it would allow us to pre-borrow for next year. But the circumstances would have to be very good for that. He also asked whether we intend to borrow on the amount that is left in the 1982 loan bill. Mr. Speaker, no, for two reasons: The amount is relatively small. We usually do not borrow for a lesser amount than \$15 million, it is just not administratively efficient to borrow for less than that at any one time and there is not that amount left in the 1982 loan bill, but also, of course, one hopes that the 1983 loan bill will be adopted very shortly and the 1982 loan bill will expire at the same time.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition said our credit rating is the worst in Canada and it could not go any lower. Well, it certainly could go lower,

DR. COLLINS:

very definitely it could go lower. In some respects it is not even the worst in Canada. With some credit rating agencies in the United States, yes, there is no province lower than ours, but the Canadian credit rating people have given us ratings similar, for instance, to P.E.I. and to Nova Scotia and so on. Our credit rating is low and our aim in this administration is to get it up and I think we will in time. But certainly we were holding our own extremely well, which other provinces have not been able to do, and in some respects we are not any lower than some other provinces in the same position as ourselves. He mentioned the per capita debt, \$7,000; if you want a precise figure I do have it here, it is not \$7,000. In actual fact, at the present time, if one includes the indirect debt as well as the direct debt, that is the debt that is guaranteed by the Province but is held by the Crown Corporations and so on and so forth and guarantees we have given to certain businesses, for instance, the fishing industries who need these guarantees to be able to pursue their activities, especially in difficult financial times, if you roll these all in, at the end of March 31, 1983, the per capita debt was \$5,940; the direct debt was \$3,494 and the indirect debt was \$2,446 and those figures added will give you \$5,940 per capita.

MR. TULK:

But what is that per capita debt?

DR. COLLINS:

I just told you. I just told you.

The per capita debt - the direct debt is \$3494, that is the direct debt, and the per capita debt indirect is -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) thousand divided into the public debt and what do you get?

DR. COLLINS:

Are you talking about the public sector debt? The total public sector debt, I presume.

MR. TULK: No, the public debt.

DR. COLLINS: There is a difference. Hon. members opposite may not know this but there are two aspects of public sector debt and they are very different from each other

AN HON. MEMBER: It is a provincial debt.

DR. COLLINS: The public sector debt per capita is \$5,940.

MR. CALLAN: How much?

DR. COLLINS: \$5,940.

MR. CALLAN: \$5,940?

DR. COLLINS: Yes, not \$7,000 as the hon. member said.

MR. NEARY: Is the indirect debt in that?

DR. COLLINS: The indirect debt is in that. Mr. Chairman, the hon. members opposite obviously do not know what they are talking about so I will leave that subject.

DR. COLLINS: there are a lot of interruptions over there. I notice most of the interruptions are from that side of the House. I do not think the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) needs those Charlie McCarthy helps when he speaks. I think he is quite capable of speaking for himself. But the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) and the hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) sort of keep feeding him remarks as though he needs that sort of help. He does not. He is a very experienced orator and no matter what you might think about the content of his speaking, he does not need help from the rather inexperienced callow youths on either side of him. He is quite able to make his own remarks.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Leader of the Opposition also made some remarks about the economy which I would like to respond to just very briefly. He sort of compared the management of the economy under Liberal regimes with the management of the economy under the PC administrations and he did it to the -

MR. CALLAN: Tory.

DR. COLLINS: All right Tory. Tory is a fine word. - to the latter's detriment. I would like to just very briefly analyze how the Liberals handled things. In the first instance the Liberals brought in multiple, small, non-resource based related businesses. And you know the chocolate factory, the tobacco factory, the shoe factory and all these sorts of things, nothing to do with our resources and, of course, they had an abysmal failure rate. That was the first attempt that the Liberals used.

The second attempt at having a go at it was to bring in large organizations. Some of these were non-resource based and, of course, a classic one was the Come By Chance refinery, It is nothing to do with our resources that were on the horizon at the time and, of course, that also was an

DR. COLLINS: abysmal failure and we are only now trying to dig ourselves out of that hole. They then brought in large resources related to our resources. They finally got the message and they brought in large resource businesses related to our resources here. And, of course, the classic one is the Upper Churchill and the other classic one, of course, is Linerboard. But they brought them in in such a hopeless way, a totally hopeless way that the province does not get any benefit from them. The Upper Churchill is a large organization. It is based on our resources. I will give them A for that, but they brought it in in such an abysmally stupid way that we do not get any benefits from it. And similarly with the Linerboard mill. The Linerboard mill was based on our resources, our wood resources. As a thought it was not a bad thing, but they did it in such an infantile, you know, slipshod mismanagement type of way that the whole thing was a total disaster. And what we had to do, we had to dig our way out of it and now in place of the hopeless way they managed it we now have got in place out in Stephenville an operation which is a very, very successful operation.

How did the PCs come in? How did they manage things? They made an underlying commitment. One is that most of the development here will be based, sensibly, on our resources. And we will do it in small ways, that is in the fishery, we will do it in the forestry, we will do it in rural Newfoundland, the small operations out there, the small service operations out there in Newfoundland, and we have been tremendously successful in doing that. The other thing we committed ourselves to was that when we would bring in, again because based, but when we will bring in not the small but the large organizations, well we will bring them in with careful planning, we will hold a persistent course. And, of course, that is what we have done. We are now planning for further hydro development,

May 24, 1983

Tape No. 2487

NM - 3

DR. COLLINS: we are planning for offshore developments, and we are now planning for fishery development, but we will bring it in in a carefully planned way so that you will not have these tremendous mistakes that the Liberals made when they brought in large resource-based operations, but which were so unplanned, so poorly

DR. COLLINS:

organized, so slipshodly done that they did not have a chance of success. So that is just a snapshot picture of the difference between the way the economy was managed when the Liberals were in and the way it is now being sensibly managed with the Tories in.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) thinks that was a grand speech. That is right up his alley, Mr. Chairman. The hon. gentleman does not have the energy to get up himself today and make a speech. And for some reason or other the hon. gentleman is very quiet, sitting in his seat over there, hoping that hon. members there opposite will not intimidate the Opposition, will not provoke us into prolonging debate on this bill. The hon. gentleman is so anxious to get out of here! Mr. Chairman, I never saw the Government House Leader so anxious to get out of out of the House. Now the hon. gentleman sits in his seat and he is not going to say anything. Every time somebody there opposite gets up, he looks around out of the corner of his eye as much as to say, 'Will you sit down and keep quiet, boy, because all you are doing is encouraging that crowd over there to make more speeches'.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt but by Friday the Lieutenant-Governor will be in to sign the bills, no doubt about that at all, because there is a limit to what we can do, there are only eight of us. I spoke for seven days on the Budget Speech in the hope that the administration would produce plans to deal with the Newfoundland and Labrador economy and they did not and they have not so far. The House will close, they still have not produced any plans. I bet you, Mr. Chairman, that you cannot think of one positive plan that was debated in this House in this session that deals with the horrible state

MR. NEARY: of the Newfoundland and Labrador economy. Can Your Honour point to one suggestion, one idea, one plan, put forward by the administration to deal with record unemployment in this Province?

MR. TULK: The Chairman is racking his brain on it.

MR. NEARY: The Chairman is racking his brain, and rightly so, because there are none. Not one hon. gentleman there opposite can point his finger to one positive, constructive idea that has been laid on the Table of this House by the present administration to deal with the Newfoundland and Labrador economy or to deal with high unemployment in this Province or to deal with high electricity rates or to deal with the crisis in the fishery or to deal with the situation in Corner Brook or in Labrador West or in Buchans.

Mr. Chairman, I have to say this, Eight days ago I asked the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Dawe) about the barite operation in Buchans. It is now shut down. This administration has a long track record of shutting down industries in the Province. They went out to Buchans a little over a year ago and they boasted about the fact that offshore oil would help communities like Buchans. The member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry), who was then the Minister of Energy, told the people in Buchans that, even though the mine was going to close, the barite operation, which was then employing thirty-five or forty men, would increase, would go up to fifty, sixty, seventy, eighty, ninety employees. They were told that the barite operation to provide the mud for offshore was the last hope that Buchans had of permanent jobs, permanent employment.

MR. NEARY: That was a little over a year ago and now they have had the carpet pulled out from under their feet again, Mr. Chairman. Their hopes and aspirations were built up by this administration, they were led to believe that they would get local preference -

MR. MARSHALL: You are talking about the barite now?

MR. NEARY: I am talking about the barite in Buchans- and now we are told that there will not be one pound of barite produced in Buchans this year and that the people who were working producing barite, and the ones who thought they were going to get jobs in that barite operation, have now been economically marooned. And, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman who answered the questions during the Oral Question Period today on this criminal, almost cruel, building up of hopes in Buchans, talked about a joint venture, talked about somebody coming in from outside and joining in a joint venture with a local company. All that local company did was put up the building, all they are doing is fronting for somebody outside this Province when in Buchans we have Newfoundland companies and we have \$400,000 of Canadian taxpayer money that went into that operation and now it is shut down without a hope of ever getting in operation again. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is the kind of policy that this administration have been following. That is the kind of policy that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) was just telling us about, how cautiously they move, they will not move unless they are sure of themselves, they are being very cautious about the development of our natural resources, they have a different policy than the Liberals. Well, certainly they have a different policy. The Liberals were developers, the Liberals believed in development. They developed the Province, they were builders.

May 24, 1983

Tape No. 2489

MJ - 2

MR. DINN: You gave it all away.

MR. NEARY: 'You gave it all away.' Just listened to that now! That is their old, tired excuse, 'You gave it all away.'

Now, the kind of policy they are following now, the one that was just outlined by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) whose now speaking for the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) and speaking for the administration is the

MR. NEARY: 'shut her down' policy, 'shut her down.' They shut down Come By Chance. The very first thing they did, by the way, when they formed the government was shut down a steel mill at the Octagon, that was the first casualty of the Tory administration, and they have been shutting down one operation after the other ever since. The steel mill was closed down the moment the Tories took over the government of this Province. And Mr. Crosbie, who is out looking for the leadership of the national Tory Party, going around Canada telling everybody how he believes in private enterprise, how clean he is as far as having any socialist ideas is concerned, that he is Mr. Pure. Well, who nationalized Labrador linerboard at a cost of \$500 million to the taxpayers of this Province? And who kicked out the best corporate citizen we had in this Province, BRINCO, and nationalized the Churchill Falls Corporation? It was none other than Bully - boy, himself. Bully-boy Crosbie, who is now going back and forth across Canada preaching private enterprise.

Mr. Chairman, I am tempted to write a letter and have it circulated to the delegates at that convention, only I would not lower myself, I am tempted to do it.

MR. WINDSOR: They need some comic relief.

MR. TULK: Listen, your father went to school in Ladle Cove; do not make a fool of yourself.

MR. NEARY: The clown is going back and forth across Canada now telling us what a firm believer he is in the private enterprise system. Well, in this Province we can point out finger to two industries that were nationalized by Mr. Crosbie - he was the instigator of it, he was the Godfather of it - two industries nationalized that cost the taxpayers of this Province I would say upwards of \$1 billion, \$1,000,000,000, and that is the same gentleman now that is trying to con people, trying to pull the wool over the eyes of delegates to the

MR. NEARY: convention, that he is the great saviour of the private enterprise system in Canada.

MR. BUTT: He is coming on strong.

MR. NEARY: He is coming on strong. Well, Mr. Chairman, I will tell you how strong he is coming on -

MR. TULK: He provides the jokes.

MR. NEARY: - I say he will be very embarrassed when this is all over. By the way, I have to say this, too, in case hon. gentlemen do not know; Mr. Mulroney has a supporter on the opposite side of the House -

MR. WARREN: That is right.

MR. NEARY: - the member for Menihek (Mr. Walsh) has listed a telephone number -

MR. WARREN: Plus two other delegates from Labrador City.

MR. NEARY: Not his own, by the way, a government phone number, in the brochures that

MR. NEARY: have been sent out by Mr. Mulroney. So Mr. Crosbie does not have 100 per cent of that side of the House.

DR. COLLINS: They are all good P.C.s. We do not mind supporting any of these, they are all really good fellows.

MR. NEARY: The member for Menihek (Mr. Walsh) is going his own way and I cannot blame the member for Menihek for not wanting to have anything to do with Mr. Mulroney since he represents a district where you have the Iron Ore Company of Canada. And there are probably a lot of other members over there who will not come out openly.

MR. TULK: Did you hear what he said, that they were all good P.C.s, in other words, he would support Mulroney?

MR. NEARY: There is no such thing as a good P.C.

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

MR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, there are a couple of points I want to make. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), in an earlier address, pointed out that this government had done nothing, had nothing to show for the money it borrowed, and although it would be tedious repetition on my part to go into it, I will mention that Stephenville was rescued and, of course, the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Cross) has just informed us generally that the causeway to Greenspond Island is now linked up and is a very successful industrial venture.

MR. CARTER: By the way, while I am looking across the House - this is not relevant to anything, Mr. Chairman - I should point out that I suppose the Liberal Party of Newfoundland is the only party that has ever chosen as its president a man with the first name, 'Beaton'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CARTER: And I think it is symptomatic of the straits and the fix they find themselves in. 'Beaton' by name and beaten by nature!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CARTER: I used to think that the Liberal Party was a very happy party to be in; one merely had to join the Liberal Party to be assured of many hundreds of close, bosom friends. But in this morning's paper I read this article by a former Leader of the Liberal Party who disassociates himself absolutely from the present Leader, who he says was not elected. I had forgotten that, I think most members had forgotten: They are so used to Leaders of the Liberal Party springing up like mushrooms that they figure they must be there legitimately. But the hon. gentleman was not elected, he was chosen by some sort of rump.

MR. BUTT: Yes, at a celebrity roast.

MR. CARTER: Anyway, I do think that the loan bill should pass. I have to congratulate the government because of the size of their loan bill, which is no larger than last year, as the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) pointed out.

MR. CARTER: I certainly would hope that we would be able to get by some year without any loans except for those needed to roll over any debt that is coming due and I do take small issue with the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) there that I do not see the distinction between current and capital, it all has to be repaid, and I would hope that the present course that he is successfully navigating he will be able to follow to a more successful conclusion. So, I would like to congratulate him and I would like to say that I am certainly voting for this loan bill.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN (McNicholas): The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Chairman, in the few minutes that I am going to speak, I would like to tell the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) a little story. His Tory colleagues at one time, I believe it was the 1979 election, their motto was, 'Let's beat Beat.' And I have to tell him that the Tories have not succeeded in beating Beat yet, and I do not plan on having them do it. So, I would like to tell the member for St. John's North that.

MR. TOBIN: I hope that is not supposed to be funny.

MR. TULK: It is not supposed to be funny. It is about as funny as the member for St. John's North was.

MR. TOBIN: No, he was right on.

MR. TULK: He was right on?

MR. TOBIN: Yes.

MR. TULK: Okay.

MR. HODDER: Well, it depends on the eye of the beholder.

MR. TULK: That is right.

The Minister of Finance spoke of the record of the previous Liberal Government. Mr. Chairman, I

MR. TULK: did not have the privilege to serve in that government, I did not have the privilege to be part of the Liberal Party at that time. He went on to point out that the Liberal Government wasted all sorts of money on developing this Province and he said this government would never do that, they were going to keep planning, they were going to have their plans for resource development, they were going to develop small. Well, I suggest to them that the small development that has taken place in this Province under this government is about yea wide. Mr. Chairman, it is true that this government has not wasted money on development. That is a true statement. They have wasted the money of this Province, Mr. Chairman, but there has certainly been no development. The Tory Government cannot list developments, as the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) tried desperately to list. I think he said something about Stephenville being opened up, being rescued by the Tory Government. Now, Mr. Chairman, Stephenville, as I understand it, as I remember it, was closed down by a Tory by the name of John Crosbie, Bully-Boy Crosbie, and then the same gentleman, the same John C. Crosbie opened it up again. So the Liberals

MR. TULK:

had it open, the Tories closed it down and the Tories opened it up.

MR. ROBERTS: All that happened was he left \$250 million on the table when he did it.

MR. TULK: And he left \$250 million, I am told by my friend from the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts), on the table when he did it. Now that is typical of the Tory administration in this Province.

Mr. Chairman, the Finance Minister (Dr. Collins) also mentioned the planning of this government, and that, again, is a true statement. All this government has done is plan, plan, plan. I was looking for that five-year plan. Where is that? The Minister of Finance was heard to say last year, on one particular occasion when asked how his five-year plan was progressing, 'Five-year plans are five-year plans. We are now a year ahead, we have not done really anything that is in the five-year plan, but we will use it for the next five years,' a year later after you produce the document.

Mr. Chairman, we have had eleven years of planning by this government, no action, absolutely no action. They are the best example that you can find in Canada of planners. The government budget was a fine example of planning, planning on how you could get dollars out of the poor and the working class people in this Province to finance nothing, absolutely nothing, only an administration that can be considered a caretaker government. It had no new investment strategies at all, nothing, absolutely nothing to narrow the gap between Newfoundlanders and the rest of Canada. The theme of that budget was 'Sock it to the poor and the working class in this Province, to keep us planning, to keep the government planning,' making plans but no action. Mr. Chairman, they have all kinds of plans, yet today, when

MR. TULK: you ask the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) what he is going to do about a disaster on the Northeast Coast of this Province, an emergency situation in the fishery in this Province, they are going to do everything that they can, he said, but they have no money.

Mr. Chairman, that is the type of answer that you get. Last week we asked the Premier in this House about the Fishery Products situation, where we have 750 plant workers being laid off. The best he could do was promise to give us the answers later. What did we get back, Mr. Chairman? Something about the collective agreement that we knew all the time but he was not even aware of. That is the kind of action we are getting from this government.

Mr. Chairman, the President of the Council and the Finance Minister (Dr. Collins) are very fond of standing up and talking about the wasteful Liberal government before 1971. Well, as I understand it,

MR. TULK: and the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) can correct me, but as I understand it the public debt in this Province when the Liberal Government went out of office was something like \$970 million.

MR. NEARY: Less than that.

MR. TULK: Less than that?

MR. ROBERTS: And there was something to show for it.

MR. NEARY: That is right, we had something to show for it.

MR. TULK: \$970 million, I understand, but you say it was less than that. In any case, it was less than \$1 billion, substantially less than \$1 billion. Today it is \$3.5 billion, but, as the member for the Strait of Belle Isle just said, when the Liberal Government went out of office there was something to show for it. And I am sure that the Leader of the Opposition and the member for the Strait of Belle Isle could stand up and could stay here until eight or nine o'clock tonight listing off the accomplishments of that government.

The development projects that took place, the successes that took place, and there were failures, but the successes that took place under the previous Liberal Government were unparalleled in Newfoundland's history. And we have seen absolutely nothing, not one thing -

AN HON. MEMBER: You can name one.

MR. TULK: - you cannot name one thing that this government has done, not one thing they can point to and say 'That is our idea, that is our original idea.' Absolutely nothing. And yet today, eleven years after they took office -

MR. ROBERTS: Closing hospitals.

MR. TULK: Well, they are good at closing hospitals. Somebody pointed out to me over the weekend the strange kind of planning that goes on in this government. While they are closing down one hospital, they are promising the people of Clarenville

MR. TULK: and Burin that they are going to build them one. They are going to close down one and build another one. They are going to cut down on the staff in one hospital, cut it down to the place where there is absolutely no service, practically none - the quality of service, not the quantity but the quality of service has obviously got to deteriorate. And what do we have to show for it? A \$3.5 billion deficit. Now, remember, after twenty-three years of Liberal rule we had substantially less than \$1 billion, something like \$1200 for every man, woman and child per capita debt in this Province. Today what do we have? The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) says it is something around - what was it he said, \$5,000?

MR. NEARY: \$5,900.

MR. TULK: \$5,900. He is using the same kind of mathematics that he used when he said that an increase of 2 per cent to 3 per cent was not a 50 per cent increase, rather it was 1 per cent. The same kind of mathematics.

MR. NEARY: Buy it for \$1, sell it for \$2, that is 1 per cent.

MR. TULK: In actual fact, the public debt has increased from about \$1,200 in 1971-1972 to \$6,500 or \$6,600 today.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. TULK: And as I said before, what has been done? Not a thing.

We have heard from the former Premier of this Province, this Premier of this Province say - we have had Churchill Falls come out of our ears - they are going to develop Churchill Falls. Every election Churchill is brought up to the front, or slightly before an election, promises of this going to be done with Churchill Falls, that is going to be done, the development of Churchill Falls is imminent. They wanted a corridor across Quebec, they wanted the legislation passed by the federal government, they got that, and they are still sitting on it, still no development offshore

MR. TULK: oil, Mr. Chairman, the development of the offshore, the expenditures of funds in this Province to develop the offshore, what has that done for us? Mr. Chairman, we have a Premier in this Province who will go down in history as the person who gave it away absolutely. He is the person who gave it away, put it in the courts of this Province, and by putting it in the courts gave it away. He refused to have a negotiated settlement. The Premier of this Province gave away the offshore oil in this Province. That is the accomplishment of this government, Mr. Chairman. That is it. That is what they have done.

The fishery, they have sat on their hands over there for about six months with the South Coast of this Province closed down until finally, at our insistence, I believe it was on March 16, they rushed off to Ottawa with this little plan on restructuring. If you go back through Hansard and do some research you can see what they desperately did, without any plans themselves, was take a few ideas that they got from this side of the House and put them on paper. That is exactly what they did. They are great planners, Mr. Chairman.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) is depending on his Tory buddy down in Burin to get him re-elected. He will not say who that is, but we know who it is, his Tory buddy, he hopes that he is going to be popular and as a result he will try to ride in on his coattails.

MR. NEARY: He is so unpopular down there that you would not believe it.

MR. TULK: No, he is not popular, and he is not unpopular. The truth is that on the Burin Peninsula he is a non-factor.

MR. TOBIN: Tell us about the survey that was done in Burin-Placentia West.

MR. TULK: That is the word that has been given to me. The word in Burin-Placentia West is that the member is a non-factor.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. TULK: He is not important nor he is not unimportant.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. member's time has elapsed. The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Chairman, when we see a bill of this magnitude come into the House it makes us stop to reflect on where we are going as a Province. The minister said it is no greater than last year's, but I would like to say to the minister that it certainly adds on to what we borrowed last year. So if we had record borrowing last year and record borrowing this year that makes twice the amount of money that we borrowed, and I would like to see the minister come in to the House and tell us that the economy of this Province is strong enough, that we can decrease our borrowing in this Province.

Mr. Chairman, it is of great fear to us on this side of the House that the Province is slipping into a mire from which we might not be able to extract ourselves because nothing is happening. We heard the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), I believe over the weekend or on Friday, talking about our GNP growing by 2 per cent this year. I do not know where the

MR. HODDER: minister is getting his figures; he has been notoriously inaccurate in his predictions over the past twelve months. We have a massive deficit of \$26 million projected, which looks more and more every day, with the continuing problems in the fishery and the continuing problems in our mining industry that this deficit will be much larger than the minister has predicted, but at the same time nothing has happened. It would seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that the members opposite for the past four years have put all of the eggs in the one basket. The offshore oil has been the guiding and overriding thing, and this government has hooked its wagon to that one star. As soon as the Newfoundland Supreme Court case was over and offshore oil was something that did not motivate this government as much as before, since that time it seems as if the government ministers are not even bothering to turn up in their seats. It is the first time in the eight years that I have been in the House of Assembly that I come into the House for Question Period and find eight or nine ministers absent from their seats, as was the case again today. It seems, Mr. Chairman, that there is no longer that zeal in the individual departments - the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor), the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Dawe) - to go out and do things. Certainly the Premier has taken a hands-off approach to the economy for the last two years, and in the last year and a half things have been getting very, very bad and he sort of stands back from the economy and says, 'No, we will just ride this one out and then they will sign the oil agreement, we will get some revenues going and things will pick up.' But there has been no effort whatsoever to try to change the economic events that have been happening in this Province. As my friend from Fogo (Mr. Tulk) mentioned recently, on the restructuring of the fishery the government took a hands-off approach, the strategy

MR. HODDER: of the government all the way through. I mean, when you go back and look at some of the Premier's statements, he does not make so many of those statements, Mr. Chairman, any more. One time you would see him every five or six months on local television telling Newfoundlanders that the federal government are going to take away our church schools; then you hear a minister six months later speculating out loud that we should perhaps do away with the church schools. I do not know what the end of her comments could have meant otherwise, if it was not a trial balloon.

MR. NEARY: A pretty stiff letter from the churches.

MR. HODDER: I would say so. And telling us that we were going to lose our Labrador boundary, and running a government which focused people's attention on the federal government, who were trying to do something, because he who tries to do something sometimes makes mistakes, but he who does nothing cannot make mistakes; and that has been the philosophy of the Premier, to focus attention on the federal government, to warp the minds, to use propaganda - and that is one thing this government has been noted for, and that is one thing the Premier has been noted for. Every minister has someone in his department now who is a public relations person. We have a fantastic bureaucracy downstairs which grinds out press releases for ministers. The Premier, I must admit, is a master of propaganda. The thrust of this government is to sign that deal, get the offshore oil, but I often wonder, Mr. Chairman, what would have happened had there been no oil? Where would this government be then? It probably would have been good for Newfoundland if we had not struck the oil so quickly.

MR. HODDER: It has done nothing to this point for the economy of the Province, or very little, but, Mr. Chairman, it has allowed the government to get away with focusing the people's minds to the future, to the pie in the sky, instead of sitting down to wrestle with the economy.

Interprovincial relations between this government and the federal government are the worst in history. And with those types of relations how can we wrestle with the problem of high unemployment in various areas of this Province? There are areas of this Province where the unemployment is horrendous. There are geographical areas in this Province where there is unemployment of 85 per cent and 90 per cent, there were last Winter, and the figures have not dropped very much now, yet the government stand by and does nothing.

As a matter of fact, the last budget which was brought down here in the House did worse than nothing because the budget was aimed at those people who had less. There are more and more people in the Province now on social assistance than ever before. These people who are on social assistance, many of them have never been on social assistance before, and yet I received a letter yesterday from a woman, whose child had to have physiotherapy, telling me that the child could only get physiotherapy once a week because of cutbacks in the Social Services budget, and that child needs it twice a week. So I checked it out and, sure enough,

MR. HODDER: I spoke to the physiotherapists and they said, 'That is correct, Sir. Because of the recent cutbacks in Social Services, this child cannot get physiotherapy.' I said, 'Does the child need physiotherapy?' 'Yes, definitely, he should have physiotherapy, but the mother is on social assistance and the Social Services budget has been cut back.' That is only a minor example of some of the hardships that go on, the cutting back on drugs, the fact that social workers are now limited in transportation. People in some departments of the provincial government can be seen any weekend with their wives and children out driving around on Sunday afternoons in government owned cars - and every member of this House should know that because you can go to any part of this Province and find civil servants using government cars, yet a social worker who needs to get to people to help them cannot get the use of government cars: they have been so restricted that when they do go out they just cannot do the job they are supposed to do. In rural areas you do not have people who can get to the office all the time, the social worker must go to the home to see what the situation is, and I agree with that, but these people are being restricted. So we have in the province a government on the one hand who brings in a budget which does not tell all, because it is only once you get out into the rural areas, and not only the rural areas of the Province but right here in St. John's, when you talk to people in St. John's and see how that budget has affected them, not only with health-care, people lined up in pain and suffering - I had a call over the weekend from somebody who wanted to get into the Health Sciences Complex with a disc problem, who could not even find out how long it would take to get in. A woman came to me last week who had been a public health nurse for forty odd years, who had to come in for cancer surgery - they had done everything they could at the Western Memorial Hospital in Corner Brook for her a month and a half ago - and she could not get any satisfaction whatsoever on when the surgery would be done,

MR. HODDER: and she had been a public health nurse in this Province in excess of forty years.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Chairman, I will come back to it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, just to make a few comments, firstly on the last hon. member who spoke. He brings in specific cases of difficulties, whether it is regard to physiotherapy or whether with regard to public servants using transportation as opposed to those who work for Social Services. These are all vague references and I am sure if the hon. member has legitimate concerns and he directs them to the departments that are concerned, he will get what answers are available. I would suggest that in most instances the answers are perfectly satisfactory. Mr. Chairman, I think there may be a certain amount of genuine concern about the public debt of the Province, and I think the concern is very largely unwarranted. For the hon. members' benefit I would like to give a few figures, and these are not cooked up figures, I can assure the hon. members, you can get these out of the budgets over the last numbers of years, or from statistics that are officially kept.

DR. COLLINS: I think it is important that hon. members understand the situation and perhaps also that through this House the message get out to the public.

If we look at total public sector debt per capita, that is on an individual basis, if you compare the difference between 1981-1982 and 1982-1983, compare those two years, there was an increase of 7.5 per cent. Now that was less than the inflation rate. If you compare then 1982-1983 with 1983-1984, 1983-1984 is the current year, the increase was 5.7 per cent. That was considerably less than the anticipated inflation rate. In other words, the growth in our public sector debt is increasing in the last number of years at a rate less than inflation. And you can therefore say that in real terms, because inflation brings you into the nominal value aspect of things, in real terms our public sector debt is decreasing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

DR. COLLINS: Now the hon. members opposite will laugh at that. This indicates the level of their understanding. There is no amusement in the figures. If they laugh at that it merely indicates the level of their diminished understanding of the matter, that if you owe something and from one year to another what you owe increases at less than the rate of inflation, in real terms you owe less. I can understand if the hon. the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) does not understand it, I can credit that; I think the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) does understand it because he is pretty smart, but he will laugh for political purposes.

Now another point: If we look at budgetary requirements as a percentage of total expenditure, and that is a very legitimate way of looking at them, ten years ago there was an 18.3 per cent average over a

DR. COLLINS: four year period. That was a budgetary requirement as a percentage of total expenditures, 18.3 per cent averaged over four years. In recent years, the percentage is down to 8.7 per cent averaged over four years, the most recent four years 8.7 per cent. So we have gone from budgetary requirement as a percentage of our total expenditures from 18.3 per cent down to 8.7 per cent.

If you compare debt charges as a percentage of total current account expenditures, you take your total current account expenditures, take out the amount that you spend on taking care of your debt charges - in 1978-1979 that was 16 per cent, in other words, 16 per cent of total current account expenditures went to service our debt, 16 per cent - in the current budget the percentage is 16.3 per cent. It is up only .3 per cent and this is in the middle of the worst recession in Canada since the Second World War and our percentage has only gone up by .3 per cent. Last year, Mr. Chairman, it was only 15.6 per cent. In other words, it was less last year than it was in 1978-1979.

DR. COLLINS: If we look at the growth, and this was mentioned in the Budget Speech, if you look at the growth in public sector debt over the past five years, in Newfoundland and Labrador the average growth per year was 7 per cent; the all province average was 12 per cent; the federal government's growth rate was 11 per cent; ours was 7 per cent, if you put all provinces together they average 12 per cent over the past five years, and the federal government averaged 11 per cent growth over the last five years. So on all four scores, that is our public sector debt as a per capita public sector debt, how it compares to inflation, the budgetary requirements - that is what we have to borrow for our capital account to cover any deficits we might have - compare that with a decade ago, you look at the debt charges as a percentage of our total current account expenditures and you look at what our public sector debt has done over the past few years in this Province compared to all other provinces and compared to the federal government, on all those four points we have come out better than, in most cases, the others, or at least as well.

Obviously it is a good debating point to say we are going down the tube, but, quite apart from that thought, I think that some people do have a misunderstanding of what the public debt is all about; what is happening to it? Is it getting worse, is it getting better, how do we compare with other places? And I think, as I mentioned, that we are doing extremely well in that regard.

One final point, the hon. members opposite have mentioned the public debt in the final years of the Smallwood administration, and I am

DR. COLLINS: quite sure - I have not checked this out-but I am quite sure they are talking about the direct debt and they are saying it was something about \$900 million or whatever, and they are saying well now, look what it is now, our direct debt is so much more. In actual fact, Mr. Chairman, if you use 1971 dollars - I am sure the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) will not understand what I am talking about now when I get into this but this is how comparisons are made - you use constant dollars and then you can compare apples with apples and, because inflation is taken out, you are not comparing apples with grapefruit. If you use 1971 dollars, the direct debt of the Province has only gone up from whatever it was - \$900 million dollars or whatever the hon. members say - it has only gone up in those terms up to \$1200 million. So we have only increased our public debt in constant dollars by \$300 million since the closing days of the Smallwood regime and look at what has been done with it! Look at the linerboard mill, look at the expansion of the fishing industry, look at the many other things that this government has done in rural Newfoundland and all these other areas, and we have done that

DR. COLLINS: by just increasing our debt in constant dollars by \$300 million.

Now, as I say, I am quite sure the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) will understand these things, the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) would, I am sure the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) will not, and I am convinced that the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) will not, but, I mean, these are points that anyone with any knowledge of financial matters will see are very cogent points and have to be kept in mind when we are talking and not talk foolishly about our public debt in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I think we are good for a week or two on this yet, but I wonder if the House Leader wants to be beneficent and call it six o'clock?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed to call it six o'clock?

MR. ROBERTS: We will be back at it Thursday, I guess, will we?

MR. MARSHALL: I will call it six o'clock. You have been run over by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins).

MR. ROBERTS: May I also in asking that thank all members of the House, including my friend the House Leader, for their kindness in rearranging the order of the Private Members' motions last week, I do appreciate it, I was caught in a most embarrassing way, in that I had a commitment I could not get out of in Corner Brook. I am grateful to my friends on both sides for accommodating me.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for Kilbride.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to it referred, have directed me to report some 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.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, at 3:00 P.M.

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